

From Oracle Choice to Oracle Lock-In: An Exploratory Study on Blockchain Oracles Supplier Selection.

Giulio Caldarelli

Department of Management “Valter Cantino”

University of Turin, Italy

giulio.caldarelli@unito.it

[ORCID-ID: 0000-0002-8922-7871](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8922-7871)

Abstract

As data is an essential asset for any Web3 application, selecting an oracle is a critical decision for its success. To date, academic research has mainly focused on improving oracle technology and internal economics, while the drivers of oracle choice on the client side remain largely unexplored. This study fills this gap by gathering insights from leading Web3 protocols, uncovering their rationale for oracle selection and their preferences when deciding whether to outsource or internalize data request mechanisms. The collected data covers more than 55% of the DeFi market cap and is obtained exclusively by protocol executives, board members, or delegates. Insights support the view that protocol choices are tied to technological dependencies, where immutability of smart contracts amplifies lock-in, preventing agile switching among data providers. Furthermore, when viable third-party solutions exist, protocols overwhelmingly prefer outsourcing rather than building and maintaining internal oracle mechanisms.

Keywords: *Blockchain Oracles, Smart Contracts, Supplier Selection, Vendor Lock-in, Multi-Sourcing, IT outsourcing.*

1. Introduction

“There is ~40Bn of value secured by these oracles. It’s pretty much the biggest existential risk in all of crypto,” warns Flare co-founder Hugo Phillion (2024). When tens of billions in assets depend on a single data layer, the way DeFi protocols select and govern their oracle providers becomes a systemic risk factor rather than a mere implementation detail. Data is a critical input for Web3 applications, and the secure collection and transmission of this data are essential to prevent protocol failures and malfunctions. In recent years, several high-profile attacks and manipulations have demonstrated how weaknesses in oracle design can enable malicious actors to drain substantial value from DeFi systems, underscoring the need for robust, secure oracle mechanisms.

Industry forensics show that price-oracle manipulation has become one of the most damaging attack vectors in DeFi. Chainalysis estimates that DeFi protocols lost about \$403

million to oracle-manipulation attacks in 2022, and later security reports document \$52 million in additional oracle-based losses in 2024 and well over \$200 million in documented incidents in 2025 alone, implying cumulative recorded losses comfortably above \$700 million (Chainalysis Team, 2023; Tsentsura, 2025). These figures, however, cover only misconfiguration, bugs, and manipulation of price oracles inside DeFi protocols. If one adopts a broader taxonomy in which cross-chain bridges and interoperability layers are treated as oracle-like components that relay state between blockchains, the magnitudes become dramatically larger. Chainalysis reports that in 2022, cross-chain bridge hacks alone accounted for around \$2 billion in stolen assets, roughly two-thirds of all value stolen from DeFi that year, contributing to a total of \$3.8 billion stolen from cryptocurrency businesses (Chainalysis Team, 2022). Recent systematizations of bridge attacks estimate cumulative losses of nearly \$4.3 billion across 49 cross-chain bridge incidents between June 2021 and September 2024 (Wu *et al.*, 2025). Security reporting for 2025 indicates that this trend is intensifying. Hacken's 2025 Web3 Security Report, estimates that Web3 hacks and fraud caused more than \$3.1 billion in losses in the first half of 2025, with cross-chain bridge exploits alone responsible for over \$1.5 billion in stolen funds by mid-2025, while Chainalysis' mid-year crime update puts total crypto stolen in 2025 at over \$2.17 billion by July, already surpassing the 2024 full-year figure (Chainalysis Team, 2025; Hacken, 2025).

In order to address this dramatic trend, Academic and industry research have, however, so far concentrated mainly on improving oracle technology itself, focusing on architectures, decentralized reporting mechanisms, incentive schemes, and cryptographic guarantees (Sztorc, 2015; Murimi and Wang, 2021; Park *et al.*, 2021; Pasdar, Lee and Dong, 2023). While this work is essential, much less is known about the demand side, so as how Web3 protocols actually choose between alternative oracle solutions, when they decide to build proprietary mechanisms, and how they manage dependence on dominant providers in a highly concentrated market. In other words, the decision problem faced by protocols when selecting an oracle, which we consider at least as important as guaranteeing users' safety in Web3, has received little attention compared to the technical properties of oracles themselves.

This study addresses that gap by shifting the analytical lens from oracle providers to oracle users. We conceptualize oracle providers as specialized ICT suppliers, and Web3 protocols as buyers engaged in a supplier selection and make-or-buy decision. In this scenario, we investigate first how leading DeFi protocols decide whether to develop proprietary oracle modules or rely on third-party providers. Second, how they evaluate the reliability, governance, and security guarantees of those providers, and third, how they perceive switching costs and lock-in once an oracle is embedded into their protocol design.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first empirical study to survey Web3 protocols on oracle supplier selection directly and to apply supplier-selection and IT-outsourcing frameworks to this context explicitly. Furthermore, as the area under analysis is vast, consistent with the survey design and thematic structure outlined in Section 3, we organize the study around six thematic areas and corresponding research questions:

Protocol and sourcing context. (RQ1) How are oracle sourcing architectures configured among leading Web3 protocols in terms of product type, supported chains, and use of proprietary versus third-party oracle modules?

Make-or-buy of the oracle module. (RQ2) What factors drive Web3 protocols to develop proprietary oracle modules instead of relying exclusively on third-party providers?

Drivers of third-party oracle selection and multi-sourcing. (RQ3) What criteria do Web3 protocols use to select specific third-party oracle providers, and under which conditions do they adopt multiple providers in parallel?

Trust, knowledge, and risk allocation in third-party relationships. (RQ4) How do Web3 protocols understand and evaluate the operation, trustworthiness, and risk-sharing arrangements of third-party oracle providers?

Switching costs and lock-in. (RQ5) How do Web3 protocols perceive switching costs and lock-in when considering a change or addition of oracle providers?

