

Dispute Mechanism for Pair Settlement

by [Nick Clark](#) | Published April 25, 2026

What It Specifies

The dispute protocol defines: dispute initiation, evidence submission, resolver selection, resolution finding. Each message carries credentialed identity; the architecture tracks the dispute state; the resolution becomes part of the original settlement's lineage.

Dispute resolvers are credentialed authorities. Their authority to resolve specific dispute classes is declared; settling parties admit the resolution authority before the original settlement; disputes proceed under the declared authority.

Why It Matters Structurally

Pair settlements without dispute mechanism produce operational rigidity. Real exchanges occasionally fail; the architecture must support failure handling structurally.

Dispute mechanism produces structural support. Disputed settlements proceed through declared resolution; the resolution carries lineage; the resolved state replaces the disputed state under declared finality.

How It Composes With Mesh Operation

The architecture defines the dispute protocol, the evidence standards, and the resolution authority structure. Parties implementing the protocol can dispute and resolve within the architectural pattern.

Disputes can compose with other features. Cross-authority disputes, multi-party disputes, and escrow-integrated disputes all build on the dispute primitive.

What This Enables

Commercial pair operations gain structurally-supported dispute resolution. Civil-infrastructure operations gain the same; charging-station, tolling, and freight-handoff disputes proceed under declared authority.

The architecture also supports adversarial-aware dispute. Disputes raised in bad faith surface as patterns; the architecture supports dispute-resolver authority to penalize abuse; the abuse-handling itself enters lineage.