Nick Clark · Published July 30, 2026 · PDF

When Two Machines Must Settle and No One Is Watching

At 4:40 in the morning, a sealed pharmaceutical container changes hands at a loading bay, and the two parties to that exchange are both machines. Nine days later a custody-compliance lead at a regional cold-chain carrier is asked to prove who held the container at the moment of transfer, under whose authority, and where. She cannot, because in her setup the handoff produced a dispatch entry rather than a bound bilateral record, and the moment is gone. U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/049,409 discloses a matched-pair settlement primitive in which the surrendering custodian's release observation and the receiving custodian's acceptance observation pair into a persistent settlement record. This article describes what her failure costs her, and what shape the disclosed mechanism takes.

The 4:40 Handoff

The custody-compliance lead at a regional cold-chain carrier has one job that matters more than the rest of them: for any container her company has touched, she has to be able to say who was holding it at every minute of its life. Most days that is a paperwork job. Nine days ago it stopped being one.

At 4:40 in the morning, at a depot bay her carrier does not own, a driver's tractor released a sealed pharmaceutical container to a receiving dock agent. Neither side was a person. Her driver was asleep in the cab on a mandated rest break, and the depot runs its inbound bays unattended between two and six. Her tractor's telematics wrote a departure event. The depot's yard system wrote an arrival event. As those two systems are provisioned in her lane, neither has ever exchanged anything with the other.

Today the consignee has flagged a temperature excursion on that lot and is holding her carrier responsible. She has pulled everything she has. Her tractor's log says the container left at 4:41. The depot's log says it was received at 4:47. Six minutes sit between those two numbers, and for those six minutes her records name no custodian at all. The depot's counsel has already written that the container was, in their reading, still in her carrier's custody when the excursion began.

What she cannot do is the specific thing her job is: produce a single record, made at the moment of transfer, that both parties signed, that fixes where the two of them were and when, and that neither of them can now walk back. In her deployment nothing produced that record, because nothing she had put at that bay was configured to. Two independent logs, written by two systems answering to two different companies, are what she has.

What She Cannot Get Back

The lot is gone. That part she had made peace with by the second day, since nothing in her carrier's quality procedure releases quarantined product back into distribution, and the value of the shipment is a number her company can absorb.

What does not come back is the moment. Her carrier's exposure here is not the container, it is the six minutes, and in the way she had that bay set up those six minutes went unwitnessed. She can subpoena the depot's yard system and get their version. She can put her driver under oath about a rest break he slept through. She can hire a

forensic reader for both telematics streams and get two internally consistent stories that disagree with each other. None of that manufactures a record that did not exist at 4:41, and every reconstruction she pays for is an argument rather than an artifact.

The second thing that does not come back is her position in the argument. As her operation is configured today, all she can bring to the table is her own log, against a counterparty bringing its own and rather more counsel. She is not going to lose the excursion claim on the physics. She is going to lose it on the gap.

The third loss is the one that keeps her at her desk after the claim is closed. Her carrier runs roughly nine hundred unattended handoffs a month across bays it does not control. Every one of those, for her purposes, has the same open six minutes in it. The claim she is fighting is not the exposure. It is the sample.

Why Her Problem Has This Shape

The difficulty in her network is not that the two machines failed to record anything. Both recorded diligently. The difficulty is that each one recorded alone.

An event written by her tractor is an assertion by her carrier about her carrier. An event written by the depot's yard system is an assertion by the depot about the depot. For her purposes those are two affidavits rather than one transaction, and each of the two was produced by the party it happens to exonerate. Were her tractor and the depot's dock agent able to produce one record between them, rather than one record apiece, she believes the six minutes would be considerably harder for her counterpart to argue.

Her second constraint is that the exchange happened in physical space and left her no physical-space evidence. The container was in one place at one time. Both machines were within a few meters of it. Nothing in her setup bound the record to that fact, so the geometry that would settle the question is exactly the geometry that went unrecorded.

Her third constraint is timing. Her tractor's clock and the depot's clock are set independently, and neither company's timestamps are credentialed to the other. The six-minute discrepancy that her counterpart is building a case on may be a custody gap or may be clock drift, and as her records stand she has no way to argue which without arguing about clocks, which is a losing venue.

Her fourth constraint is that adding an intermediary does not obviously help her. Were she to route every unattended handoff through a clearing service, she would be adding a third party that was also not present at 4:41, that would hold her transaction data, and that she would have to defend in the same dispute. For her carrier's purposes, the parties she would want settling are the two that were actually there.

Paired Observations as a Settlement Primitive

U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/049,409 discloses a matched-pair settlement primitive directed to the governance-chain-preserving bilateral settlement of a physical-world exchange. In described embodiments, the settlement is produced through paired governed observations from two authority-credentialed parties within a governance-policy-defined spatial and temporal window, yielding a persistent settlement record admissible by downstream consumers without third-party intermediary, without centralized consensus, and without pre-negotiated session state.