Oracle usage, dependence, and performance. (RQ6) How do Web3 protocols use oracle services in practice, how dependent are they on them, and how do they assess the performance of proprietary versus third-party solutions?

Empirically, the study draws on survey data from 32 Web3 protocols, whose combined total value locked (TVL) accounted for more than half of the TVL in the economically relevant DeFi universe at the time of data collection. Responses were obtained exclusively from founders, C-level executives, or the engineers directly responsible for oracle integration. The findings indicate that protocols generally prefer third-party solutions when viable options exist, but in some cases technological dependencies and specific functional requirements force them to develop and maintain proprietary mechanisms. Even when alternative providers might offer similar or better services, the immutability of smart contracts and the deep integration of oracle logic into protocol architectures can make evaluation and switching costly or practically infeasible. In other cases, protocols simply declare themselves satisfied with their current solution and show little interest in exploring alternatives.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature on blockchain oracles, supplier selection, and IT outsourcing, with a focus on technology

providers in concentrated markets. Section 3 presents the methodology and survey design. Section 4 reports the empirical findings, and Section 5 discusses these results in light of existing literature, highlighting the implications for supplier selection, make-or-buy decisions, and vendor lock-in in Web3. Section 6 concludes the paper, outlining avenues for future research.

2. Literature Background

Blockchain oracles play a critical role in bridging real-world data to blockchain networks, serving as a foundational component in the functionality of smart contracts, particularly in DeFi and other dapps (Heiss, Eberhardt and Tai, 2019; Al-Breiki *et al.*, 2020; Caldarelli, 2023). Their proper functioning prevents failures and hacks that lead to protocol drain or unwanted liquidations. Significant research has been conducted on the technical challenges and solutions related to oracle design, including security issues, data veracity, and decentralization. To date, it is in fact still under debate which Oracle design is best for what specific application, how security should be best handled, and how to recognize and demonstrate the truthfulness of data. Studies such as (Beniiche, 2020; Mühlberger *et al.*, 2020; Pasdar, Dong and Lee, 2021; Bartholic *et al.*, 2022) have explored various models of oracle architectures and their implications on network efficiency and reliability. In parallel, a line of investigation, guided by the work of Sztorc (2015) and Buterin (2014), leveraged economic theories to find the optimal compromise between decentralization and efficiency balancing reporter number and consensus mechanisms. Finally, a stream of research focused on the nature of information reported by oracles and investigated the rationale to discover truth with a more philosophical slant. While some focused on the relationship between query type and quality of answer (Bartholic *et al.*, 2022; Caldarelli and Ornaghi, 2025), other focused on the very concept of ground truth and how to discern it (Egberts, 2017; Damjan, 2018; Frankenreiter, 2019).

A growing body of literature then began analyzing the oracle usage and performance for different tokens (Liu, Szalachowski and Zhou, 2021) and for different chain highlighting, including fee usage (Kaleem and Shi, 2021). Finally, a recent research by Cong *et al.* (2025) focuses on oracles' economics, intended to highlight how these projects can be financially sustainable. As we can observe, the center of the analysis of the oracle function and its malfunction lies in the oracle protocol itself. However, a critical factor in determining the robustness of a web3 protocol with respect to data reliability is the choice of an appropriate oracle module.

Therefore, there is a noticeable gap in systematic empirical research on the decision-making process behind oracle provider selection, whether from a strategic management or a technical perspective. To date, no studies have directly involved oracle users and applied

supplier selection theories to this context, which are crucial for understanding the motives and criteria influencing these choices and the overall reliability of oracles in the market. The next section provides a background of theories and studies that could support our analysis.

2.1 Market selection for technology providers.

Although the blockchain oracle market has not been previously investigated, looking at defilama.com stats, we observe that a few large oracles manage the Total Value Locked in DeFi; therefore, we may already hypothesize an oligopoly in the market. If we view the blockchain oracle market as similar to other technology markets, we can draw on numerous academic studies that highlight the conditions leading to market concentration. A key concept to understand the dominance of a few technology providers in technology markets is the network effect. A network effect exists when the value of a product increases as more people use it (Jullien, Pavan and Rysman, 2021). Network effects encourage the standardization of a single technology or the monopolization of a single network, a phenomenon also known as market tipping.

These network effects often create highly concentrated markets, sometimes characterized by a natural monopoly, a situation in which one firm can serve the entire market at a lower cost than multiple firms due to economies of scale. As Katz and Shapiro (1994) explain, in cases in which fixed costs are high and marginal costs tend to zero, markets tend to favor a single provider.

Although initially convenient for users, this also creates negative conditions. As further explained by the work of Salop (2021), in the absence of regulations, the drivers that make digital products efficient constitute, in reality, enormous barriers for newcomers, yielding to a quasi-monopolistic market structure. Also, as Liebowitz and Margolis (1994) observe that if a supplier is selected due to network effects, this raises questions about whether it really offers the best technical solution among the available alternatives. In our case, it is interesting to understand if there is a monopolist among oracle providers, what factors contributed to this dominant position, and how it is perceived by its users. It is also crucial to know if it is preferred over the available alternatives.

It is important to restate that these monopolies are natural in the sense that they are not the outcome of malevolent collusion between capitalist forces or regulatory bodies but a direct consequence of market forces. Users basically gravitate to the largest and most valuable network, and the winner can capture most of the market simply by being ahead. Well-known examples of these conditions are Google, Facebook, and Amazon in their respective domains.

As these conditions are known and their outcomes are predictable, they change the rules of competition. Labeled in literature as “*bidding for the future*”, an actor may therefore subsidize its service, with the aim of benefiting from a monopoly later on (Goeree, 2003). Basically, the competition shifts from “in” the market to “for” the market.

