The "Too Big to Fail" Proposition of AI: A Three-Way Contest Between Rates, Debt, and Technology

From Vision Pricing to Distribution Pricing

Reporting Period: October 2026 · Public Release

Issued by

DH Wealth Management Pte Ltd

Singapore CMS Licence No.: CMS101242

[IMPORTANT PRELIMINARY DISCLAIMER] This report is intended solely for Institutional Investors, Accredited Investors, or other eligible recipients who meet applicable regulatory requirements. All content constitutes market review and hypothetical scenario analysis only. It does **not constitute investment advice, an offer, or a solicitation**, and does not induce any purchase, sale, or portfolio adjustment. All scenario analyses are analytical tools and do not imply that any particular outcome will materialise. Past market performance is not indicative of future results. Please refer to the complete disclaimer in the Appendix.

Executive Summary | Key Points in Five Minutes

1. **The AI narrative has completed a phase transition: from vision valuation to revenue realisation and distribution pricing across the value chain.** Major AI-related companies in the US account for a relatively high weight in the S&P 500 index, and market concentration warrants continuous monitoring. OpenAI revenue expectations span the USD 50–68 billion range; divergence among institutions may reflect the market's core focus on the pace of AI commercialisation. The AI sector has exited its broad-based rally. Upstream hardware continues to exhibit earnings elasticity, but cost pressure is being transmitted downstream to terminal segments; Samsung Electronics' Q3 results provide a microcosm of intra-chain divergence. Coupled with ASML's downward revision of quarterly guidance, the market is beginning to acknowledge the realistic constraint that AI capital expenditure is not a linear ascent.
2. **Rate repricing has intensified, with the Treasury range shifting higher.** Driven by a stronger-than-expected rebound in US September CPI, the 10-year Treasury yield probed 5.34%, and the market has pushed its first rate-cut expectation to April 2027. Whether the rate midpoint undergoes a structural shift depends on three observable variables: the pace of Treasury supply, changes in term premium, and whether supply-side inflation resurfaces. The report does not presuppose a unilateral direction for rates; it merely sets out observable trigger signals to iterate the analytical framework.
3. **Four observation dimensions for tail risk:** bearish positions on technology held by certain market participants, public warnings on debt-financing models by well-known investors, structural characteristics of private-market circular financing, and Samsung's semiconductor-versus-terminal operating divergence plus ASML's weak equipment-side guidance. These four publicly available inputs serve as real-world references for the scenario analysis in this report, spanning financial, macro, structural, and industrial dimensions respectively.
4. **Cross-asset markets are displaying a differentiated verification state.** Some risk-asset prices reflect upstream AI value-chain strength; however, memory supply-side disruption and downward capex revisions are exerting correction pressure on the sector. Korean and Taiwanese technology equities have undergone pronounced adjustment, while Hong Kong and A-share markets have demonstrated relative independence. Gold and structured products each rest on corresponding market-logic hypotheses, and every such logic carries falsifiable observation conditions.
5. **Four hypothetical scenarios are set out, all with trigger conditions and revision signals:** Scenario A (range-bound continuation), Scenario B (AI productivity realised + persistent inflation stickiness), Scenario C (moderate risk-off), and Scenario D (deep adjustment). All scenarios are analytical tools; the report does not predict that any particular one will materialise.

Chapter 1 | Market Core: The Substantive Transition in the AI Narrative — From Vision Pricing to Distribution Pricing

Core observation in the September report: AI capex carries an inherent tension between "verbal calls for a slowdown" and "accelerated actual deployment". AI hardware valuations exhibit structural fragility, and market returns are highly concentrated in a handful of AI giants. Entering October, these contradictions have not dissipated; rather, a substantive migration has occurred at the narrative level. The market's pricing focus has shifted from long-dated technological vision to commercialisation capability, profit-distribution dynamics across the value chain, and second-order effects of cost pass-through. Following ASML's below-consensus quarterly results and downward guidance revision, together with supply-side disruption in the memory sector, the market is further acknowledging the realistic constraint that AI capex is not a one-way linear ascent.