The disclosure parameterizes that primitive across domain instances. In the chain-of-custody custodial handoff instance described in the filing, the first observation is the surrendering custodian's release observation and the second observation is the receiving custodian's acceptance observation. That is the shape of the transaction the compliance lead's 4:41 event would need to be, rather than a departure entry with no counterparty.

Structurally, the disclosed primitive includes a first-observation interface ingesting a governance-credentialed observation representing offer, tender, claim, demand, or commitment; a second-observation interface ingesting a governance-credentialed observation representing acceptance, counter-tender, acknowledgment, or fulfillment; a spatial-proximity evaluator verifying that the observations fall within a governance-policy-defined spatial window per the mesh-derived coordinate primitive; a temporal-proximity evaluator verifying a governance-policy-defined temporal window per the mesh-derived time primitive; a matched-pair recognition engine applying governance-policy-defined pairing rules; a per-party authority evaluator verifying each party's authority credential; and a composite admissibility evaluator admitting the matched pair as a settlement candidate.

The pairing rules themselves admit a plurality of forms in the disclosure, including content-matching, cryptographic-handshake, spatial-coincidence, temporal-coincidence, composite spatial-temporal, authority-pair, derivation-chain, and sequence-ordered rules. The filing gives chain-of-custody handoff as an example that may require an authority-pair rule plus spatial-coincidence plus a cryptographic handshake, with recognition rules described as governance-policy-configurable per transaction type and per deployment.

On the evidentiary side the disclosure describes a cryptographic settlement binding mechanism supporting non-repudiation, comprising a per-party signature interface producing each party's signed observation with authority credential, a pair-binding composer producing a binding over both signed observations, a spatial-temporal attestation composer binding the cryptographic pair with the spatial-proximity and temporal-proximity attestations, and a non-repudiation verifier supporting downstream verification that the settlement was authentically produced by the claimed parties at the claimed location and time. A settlement-lineage recorder is described as recording each first observation, second observation, pairing determination, binding, negotiation, escrow, failure, dispute, and downstream consumption in the governance chain lineage field.

The filing also describes what happens when a pair does not form. A timeout detector identifies first observations that receive no matching second observation within the temporal window, a non-acceptance detector identifies explicitly rejected second observations, and a failed-fulfillment detector identifies fulfillment that does not satisfy governance-policy-defined completeness. Failure responses described include notify-and-retry, escalate-to-authority, partial-settlement, rollback-with-lineage, compensating-transaction, and dispute-escalation. Proximity-window violations are described as producing governance-chain-preserving rejection with lineage recording the violation type, both observations, the measured and required windows, and the governance-policy-defined rejection consequences.

For an argument like the one on the compliance lead's desk, the disclosure describes a dispute-resolution mechanism with a dispute-initiation interface accepting governance-credentialed claims from either settled party, a dispute-admissibility evaluator applying time limits, authority appropriateness, and standing requirements, a routing engine directing admissible disputes to the governance-policy-defined resolution authority, and an evidentiary-lineage assembler assembling the complete governance-chain lineage of the disputed settlement as evidence.

Where the Disclosure Stops

Several things her situation needs are outside what the filing addresses.

The disclosed windows are governance-policy-defined. The filing describes spatial windows in radio-range, polygonal, radius-from-point, topology-bound, sensor-coverage, vehicle-proximity, and credentialed-venue forms, and temporal windows in absolute-duration, relative-event, authority-clock, operational-context, and adaptive forms, but the values appropriate to her bays are a configuration decision she would have to make and defend. A window she sets too wide would admit pairings she should not want, and one set too narrow would push ordinary handoffs into her timeout path.

Settlement of a custodial pair, as described, concerns the exchange. It does not speak to whether the goods inside her container were sound. Were her deployment to settle every handoff perfectly, a temperature claim would still turn on sensing evidence that the pairing mechanism does not itself produce.

The matched-pair primitive as disclosed is described for two parties. The filing routes coordination among three or more parties to a separate N-party coordination settlement primitive described in a following chapter, so a bay where her driver, a broker's agent, and a depot agent all take part would sit under different described subject matter.

The described spatial window presumes co-location. Transfers in her network that are effected remotely, with no two parties inside a common window, do not have the shape the bilateral primitive is described as settling.

Nothing in the filing addresses whether the tribunal hearing her claim would receive a settlement record the way she would want it received. The disclosure describes governance-chain-preserving lineage supporting regulatory audit, legal discovery, and forensic reconstruction. What a given forum does with it is not a matter the filing speaks to.

Disclosure Scope

This article is a technical description of subject matter disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/049,409. Descriptions here refer to embodiments described in that filing. Nothing in this article characterizes the scope of any claim, and nothing here is an admission regarding the state of the art. The scenario and the party described are illustrative and do not refer to any actual person or company.

Matched-Pair Settlement (/matched-pair)

All 49 steps → (/inventive-steps)

Two credentialed observations within a proximity window finalize. No intermediary, no consensus.