Another important factor to consider in market selection is the switching costs and lock-in. When technologies are incompatible with each other, users who commit to a provider or a standard face significant costs (financial, technical, or convenience costs) to switch to an alternative. Switching costs and network effects can “lock” the market, binding users or even the whole market to an early choice. This lock-in grants the incumbent significant ex post market power over its user base (Farrell, 2004). Subsequent competitors face not only the daunting task of offering a superior product but also the challenge of overcoming user expectations and network lock-in. In our case, for oracles, we have to investigate if there is actually a real barrier that prevents others from entering the market after a natural monopoly is established. Because even if it is demonstrated that at the moment, the monopolist offers the best service, it is not guaranteed that the level of service will always be optimal. Technological dependencies may therefore impede future better providers from entering the market, obliging users to a lower level of service.

A historical example is the QWERTY keyboard layout, for which David (David, 1985) argued that it became entrenched due to a historical accident and switching costs, even though the Dvorak layout was more efficient. Although it's still to be demonstrated which of the two technologies is actually better, it's arguable that market selection can sometimes favor a technology that isn't optimal. Once a standard achieves critical mass, the benefits of joining the majority can outweigh the individual benefits of a superior but less adopted alternative.

It's also important to note that not all networked markets inevitably end up with a single standard or monopoly provider. Research also identifies conditions where multiple standards may coexist. If network effects diminish after a certain point or if consumer preferences are heterogeneous, the market can sustain more than one viable network (Page and Lopatka, 2000). A classic example that remains valid today is the coexistence of Windows and macOS as separate standards. Although Windows is the dominant mass-market standard, macOS is the standard for a specific product niche due to its differentiation. The same can be said for the duopoly of Android and iOS. These examples show that multi-homing users can mitigate the winner-takes-all effect. If some users strongly prefer an alternative or if platforms are not entirely compatible, an oligopoly can persist rather than a full monopoly. In the blockchain context, we know that different networks and standards coexist, such as Bitcoin, Ethereum, and so on. These coexisting

standards may lead to the coexistence of different Oracle standards, de facto facilitating an oligopoly. Investigating different network dependencies may also shed light on this aspect.

Although the literature on technology suppliers rarely considers this aspect, as web3 protocol developers are arguably also capable of creating their own data module, it is also interesting to understand the drivers behind in-house development of the oracle module or its externalization to a third party.

Literature on supplier selection leveraged different methods to investigate these markets, and the following section provides insights into how we decided to combine and adapt prior rationales to our case.

3. Data and Method

Being an exploratory work on web3 market selection, this section explains specifically how the data gathering was performed, the barriers encountered in this process, and how they were overcome. Again, being web3 companies, atypical compared to ordinary ones, the present section also explains how the methodology was tailored to this specific study.

3.1. Methodology and survey design.

Research on supplier and market selection has a long tradition, yet no single, universally accepted set of variables has emerged. Dickson's seminal survey identified 23 supplier selection criteria, including quality, delivery, performance history, price, technical capability, financial position, reputation, and service. His research showed that their importance strictly depends on the sector (Dickson, 1966). Later reviews by Weber et al. (1991) and de Boer, Labro, and Morlacchi (2001) confirm that supplier selection is a multi-criteria decision problem and that different buying situations require different combinations of economic, technical, and relational factors.

Building on these guidelines, our survey conceptualizes blockchain oracle providers as specialized ICT suppliers delivering mission-critical data services to Web3 protocols. We start from the classical criteria identified in supplier selection and vendor evaluation studies (e.g., product/service quality, price, delivery reliability, technical capability, reputation, financial strength, and risk) and adapt them to the specific technological and organizational features of the oracle market.

In parallel, we further examine IT outsourcing and make-or-buy decisions for ICT services, vendor selection in concentrated technology markets, and vendor lock-in. The literature highlights that sourcing choices depend on relative costs, internal technical capabilities, asset specificity, perceived risk, and environmental uncertainty (Aubert, Rivard and Patry, 2004). Studies on cloud and IT outsourcing also emphasize vendor reputation, information

security, service quality, regulatory compliance, and relational trust as key determinants of provider choice and outsourcing success (Kim and Chung, 2003; Wu and Weng, 2010)

Our survey extends these lines of research to Web3 protocols operating in a highly concentrated oracle market, in which a small number of providers serve most clients, and protocols face strong technical dependencies on their chosen oracle. Although data from defilama.com lists 65 oracle providers, it is hard to tell how many are actually available for selection, as many may have ceased operations. The same website also shows that only five players account for nearly 95%, with more than 60% managed by a single provider.

To capture the market configuration explained above, we have structured the questionnaire into diverse areas of investigation (Table 1), which will help better follow the results outlined in the findings section and are explicated below.

Protocol and sourcing context: gathers demographic information on the respondent (role in the organization) and basic characteristics of the protocol (product type, supported chains, and overall oracle structure such as proprietary, single third-party provider, or multi-provider setup). These variables mirror the contextual descriptors used in supplier selection and IT outsourcing studies, which typically record the buyer's industry, size, and sourcing configuration to interpret vendor choice and performance (de Boer, Labro and Morlacchi, 2001)

Make-or-buy of oracle functionality: mirror the classic make-or-buy question for ICT services to the oracle domain. Following research on IT outsourcing, we include closed and open questions on the reasons for building a proprietary oracle module (e.g., need for customization, control, security, or specific price-discovery features) and on the perceived barriers to internal development (time, cost, technical complexity, audits, governance overhead). Prior work shows that such decisions are driven by relative costs, internal capabilities, service criticality, and perceived risk (Aubert, Rivard and Patry, 2004), and by concerns about vendor power and lock-in in concentrated markets (Opara-Martins, Sahandi and Tian, 2016).