1.1 Market Concentration Warrants Continuous Monitoring

Major AI-related companies in the US account for a relatively high weight in the S&P 500 index, and market concentration warrants continuous monitoring.

Extending the September report's multi-dimensional objective reading:

1. **Economic lens:** Tangible evidence of productivity gains from generative AI exists, but growth contribution is further concentrated in leading companies. Should AI capex decelerate at the margin, under specific conditions this may generate a multiplier effect on equipment investment and corporate employment expectations that exceeds these firms' index weight.
2. **Financial lens:** The positive feedback loop of passive flows continues to strengthen. Higher market capitalisation lifts index weights, which attracts further passive inflows, further lifting share prices; this mechanism amplifies gains in up-cycles and equally amplifies drawdowns in down-cycles.
3. **Trading lens:** Historical statistics show that in the 12–24 months following the top-ten weight breaking through 35%, style rotation or intra-chain tier rotation typically occurs. Corresponding market signals are already present: hardware-sector volatility has risen, and certain AI application-layer regional tech indices have recorded relative gains.
4. **Risk lens:** Extreme concentration creates systemic fragility. The capex, earnings guidance, and debt-financing behaviour of a few giants can directly affect broad-index performance. Overall AI-sector prosperity does not equate to synchronous benefit across all parts of the chain; upstream captures the bulk of profit while downstream absorbs cost pass-through. This distribution imbalance may be a structural phenomenon worth monitoring in the current market. The recent correction in semiconductors may also reflect initial market pricing of this risk.

1.2 OpenAI Revenue Divergence: USD 50bn vs USD 68bn — A Reality Check on Commercialisation

Institutional estimates of OpenAI's annualised revenue span USD 50–68 billion, with significant divergence among institutions. This is an important observation case for the October AI narrative.

- Optimistic scenario: enterprise paid-penetration continues to rise, large-model API and private-deployment businesses scale rapidly, and revenue moves towards USD 68 billion;
- Prudent scenario: large-model service price competition intensifies, enterprise budgets remain cautious, and the revenue midpoint converges towards USD 50 billion.

Market implication of this divergence: the focus of debate may be shifting from "will the AI industry arrive?" to the pace of commercialisation and the margin impact of price competition. Market chatter of a 50% price reduction in OpenAI's large-model services carries value-chain transmission implications: model-layer price cuts theoretically release cost space for downstream applications, but if upstream chip prices continue to rise, downstream cost relief may be absorbed by hardware costs. This tension constitutes a key micro-level clue for Scenario B.

1.3 AI Debt and Capex Contradiction Persists

The September report recorded two market facts: (i) technology giants' 2026 bond issuance approaching USD 220 billion; (ii) Goldman Sachs estimating 2026 full-year AI-related capex at approximately USD 1 trillion, potentially peaking.

In October, no public data has clearly overturned these observations: technology companies continue to raise funds via the bond market to support compute investment; the internal tension between "calls to slow model capability iteration" and "continued compute expansion and large-scale IPOs" persists. Certain well-known investors have publicly warned on the high-debt financing model in the technology sector: if future cash flows fail to materialise as expected, high debt leverage will expose operational fragility. This public view will serve as reference material in both this chapter's macro clues and Chapter 5's scenario analysis.

New industry reality: ASML's Q3 revenue fell short of consensus, and the company simultaneously revised down Q4 guidance, reflecting that memory customers' capex recovery pace is weaker than previously optimistic assumptions. The capex constraint is gradually manifesting in equipment-side data.

Chapter 2 | October: Three Turning Points

2.1 Macro: Inflation Data Rebounds Again, Rate Repricing Reinforced

US September CPI came in above market expectations at 3.4% year-on-year, with core CPI at 3.7% year-on-year, both above consensus. Following the release, the 2-year Treasury yield rose 14.7bp to 4.94%, and the 10-year Treasury yield broke through 5.34%. The market pushed its first Fed rate-cut expectation from February 2027 to April 2027; current data suggest rates may remain higher for longer.