Provisional application

PRIMARY TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE

- Matched-Pair Settlement: Bilateral Finality From Spatial-Temporal Proximity (/articles/matched-pair-settlement-bilateral-finality-from-spatial-temporal-proximity)

SECONDARY TECHNICAL

- Spatial-Temporal Proximity Window for Pair Settlement (/articles/matched-pair/spatial-temporal-proximity-window)
- Governance Chain Lineage for Pair Settlement (/articles/matched-pair/governance-chain-lineage)
- Cross-Authority Settlement Taxonomy (/articles/matched-pair/cross-authority-taxonomy)
- No-Intermediary Pair Settlement (/articles/matched-pair/no-intermediary-settlement)
- No-Consensus Pair Settlement (/articles/matched-pair/no-consensus-settlement)
- Counter-Offer Mechanism for Pair Settlement (/articles/matched-pair/counter-offer-mechanism)
- Escrow Integration for Pair Settlement (/articles/matched-pair/escrow-integration)
- Dispute Mechanism for Pair Settlement (/articles/matched-pair/dispute-mechanism)
- Tolling Pair Settlement Embodiment (/articles/matched-pair/tolling-embodiment)
- Vehicle-to-Grid Charger Embodiment (/articles/matched-pair/v2g-charger-embodiment)

APPLICATIONS · GENERAL

- Continuity-Settled Digital Currency: Instant Cross-Border Payments Without Blockchain, Mining, Gas Fees, or Public-Key Addresses (/articles/matched-pair/continuity-settled-currency)
- EV Charging as Pair-Settled Ecosystem (/articles/matched-pair/ev-charging-pair-ecosystem)
- Port Call Coordination as Credentialed Vessel-Port Settlement (/articles/matched-pair/port-vessel-pair-coordination)
- Road Tolling Without an Intermediary: Pair-Settled Vehicle Toll Network (/articles/matched-pair/road-tolling-pair-network)
- Carbon Credit Settlement Without Double-Counting: A Matched-Pair Substrate for Article 6 and the Voluntary Market (/articles/matched-pair/carbon-credit-pair-settlement)

- Prosumer-to-Grid Energy Settlement: Auditable DER Bilateral Records Under FERC Order 2222 and NEM 3.0 (/articles/matched-pair/energy-prosumer-grid-settlement)
- Intermodal Freight Custody and Settlement Across Modes Without a Platform Intermediary (/articles/matched-pair/freight-pair-coordination)
- Atomic Settlement for Tokenized Real Estate: Closing the Cross-Jurisdiction Title Gap (/articles/matched-pair/real-estate-tokenized-settlement)
- Per-Grant Compliance for the Spectrum Secondary Market: Matched-Pair Settlement for CBRS and Dynamic Spectrum Access (/articles/matched-pair/spectrum-secondary-market)
- **When Two Machines Must Settle and No One Is Watching (/articles/matched-pair/matched-pair-stakes)**

APPLICATIONS · SPECIFIC

- ChargePoint Alternative: Pair-Settled EV Charging Beyond the CSMS (/articles/matched-pair/chargepoint-network)
- EVgo Alternative: Pair-Settled EV Charging vs Platform Intermediation (/articles/matched-pair/evgo-fastcharging)
- E-ZPass Alternative: Pair-Settled Tolling Beyond Transponder-Issuer Clearing (/articles/matched-pair/e-zpass-tolling)
- Blink Charging Alternative: Pair-Settled EV Charging Beyond Central Network Ledgers (/articles/matched-pair/blink-charging)
- Circle USDC Alternative: Pair-Settled Composition Beyond Stablecoin Rails (/articles/matched-pair/circle-usdc)
- Square (Block) Alternative: Pair-Settled Commerce Beyond the Aggregator (/articles/matched-pair/square-block)
- Stripe Alternative for Pair-Settled Bilateral Commerce (/articles/matched-pair/stripe-payments)
- Tritium Fast Charging vs Pair-Settled Charge Sessions (/articles/matched-pair/tritium-fast-charging)
- Beam Mobility Alternative: Operator-Independent Trip Settlement (/articles/matched-pair/beam-mobility-asia)
- Governed Micro-Mobility Beyond Bird, Lime, and Spin: Pair-Settled Permit Compliance (/articles/matched-pair/bird-lime-spin-mobility)
- Enphase Energy alternative: bilateral pair-settled DER commitments beyond aggregator VPP (/articles/matched-pair/enphase-microinverter)
- Stem Athena Alternative: Bilateral Pair-Settled DER Commitments (/articles/matched-pair/stem-energy-management)
- Tesla Megapack alternative: credentialed pair settlement for grid-scale energy (/articles/matched-pair/tesla-energy-megapack)

HOW-TO GUIDES

- How to Build a Carbon-Credit or Energy-Prosumer Settlement Network Without a Central Clearinghouse (/articles/guides/carbon-credit-and-prosumer-energy-settlement)
- How to Build an EV Charging or Tolling Network That Settles Peer to Peer (/articles/guides/peer-to-peer-ev-charging-and-tolling)
- How to Settle a Transaction Between Two Devices Without a Central Clearinghouse (/articles/guides/settle-transactions-between-devices-without-clearinghouse)

TERMINOLOGY

- matched-pair settlement (/glossary#matched-pair-settlement)

Matched-Pair Settlement overview → (/matched-pair)