Drivers of third-party oracle selection: investigates why a given third-party oracle is chosen, and under which conditions multiple providers are used in parallel. We leverage the most frequently mentioned criteria in cloud-provider selection studies, such as reputation, security, technical capabilities/innovation, extended with blockchain-specific characteristics, such as decentralization, multi-chain coverage, community support, regulatory compliance, and cost, into rating scales and checklist questions (Dickson, 1966; Weber, Current and Benton, 1991). We also include items on the reasons for adopting multiple oracles, which reflect the logic of multi-sourcing and multi-cloud strategies used to

mitigate vendor lock-in and service disruptions in IT outsourcing (Handley, Skowronski and Thakar, 2022).

Trust, knowledge, and risk allocation: focuses on the relational and risk-sharing dimension of the client–oracle relationship. Inspired by IS outsourcing satisfaction models and studies on vendor lock-in, we ask respondents whether they understand how the third-party oracle works, whether they know who the data reporters are, how trustworthy they perceive these reporters to be, and whether they expect the oracle provider to compensate in the event of misreporting or manipulation. Prior research shows that perceived provider competence, transparency, and relational trust are central to outsourcing success (Kim and Chung, 2003), while cloud-migration studies highlight that unclear liability and exit options are a core component of vendor lock-in (Opara-Martins, Sahandi and Tian, 2016; Hanafizadeh and Zare Ravasan, 2018).

Switching costs and lock-in: includes a scenario question asking whether respondents would switch to another oracle if it offered the same service at a lower price, and a Likert-type item on how difficult it would be to change or add an oracle provider. Similar perception-based measures are common in studies of cloud vendor lock-in and IT outsourcing risk, where switching difficulty, contractual and technical dependence, and embeddedness in existing systems are treated as key determinants of lock-in (Aubert, Rivard and Patry, 2004; Martin, 2012; Schneider and Sunyaev, 2014). Open-ended follow-up questions allow us to relate quantitative responses to protocol-specific constraints.

Perceived performance and satisfaction: finally serves to measure how respondents evaluate the performance of their proprietary and/or third-party oracle solutions. Following vendor-evaluation and IS-outsourcing satisfaction studies, we use 5-point Likert scales (1 = “strongly disagree”, 5 = “strongly agree”) to capture perceived timeliness, completeness, and correctness of data delivery, as well as overall satisfaction (Amindoust, Ahmed and Saghafein, 2012). In addition, we ask respondents to rate, again on 5-point scales, how reputable, decentralized, secure, innovative, legally compliant, costly, and easy to use their oracle is, and to compare these attributes with those of alternative solutions (“less than others”, “about the same”, “more than others”). Relative performance ratings are frequently used in marketing and vendor-selection research to position suppliers against competitors.

While financial strength is a classic criterion in supplier-selection research (Dickson, 1966; Weber, Current and Benton, 1991), we deliberately do not include it as a survey variable. In Web3, protocols are typically operated by foundations or distributed communities whose financial statements are opaque and whose solvency is only imperfectly related to protocol or oracle reliability. Moreover, protocols can often continue operating even if the original foundation disappears or the governance token loses most of its value. For this reason, we

consider oracle-specific technical and governance attributes (security, decentralization, data quality, multi-chain support, and governance procedures) to be more appropriate proxies for supplier risk in this context.

The survey combines closed-ended questions (single-choice, multiple-choice, and Likert-type items) with a limited number of open-ended questions in each block, which allow respondents to elaborate on the technical and organizational reasons behind their choices. This mixed design is consistent with best practice in supplier-selection and IT-outsourcing survey research, where structured items provide comparable measures across cases, and qualitative answers capture context-specific mechanisms and emerging phenomena in new domains such as Web3 oracles (de Boer, Labro and Morlacchi, 2001).

Table 1. Survey Structure, Variables, and Literature Anchors

Thematic Areas	Main Variables / Question types	Literature anchors
Protocol and Sourcing Context	Respondent role; Protocol product type; Supported Chains; Oracle data module structure.	(Dickson, 1966; Weber, Current and Benton, 1991; de Boer, Labro and Morlacchi, 2001)
Make-or-Buy of the oracle module	Proprietary or third-party module; Reasons for building an in-house Oracle (e.g., reputation, security); barriers for an in-house Oracle (open-ended).	(Aubert, Rivard and Patry, 2004; Opara-Martins, Sahandi and Tian, 2016)
Drivers of third-party oracle selection and multi-sourcing	Reasons for choosing specific third-party (e.g., innovation, technical features); Reasons for relying on multiple third-parties (e.g., multi-chain support, redundancy for security); Questions on pricing model.	(Weber, Current and Benton, 1991; Handley, Skowronski and Thakar, 2022)
Trust, knowledge, and risk allocation in third-party relationships	Binary and Likert items on whether respondents know how the oracle works, who the data reporters are, perceived trustworthiness of reporters, and compensation in case of manipulation/misreporting.	(Kim and Chung, 2003; Hanafizadeh and Zare Ravasan, 2018)
Switching costs and lock-in	Scenario question on willingness to switch provider if another offers the same service at a lower price; Likert item on perceived difficulty of changing or adding an oracle; Open-ended questions probing technical and governance barriers to switching.	(Aubert, Rivard and Patry, 2004; Martin, 2012; Schneider and Sunyaev, 2014)
Oracle usage, dependence, and performance	Frequency of data requests; type of data requested; Likert items on quality of service (e.g., timeliness, completeness); Likert items on relative ratings for decentralization, security, cost, legal, etc.	(de Boer, Labro and Morlacchi, 2001; Kim and Chung, 2003; Wu and Weng, 2010)

The survey is available in its entirety as supplementary material, but the complete dataset is kept private due to respondents' requests. The following paragraph describes instead how

data for this research is gathered and how we selected the entities and people to fill the survey.