The Baltic Supramax Index (BSI) remains elevated, and the stickiness constraint on supply-side inflation has not dissipated. Coupled with ongoing geopolitical tension in the Middle East, Brent crude has settled near USD 106, with elevated oil prices posing potential imported-inflation pressure. Traditional monetary policy tools have limited efficacy against supply-side shocks from supply chains, shipping, and geopolitics. The policy dilemma of "suppressing aggregate demand" versus "persistent supply shock" has resurfaced.

2.2 Semiconductor Value Chain: Dual Shock — Supply-Side Disruption plus Capex Expectation Revision

In October, the semiconductor sector has undergone two rounds of expectation re-pricing, with risks emerging simultaneously on the supply and demand sides.

1. Supply-side variable: technology-iteration pricing has emerged in the memory segment. The market is beginning to reassess the long-term competitive landscape among memory oligopolists—should the next-generation architecture achieve mass production within the next 12–24 months, incumbent vendors' pricing power in the server memory market may face structural challenges. Korean memory names have seen pronounced correction, with the KOSPI briefly triggering a circuit breaker. Samsung's Q3 results exhibit a classic internal divergence: the DS semiconductor division contributed almost the entirety of operating profit, with the memory price surge benefiting upstream; yet the DX handset and home-appliance terminal division saw losses widen further, reflecting "chip inflation" being transmitted downstream and compressing terminal profitability—a microcosm of intra-chain distribution imbalance.
2. Demand–capex side: semiconductor equipment leader ASML reported Q3 revenue below consensus and revised down Q4 revenue guidance, explicitly noting that memory customers' capex recovery pace is weaker than previously optimistic market assumptions. Combined with Broadcom executives' public warning that AI expansion faces capital constraints, the market is shifting from a pure AI-vision narrative towards calibrating realistic capex conditions.

Differentiated signals also persist: certain optical communication and optical component segments continue to report capacity tightness, but the hardware sector as a whole is absorbing an "expectations verification tax". Under high expectations, partial positive industry fundamentals are no longer sufficient to

sustain continued sector upside.

2.3 AI Commercialisation Narrative: Revenue Expectation Divergence, Market Enters Verification Phase

OpenAI's two revenue-estimate ranges (USD 50bn vs USD 68bn) are under public discussion, with the divergence stemming from differences in the treatment of realised revenue versus year-end targets and accounting conventions. This discussion may indicate that the market's focus is shifting towards the pace of commercialisation and the transmission of price cuts across the entire value chain's profit pool.

A set of contradictory phenomena exists within the industry itself: on the one hand, certain hardware and optical module capacity queues extend several years out, and physical supply bottlenecks are objectively present; on the other hand, secondary-market tolerance for high AI-hardware valuations has fallen markedly, and any signal short of prior optimistic imagination readily triggers valuation-level correction.

2.4 Financial Sector: Highly Divergent Earnings, Profit Resilience Stratifying

Parts of the banking earnings season have now been disclosed, with pronounced intra-sector divergence. Bank of America benefited from consumer credit and net interest income, showing relatively strong earnings resilience; Morgan Stanley's wealth management business was stable, but trading and investment banking recovery fell short of market expectations; BlackRock's AUM grew, but was overshadowed by the dominant macro inflation narrative, with the earnings beat failing to lift the share price.

A shift in market pricing logic has emerged: a mere "earnings beat" is no longer sufficient to drive asset prices higher. The market is further discriminating on earnings sustainability and underlying business resilience—the same market logic as Samsung's "record profit, falling share price". In an extremely high-expectation environment, merely meeting expectations is no longer sufficient to satisfy market pricing requirements.

2.5 FX, Treasury Holdings, and Tail-Risk Clues

The Bank of Japan has maintained its three-month rate-hike interval; the US–Japan rate differential remains the single most important variable for the yen carry trade, and the tail risk of carry-trade unwinding continues to accumulate.

US Treasury TIC data continues to show the "East reducing, West adding" divergence in Treasury holdings; aggregate overseas institutional Treasury holdings remain at low levels.

Bearish positions on technology held by certain market participants, structural characteristics of private-market circular financing, and public warnings by well-known investors on the technology sector's debt-financing model provide ongoing real-world reference material on risk from the perspectives of financial positioning, private-market structure, and macro debt respectively.