3.1 Web3 protocols data collection

Gathering the data for this study proved particularly challenging. Building on prior work on Web3 protocols, we used DefiLlama (www.defillama.com) as a database to identify relevant protocols (Liu, Zhou and Lim, 2022; Bhambhwani and Huang, 2024). However, not all Web3 protocols are suitable for this research. First, several protocols do not require external oracles to operate. For example, automated market makers such as Uniswap derive asset prices directly from on-chain liquidity pools and can themselves function as decentralized oracles for other protocols. Likewise, liquid staking or restaking services such as Lido or EigenLayer rely on built-in oracle mechanisms and thus cannot meaningfully choose between proprietary and third-party oracle solutions. A substantial portion of the Web3 universe was therefore excluded from the outset.

To focus on protocols that can, in principle, select third-party oracles, we restricted the sampling frame to the DeFi segment related to oracles. On 7 February 2025, the date on which the research was initiated, this segment accounted for USD 58.3 billion of the total USD 114.41 billion in DeFi TVL reported by DefiLlama. Within this universe, protocols vary widely in size. Some manage several billions of dollars, others only a few thousand, and many effectively hold no capital at all. Because Web3 protocols are not conventional companies and their smart contracts remain immutably deployed on the blockchain, they do not “fail” in the traditional sense and can remain listed on DefiLlama even if abandoned (e.g., due to hacks, rug pulls, or developer exit). To ensure analytical relevance and comparability, we retained only protocols with at least USD 10 million in TVL, resulting in a population of 73 protocols with a combined TVL of USD 49.8 billion. These 73 protocols were invited to participate, and five declined on legal or privacy grounds, despite assurances of full anonymity, leaving a final accessible universe of 68 Web3 protocols.

After multiple contact attempts, we obtained completed surveys from 32 protocols, which, based on TVL as of 7 February 2025, collectively represented USD 32.3 billion, approximately 55.4% of the TVL in the defined population. These figures confirm that both the supplier and client sides of the oracle market are highly concentrated.

Several additional considerations are essential for understanding the quality and rarity of these data. Web3 protocols differ markedly from traditional firms. They may not be legally incorporated, need not maintain an official address, and are not obliged to disclose their members' identities. Some are copycats of existing designs, some are purely born as scams, and others continue to hold user capital despite being de facto abandoned. Because

founders and core contributors can operate pseudonymously, there are no standard mailing lists, commercial panels, or institutional directories through which to reach them. Identifying valid contacts, therefore, required manual, protocol-by-protocol efforts, including engagement through online communities and participation in in-person industry events.

Furthermore, we sought responses only from the highest-level representatives (e.g., founders, CEOs, CTOs) or, when they delegated, from the engineers explicitly in charge of oracle integration. This decision substantially increased the time, effort, and monetary cost of data collection. Despite these limitations, the study was conducted without dedicated institutional or project funding. All software tools and travel expenses for identifying, contacting, and surveying participants were personally covered by the author.

These features also help explain why our sample size is smaller than in many traditional supplier selection surveys. In legacy firms, supplier choice is typically handled by purchasing or procurement staff, enabling large-N surveys of “buyers”. In Web3, organizational structures are leaner, and the role of “buyer” is rarely formalized. As a result, involving top decision-makers yields numbers closer to Delphi-style expert panels, such as in (Lang, Wiesche and Krcmar, 2016) than to conventional purchasing surveys. We argue, however, that this approach is appropriate for the Web3 environment as it targets the actual decision-makers in a comparatively small global population of eligible protocols. Therefore, the 68-protocol universe and 32 completed surveys represent a substantial share of the economically relevant market.

Having clarified the sampling strategy, inclusion criteria, and challenges of accessing this population, the next section presents the empirical findings.

4. Findings


The findings in this section are organized as described earlier by thematic section. First, we present data on demographics and supplier composition; then, we explore the dynamics of make-or-buy decisions, outsourcing risks, switching costs, and lock-in. Finally, we provide an overview of consumer perceptions of the service offered and a comparison between suppliers.

4.1 Demographics of the sample

Although founders and C-level executives (CEO/CTO) were the primary targets of the survey, in several cases, they reported not being fully informed about how the oracle worked and redirected the questionnaire to specialized oracle engineers. In at least seven protocols, we identified dedicated “oracle experts” responsible for this component (Figure 1). This

suggests that, despite the high level of technical sophistication of Web3 founders, oracle management is often delegated to specialized personnel.

Figure 1. Respondent's role in the web3 protocol



As for the oracle selection, as shown in Figure 2, in many protocols, this decision is handled by the founders or CTO, while the rest opt for collegial decision-making, with a small part organized as a DAO with decentralized decision-making.

Figure 2. Oracle selection process.




Figure 3a summarizes the products offered by the surveyed protocols, while Figure 3b lists the chains on which they operate. Most protocols in the sample belong to the Web3 lending

sector, with a substantial share also active in asset management. Protocols primarily operate on EVM-compatible chains, especially Ethereum and its Layer-2 networks, as well as other alternatives such as Solana and Avalanche.

Figure 3a. Product/s offered by the Web3 protocol




Figure 3b. Chains on which your protocol operates.




Figure 4 shows the distribution of oracle structures adopted by the protocols. As illustrated, Web3 protocols frequently rely on multiple oracle providers. Almost half of the sample uses more than one third-party oracle, whereas roughly one third combines a proprietary oracle module with multiple external providers. This already hints at a complex sourcing landscape characterized by both in-house development and multi-sourcing strategies.

Figure 4. Web3 protocol oracle structure.





Figure 5 finally presents the oracle market composition. The data show a dominant provider serving almost the entire sample, while a small number of alternative providers each serve fewer than half of the respondents. The leading provider is almost always present in the oracle configuration, even when other providers are simultaneously contracted, and regardless of the network on which the protocol operates. This suggests that the dominant provider can support multiple technical standards across different networks. At the same time, alternative providers are added when additional, specific, or niche requirements must be addressed. These aspects are further clarified by the qualitative evidence discussed in the following subsections, which also examine the interplay between third-party and proprietary oracles.

Figure 5. Market Composition




4.2 Proprietary Vs Third party oracle solutions

4.2.1 In-house oracle solutions: Drivers and barriers

As shown in Figure 6, protocols primarily develop their own data-collection mechanisms to achieve greater customization, followed by control and integration motives. In other words, the decision to build in-house is mainly driven by technical requirements, although a subset of respondents also mentions security as a decisive factor. By contrast, costs, independence from external providers, and regulation do not emerge as major concerns when opting for internal solutions.

Figure 6. Reasons for building a proprietary oracle



However, generic references to “technical reasons” are insufficient to understand why protocols feel compelled to develop their own oracles and what exactly third-party providers fail to deliver. For this reason, open-ended questions were used to elicit more detailed explanations.

A recurrent theme is the presence of assets that do not meet liquidity requirements for inclusion in mainstream oracle price feeds. These assets tend to be thinly traded and therefore excluded by major providers. Another common issue is the absence of USD-denominated prices for specific tokens. As one respondent notes, “*not all tokens have price feeds in USD, so customized solutions were to use existing feeds to calculate USD price*”. In

such cases, protocols build proprietary mechanisms to derive USD prices from available feeds.

Several respondents also highlight the need for enhanced security and robustness against price errors, but most emphasize the necessity of implementing specific price-discovery features that third-party oracles did not support at the time of protocol launch. One CTO explains:

“We needed a permissionless feed that could validate prices against an on-chain time-weighted average price.....and reject values that deviate beyond a set threshold. It also allows adding multiple reporters and has a fallback to on-chain prices if the reporter key is compromised; features unavailable with third-party oracles.”

In other cases, protocols initially developed features such as exponential weighted moving averages before these were later integrated by third-party providers (e.g., Pyth). Even where such features are now available externally, respondents report that switching from a well-tested internal solution is no longer considered convenient.

The historical dimension is also relevant. A founder of a well-known protocol notes:

“When our protocol was launched, there were no third-party oracle products available. But even now, we view dependence on real-time market price feeds as a security and structural liability that should be avoided. We use a 24-hour volume-weighted average price, which is not supported by any third-party oracle.”

Thus, for some early protocols, the in-house solution is both a legacy of a period when third-party options were unavailable and a deliberate design choice to avoid perceived risks associated with real-time feeds.

Open-ended questions also explored the barriers associated with building proprietary oracles. While some respondents simply cite “time and costs”, others provide more detailed accounts of technical challenges. One representative explains:

“We had to tune the TWAP window and acceptance threshold for each market, migrate the anchor from Uniswap v2 to v3 as liquidity moved, and perform extensive audits to prevent manipulation. Managing governance votes and multisig updates for upgrades adds additional complexity.”

These accounts highlight the ongoing maintenance burden of proprietary oracles, including parameter tuning, source migration, security audits, and governance overhead.

Interestingly, not all respondents perceive in-house development as particularly demanding. One representative from a pioneering DeFi protocol states:

“It's very easy to build the oracle, and there's no magic involved. We view the job of the oracle as purely a data pipe, and not a system that should own ‘market trustworthiness’ or anything like that. The challenge is building a protocol that's robust against oracle failures and/or noisy data.”

This perspective contrasts sharply with the idea that the oracle itself should be the primary locus of trust. Instead, it shifts responsibility to the protocol design, which must remain robust to potential oracle failures or noisy inputs. This view aligns with the finding (Table 2) that none of the protocols have developed internal mechanisms to reimburse users in case of malfunctions caused by their proprietary oracle modules. Investments appear to be focused on preventing malfunctions through design rather than on ex-post compensation schemes.

Table 2. Binary question on proprietary oracle damage prevention.

Question	Yes	No
Does your proprietary oracle have a mechanism to cover in case of a malfunction?	0%	100%

4.2.2 Third-party solutions: Drivers and Barriers

The analysis of third-party solutions begins with the reasons for choosing multiple providers versus a single provider.

As shown in Figure 7, the decision to engage multiple third-party oracles is predominantly driven by technical considerations. The majority of respondents indicate that each provider offers specific features critical to the protocol's functioning. A second important driver is multi-chain deployment. When a protocol operates across chains that the main provider does not all support, it is effectively compelled to add additional oracles. Security considerations are also noted, as multiple data sources serve as a backup in case of downtime or reliability issues affecting the primary provider.

Figure 7. Reason to choose multiple third-party oracles.





Figure 8 reports the reasons for choosing a specific third-party oracle when multiple options exist for the same network or token. Reputation and security emerge as the most critical factors, selected by 30 and 25 respondents, respectively. By contrast, innovation and regulation are not considered critical drivers of oracle selection, despite being prominent topics in public discourse around Web3 infrastructure.

Figure 8. Reasons to choose a specific third-party oracle.




The role of price requires more thorough interpretation. Pricing does not appear to be a significant selection criterion, but this is partly explained by the pricing models in use (Figure 9). The majority of respondents (80.65%) report accessing oracle data for free, while roughly one third use a pay-per-request model. In practice, oracle services are often not perceived as something for which a direct fee is paid, and cost considerations tend to focus on indirect integration or operational expenses rather than on explicit data fees.

Trust in third-party providers is further examined through a sequence of questions on knowledge of the oracle, awareness of reporters, trust in reporters, and expectations of coverage in case of misreporting (Tables 3a–3b).

Almost all clients (93.55%) report having a clear understanding of how the third-party oracle works. This is unsurprising given that several protocols also operate proprietary oracles and therefore have a high level of technical expertise. Furthermore, integrating a third-party oracle requires developing ad-hoc integration modules, which arguably forces protocols to become familiar with the oracle's functioning.

Figure 9. The pricing model of your third-party oracle



However, when asked whether they know who the data reporters are, the share of positive responses drops slightly above 60%. Confidence further decreases when respondents are asked whether they consider these reporters trustworthy, as fewer than half (47.37%) say they are sure of their trustworthiness.