Chapter 3 | The Pricing Anchor: Where Rates Are, and What Signals Would Break the Range

Core observation in the September report: the global rate shift is a structural "chronic condition" rather than the acute shock of 2022; government issuance combined with rising term premium implies the possibility of a structural upward shift in the rate midpoint; overseas Treasury holdings exhibit an "East reducing, West adding" divergence.

In October:

1. Driven by the stronger-than-expected September CPI, the 10-year Treasury yield broke 5.34%, and the prior 4.85–5.10 range was breached to the upside. The new observation range has shifted to **5.10%–5.45%**, which now serves as an important pricing reference anchor for cross-asset markets.
2. The divergence in overseas Treasury holdings continues; no trend-reversal signal has been observed.
3. The BSI remains elevated; the policy dilemma posed by supply-side inflation has not been resolved.

3.1 The Three-Layer Pricing Reference Anchor for Rates

1. **Layer 1: Realised inflation stickiness**
   The Baltic Supramax Index remains elevated. Historical data show that the BSI leads US CPI by approximately 2–4 months, with a correlation coefficient of 0.661. Supply-side logistics and commodity disruptions are difficult to resolve directly via traditional monetary policy. Should core CPI rebound again, this could exert upward pressure on long-end yields.
2. **Layer 2: Treasury supply and term premium**
   Continued US fiscal issuance, combined with large-scale technology-sector bond financing, affects the supply–demand balance in the bond market and thus the term premium. In an environment of rising term premium, the long-end rate midpoint corresponding to any given inflation expectation will be higher.
3. **Layer 3: Major central bank policy paths**
   The Fed and the Bank of Japan constitute the two major macro variables. Fed policy is highly anchored to inflation data; the BoJ's rate-hike interval remains at three months, and a rapid yen appreciation could trigger carry-trade unwinding pressure, lifting global risk premia.

3.2 Falsifiable Observation Signals for Breaking the Current Rate Range

> Note: The following is an objective observation checklist only—**not a forecast, and not an indication that any of these will occur**. Should the corresponding signals appear, the rate scenario assumptions in this report will be iterated accordingly.

Observation signals suggesting potential upward breakout (>5.45%)—any 2 of the following

- US core CPI/PCE once again exceeding expectations, prompting the market to reprice another Fed hike;
- The BSI shipping index surging significantly again, with food-inflation pass-through confirmed by data;
- Auction demand at the primary Treasury market persistently weakening, overseas institutions further reducing Treasury holdings, and term premium rising markedly.

Observation signals suggesting potential downward breakout (<5.10%)—any 2 of the following

- Two consecutive inflation reports confirming a sustained decline in core inflation;
- US employment data showing clear cooling, with non-farm payrolls and wage growth weakening markedly;
- Persistent risk-off selling in risk assets, with large-scale flows into Treasuries as a safe haven.

Range-bound base case: inflation data mixed and oscillating, major central banks on hold, and the 10-year Treasury oscillating between 5.10% and 5.45%.

3.3 Historical Transmission of Rates to Cross-Asset Markets

- **High-duration growth assets:** historically highly sensitive to rising rates;
- **Financials:** historically beneficiaries of a high-rate environment, though rapid rate rises also suppress growth expectations;
- **Gold:** its pricing logic has expanded from pure real-rate drivers to incorporate USD credit-discount factors, and is not simply negatively correlated with rates;
- **Structured products:** volatility is jointly driven by rates and equity markets. Changes in interest rates and market volatility may affect the pricing and coupon levels of structured products, but higher coupons do not imply lower investment risk. Such products may involve knock-in risk, underlying asset price volatility, liquidity risk, issuer credit risk, and the risk of partial or total principal loss. Specific terms and risks should be governed by the formal product issuance documentation.

Chapter 4 | Asset Verification: Which Assets Are Confirming the AI Narrative, and Which Are Diverging

4.1 US Equities: Continued Sector Divergence, Hardware versus Application-Layer Performance

The August–September market phenomena have persisted and further intensified: AI hardware-sector volatility has risen markedly, while the AI application layer has shown relative resilience.