Table 3a. Governance and Awareness of the oracle provider

Question	Yes	No	I don't know
Do you know how your third-party oracle works?	93.55%	6.45%	-
Do you know who the reporters of the third-party oracle you use are?	61.29%	38.71%	-
Do you think your third-party oracle will cover in case of misreporting?	12.90%	67.74%	19.35%
Would you plan to build your own oracle?	15.79%	84.21%	-

Expectations regarding compensation in the event of manipulation or misreporting are even more skeptical. Nearly 70% of respondents are convinced that their third-party oracle will not cover losses arising from misreporting, and only a small minority (slightly above 10%) are confident that some remedy mechanisms will be applied. As with proprietary oracles, the focus appears to be on preventing failures rather than on setting up ex post compensation schemes.


Table 3b. Perceived trustworthiness of third-party data reporters.

Question	Trustworthiness Level	%
How trustworthy are the data reporters of the third-party oracle you use?	Very Trustworthy	47.37%
	Trustworthy	31.58%
	Neutral	21.05%
	Non Trustworthy	0%

	Very Untrustworthy	0%
--	--------------------	----

The final part of this block explores whether protocols currently relying exclusively on third-party oracles plan to develop a proprietary solution in the future (Table 3a). A large majority (84.21%) do not intend to build an in-house oracle. When asked about potential advantages of doing so, respondents converged again on technical features not currently available from suppliers (Figure 10). Security, reputation, cost, and innovation are also mentioned, but each is mentioned by roughly one-third of respondents at most. This suggests that, for most protocols, the perceived benefits of a proprietary oracle do not outweigh the convenience of outsourcing, except for very specific technical needs.

Figure 10. What will be the advantages of building your own oracle?



4.3 Switching costs


This section examines the barriers to changing oracle providers. As a first approximation, respondents were asked whether they would switch providers if another offered the same service at a lower price (Table 4). An overwhelming majority (93.75%) answered no. This could be interpreted as evidence of high satisfaction with the current provider, but a more plausible explanation is that switching would generate costs or risks that outweigh any potential price savings, or that switching is simply infeasible.

Table 4. Binary question on willingness to switch provider

Question	Yes	No
If offered at a lower price, would you pick another oracle?	6.25%	93.75%

Figure 11 reports responses to a direct question on how difficult it would be to change or add an oracle provider. Answers show no apparent convergence, which complicates the interpretation of perceived switching costs. To probe this further, we attempted to cross-tabulate switching difficulty with other variables such as oracle composition, protocol TVL, and respondent profile (e.g., founder/CEO vs engineer). We hypothesized that leading figures might perceive the change as less complicated because they delegate technical tasks to engineers, but the data do not support this hypothesis.

Figure 11. How difficult is it to change or select another oracle?



The most insightful information comes instead from the qualitative comments provided in open-ended questions. These reveal that perceived switching difficulty depends strongly on protocol design. Some respondents are genuinely satisfied with their provider and simply do not consider alternatives, even if switching would technically be feasible. Others acknowledge that they could add new providers but would need to pass through governance processes, which they interpret as “not particularly difficult” but time-consuming.

More severe constraints emerge among respondents who rated switching as difficult or very difficult. Their comments indicate that, in many cases, changing providers is not realistically feasible. A representative explains:

“Changing [oracles] requires withdrawing all TVL and going through significant changes; we can add additional ones, but not replace existing.”

Another representative notes that the protocol’s oracle is embedded directly into consensus and block-building, making substitution extremely complex. A further respondent states:

“(Our protocol) is an immutable system. We cannot alter the smart contracts in any way. The chosen oracles are enshrined in the protocol.”

These statements illustrate how the immutability of smart contracts, the enshrinement of oracles in protocol logic, and governance processes contribute to effective vendor lock-in, even when technical alternatives exist in principle.

4.4 Technology management, acceptance, and performance.

This section discusses how protocols use oracles and how they perceive the performance of proprietary versus third-party solutions.

Figure 12 summarizes how often protocols require data from their oracle. The data suggest that the frequency of data requests influences the sourcing choice. When data is required in real time, protocols tend to rely on third-party oracles. When data is needed at a lower frequency (e.g., periodic updates), proprietary solutions are more common. In general, the less data-intensive a protocol is, the lower its dependence on third-party oracles.

Figure 12. How often do you require data from your oracle?





Figure 13 describes the types of data requested from oracles. Price feeds are the primary data type for both proprietary and third-party solutions. Interestingly, RWA data is more often obtained through internal solutions, while inter-chain communication is typically delegated to third-party oracles. When operating across multiple chains, protocols appear to prefer deploying multi-chain versions of their core products rather than relying on third-party cross-

chain bridging or messaging services. This suggests that, when a viable alternative exists, protocols tend to minimize dependence on third-party intermediaries for cross-chain operations.

Figure 13. What data do you require from your oracle?



Perceptions of service quality are captured through 1-to-5 evaluations on timeliness, completeness, correctness, and overall satisfaction (Table 5).

For both proprietary and third-party oracles, average scores are above 4, indicating high satisfaction with oracle performance. However, third-party solutions consistently outperform proprietary ones on all four indicators. This suggests that protocols with in-house oracles are, on average, less satisfied with their internal solutions than protocols relying on third-party providers, but may feel unable or unwilling to outsource this component due to the technical and path-dependent constraints discussed earlier.

Table 5. Perception of data quality and overall satisfaction

Questions	Proprietary	Third Party
	Mean values (1-5)	
I receive the data from the oracle always at the contracted/established time.	4	4.4
The data I receive from the oracle is always complete	4.18	4.53
The data I receive from the oracle is always correct.	4.09	4.2
I am satisfied with the quality of the oracle I use	4.09	4.6

The final part of the analysis compares the perceived characteristics of proprietary and third-party oracles, as well as their relative position compared to other solutions available in the market (Table 6). Reputation and community satisfaction are only measured for third-party oracles, as these attributes are by definition externally oriented.