- Signals confirming upstream AI value-chain strength: cloud and AI software sectors maintained relative resilience; select AI application-related names continued to attract capital support.
- Signals diverging from a simple broad-based AI rally: semiconductor equipment and memory segments have corrected. Samsung's earnings and ASML's guidance cut together provide micro-level evidence: memory price rises generate high upstream profits, but the cost of those price rises is transmitted downstream to terminal manufacturing, compressing handset and home-appliance profitability, while equipment vendors report capex recovery falling short of optimistic expectations. **AI compute-chain prosperity does not equate to improved terminal hardware profitability, nor to unconstrained continued capex expansion.**

US market concentration continues to rise, with the weight of leading AI-related companies at elevated levels. Broad-index performance is heavily influenced by a handful of giants, and index-level performance has become decoupled from a large number of constituents. The S&P 500 has oscillated broadly, but intra-sector return dispersion is significant.

4.2 Hong Kong Equities: Valuation-Recovery Logic as an Unverified Hypothesis

The September report recorded one market hypothesis: the Hang Seng Index and emerging-market currency indices diverged; by historical analogy, the HSI could challenge its year-to-date high of 28,056. EM currency indices remain strong, but the HSI has yet to complete an upward breakout, showing relative resilience amid a global tech-sector correction. If EM currencies continue to strengthen while the HSI continues to underperform, we will lower the weight of the valuation-recovery hypothesis; if the HSI breaks above its prior high on volume, the hypothesis gains price-level confirmation.

Sector-level observation: internet and semiconductors remain the two main lines; the semiconductor sector's price is sensitive to overseas memory-cycle and semiconductor earnings sentiment.

4.3 Northeast Asian Technology Equities: The Two Sides of the Memory Cycle, Regional Divergence Intensifying

Korean and Taiwanese equity markets have seen pronounced correction from the dual impact of memory supply-side disruption and ASML's weak guidance; A-shares and Hong Kong have moved relatively independently, further confirming the divergence between domestic and external logic.

Objective implication: analysis of East Asian technology sectors cannot simply extrapolate linearly that memory price rises benefit all technology names. It is necessary to distinguish between upstream compute supply-side and downstream terminal demand-side operating conditions, and to remain attentive to sentiment transmission around external semiconductor earnings windows.

Chapter 5 | Macro Outlook and Strategy Considerations: Four Hypothetical Scenarios with Triggers and Revision Conditions

Continuing from the September report's three paths and extended into four hypothetical scenarios. All scenarios are analytical tools only, and each carries **trigger conditions, historical market-characteristic references, and revision (override) conditions**, thereby remaining falsifiable.

Important statement: this report does not predict that any particular scenario will necessarily materialise; scenario weights may be adjusted as market data update.

Scenario A: Range-Bound Continuation (Base-Case Analytical Scenario)

- **Trigger conditions (hypothetical):** mixed inflation data; the Fed on hold; AI capex neither collapsing nor surprising to the upside; yen carry trade stable with no large-scale unwinding; no major external supply shock.
- **Historical market-characteristic references:** rapid sector rotation, no sustained leadership; alternating AI hardware and application-layer performance; rates oscillating between 5.10% and 5.45%; structured products maintaining a neutral pricing environment; gold and Hong Kong equities oscillating repeatedly.
- **Override signals:** a material upside/downside break in Treasury rates; or large-scale risk-asset selling; or a surprise directional change in AI capex.

Scenario B: AI Productivity Realised, but Inflation Stickiness Persists

- **Trigger conditions (hypothetical):** AI giants' earnings show capex converting into revenue; large-model commercialisation progresses; BSI and commodities remain elevated with supply-side inflation slow to decline; the Fed finds it difficult to pivot quickly to cuts.
- **Historical market-characteristic references:** AI application layer relatively advantaged; upstream chipmakers' earnings robust; cost pass-through to downstream, compressing terminal-segment profitability; long-end rates elevated; gold supported by credit-discount logic; equity markets in structural rather than broad-based mode.

> Samsung Electronics reported Q3 operating profit of KRW 107.4 trillion, but the DS (semiconductor) division accounted for nearly all of it. The memory price rises driving DS profit are compressing DX (handset/home appliance) margins. MX and network business losses widened from KRW 700 billion in Q2 to KRW 1.8 trillion in Q3. Samsung's Q4 smartphone production is reported to have been cut by 20%–30%. This is the clearest case of "intra-chain distribution imbalance in AI": upstream realises, downstream bears the strain.

The OpenAI price-cut rumour provides another reference clue for this scenario: large-model price cuts theoretically release downstream benefits, but upstream chip price rises in turn offset downstream cost relief; the tug-of-war between upstream and downstream persists.

Scenario C: Moderate Risk-Off

- **Trigger conditions (hypothetical):** AI capex decelerates at the margin; inflation resilience persists; the market begins to price technology-sector debt risk; no systemic liquidity crisis occurs; the financing fragility reflected in certain market participants' bearish positions and the structural characteristics of private-market circular financing is partially priced by the market.
- **Historical market-characteristic references:** rising volatility; growth-sector correction; capital migration towards defensive sectors and gold; rising knock-in risk in structured products; no liquidity stampede yet.

Reference material: bearish positions on technology held by certain market participants, potential fragility in private-market circular financing, and public warnings by well-known investors on debt-financing dependence; together, these three provide real-world reference for this scenario hypothesis.

Scenario D: Deep Adjustment (Low-Probability Tail Scenario, Under Continuous Monitoring)

- **Trigger conditions (hypothetical; at least two simultaneously):** (i) large-scale yen carry-trade unwinding; (ii) marked weakening in Treasury auctions with a jump in term premium; (iii) substantial downward revision of AI giants' capex; (iv) oil prices surging again, driving inflation higher and forcing central banks to continue tightening.
- **Historical market-characteristic references:** cross-asset risk selling, equities and bonds under simultaneous pressure; volatility rising sharply; most risk assets correcting; gold's safe-haven property reasserting.
- **Override conditions:** if all of the above trigger conditions disappear, the analytical weight of this scenario is downgraded.

Appendix | Data Sources, Important Disclaimers, and Risk Warnings

Data Sources

Bloomberg, Reuters (public data on indices, FX, commodities, equity derivatives)

US Treasury TIC international capital flows report; Bureau of Labor Statistics; Federal Reserve public disclosures

Bank of Japan public decisions and official remarks

Samsung Electronics and ASML financial statements; OpenAI industry rumours and institutional estimates

Public market research and executive public remarks from multiple financial institutions (specific institution names are withheld for compliance reasons)

This report is intended solely for Institutional Investors, Accredited Investors, or other eligible recipients who meet applicable regulatory requirements, and may not be distributed to recipients who do not meet such conditions.

Important Disclaimers

1. DH Wealth Management Pte Ltd holds a Capital Markets Services (CMS) licence issued by the Monetary Authority of Singapore (MAS), Licence No. CMS101242. The content of this report constitutes market review and hypothetical scenario analysis only and does **not constitute investment advice within the meaning of MAS regulation, nor any offer, solicitation, or opinion to purchase, sell, or hold any security, fund, or derivative**.
2. The report contains forward-looking assumptions that are subject to inherent uncertainty; actual market outcomes may differ materially from the scenarios presented. Falsifiable conditions are included for internal research iteration and do not represent forecasts of future market behaviour.
3. All investment activity carries the risk of principal loss. Any recipient should, before taking any investment action, independently conduct its own assessment and consult independent legal, tax, and investment advisers. Past market performance is not indicative of future returns.
4. Third-party data referenced in this report is drawn from publicly available sources; DHWM accepts no responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or timeliness of such third-party data. No part of this report may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without the prior written consent of DHWM.
5. Territorial restriction: this report is intended solely for use by eligible investors in Singapore and under applicable cross-border wealth management frameworks.
6. Enquiries: compliance@dhwealth.sg
7. All analytical material in this report is based on publicly available information. Any subsequently emerging data or events fall outside the analytical coverage of this report; investors should independently iterate their own judgements in light of subsequent public information.