Third-party oracles receive a very high average score for reputation (4.66), and are also perceived as highly secure (4.53), slightly outperforming internal solutions (4.18) on the latter. Perceptions of decentralization and innovation are somewhat lower but still positive (around 3.9 and 3.7), and similar across proprietary and third-party solutions.

A particularly interesting pattern concerns adherence to legal standards. Previous tables show that legal and regulatory aspects are not considered primary drivers of oracle selection. Yet, in this evaluation exercise, third-party oracles are rated as highly adherent to legal standards (3.93), whereas proprietary solutions are perceived as significantly less adherent (2.81). A plausible interpretation is that protocol representatives have limited concrete knowledge of the legal status of both types of oracles but assume that third-party providers are subject to greater scrutiny or regulation, and thus more compliant, while legal issues receive less attention during internal development.

Regarding cost, both proprietary and third-party solutions are rated as not very expensive. Proprietary oracles are perceived as slightly less costly than third-party ones, even though data from third-party oracles is often accessed for free. This discrepancy is likely due to the hidden integration and optimization costs associated with connecting to external services, which may offset the apparent absence of direct data fees.

Perceptions of ease of use show the most striking difference. Internal solutions are seen as more difficult to use (3.09) than third-party oracles (2.33), where lower values indicate greater ease of use. Outsourcing the data-gathering process effectively shifts the burden of data-source selection, monitoring, and security to the third-party provider, thereby reducing the protocol's complexity. By contrast, proprietary solutions require internal teams to perform all these tasks, increasing workload and complicating protocol design.

Table 6. Characteristics comparison between proprietary(P) and third-party(T) oracle.

P/T	Questions	Evaluation (1-5) Average value	Compared with others		
			Less	Same	More
T	How reputable is your oracle?	4.66	6.45%	12.90%	80.65%
T	How supportive is the community of your oracle?	4.26	0.00%	67.74%	32.26%
T	How decentralized is your oracle?	3.93	0.00%	54.84%	45.16%
P	/	3.9	0.00%	69.23%	30.77%
T	How secure is your oracle?	4.53	0.00%	25.81%	74.19%

P	/	4.18	0.00%	53.85%	46.15%
T	How expensive is your oracle?	2.6	6.45%	74.19%	19.35%
P	/	2.36	23.08%	61.54%	15.38%
T	How does your oracle adhere to the legal standard?	3.93	0.00%	70.97%	29.03%
P	/	2.81	0.00%	84.62%	15.38%
T	How innovative is your oracle?	3.73	6.45%	62.29%	32.26%
P	/	3.63	7.69%	61.54%	30.77%
T	How difficult is your Oracle to use?	2.33	25.81%	74.19%	0.00%
P	/	3.09	0.00%	76.92%	23.08%

Finally, when asked to compare their chosen solutions with other alternatives in the market, respondents exhibit a notable tendency to understate the superiority of proprietary oracles relative to third-party ones. Although absolute scores for proprietary oracles are generally positive, they are rarely rated as “better than others”; at best, they are seen as “about the same”. One possible, and admittedly speculative, explanation, based on direct experience in data collection, is that protocol founders tend to avoid self-celebration and may overestimate the quality of external solutions. This behavioral tendency likely contributes to the modest comparative ratings of proprietary oracles despite their objectively good performance scores. The following section discusses these results and positions the research within the supplier selection literature.

5. Discussion

This section positions the findings of this research within the current literature on supplier selection and provides insights into its contributions to academics and practitioners. The section is organized by themes, again to facilitate navigation and support the reader’s understanding.

5.1 Supplier selection criteria in the oracle context

Classical supplier selection research portrays purchasing decisions as multi-criteria choice processes involving trade-offs between quality, delivery, price, technical capability, financial stability, and other factors (Dickson, 1966; Weber, Current and Benton, 1991). Our results confirm that in the oracle market, protocols reproduce this multi-criteria logic, but the technological and organizational features of Web3 reshape the relative salience of specific criteria. Reputation and security emerge as the most frequently cited reasons for choosing a third-party oracle, while price is rarely mentioned as a decisive factor. This mirrors the pattern observed in traditional supplier selection, where quality and reliability often dominate price, but with a stronger emphasis on cybersecurity, data integrity, and ecosystem reputation than on physical delivery or production capacity.

The prevailing pricing models can also explain the weak role of price in our findings. Many protocols access oracle feeds for free or under pay-per-request schemes that are perceived as low-cost. In such a setting, the selection problem shifts away from classical cost–quality trade-offs toward risk management and reliability in the provision of mission-critical data. This aligns with cloud service provider research, which repeatedly identifies security, reliability, and compliance as primary selection criteria, often outranking pure cost considerations (Lang, Wiesche and Krcmar, 2016).

Overall, the evidence suggests that Web3 oracle selection both confirms and extends supplier selection theory as the underlying multi-criteria logic holds, but the operationalization of core dimensions such as risk, quality, reputation, and cost must be adapted to the characteristics of decentralized digital services.

5.2 Make-or-buy decisions and path dependence in oracle sourcing

The second set of findings concerns the make-or-buy decision for oracle functionality. IT outsourcing research has long emphasized that decisions to internalize or externalize ICT services depend on transaction costs, internal capabilities, asset specificity, and risk (Opara-Martins, Sahandi and Tian, 2015).

Our data show that protocols primarily build proprietary oracles to obtain technical features that third-party providers do not (or did not) offer, such as specific time-weighted or volume-weighted price mechanisms, support for illiquid tokens, or custom security checks, rather than to reduce fees or increase independence from suppliers. This concept resonates with resource-based views of outsourcing that emphasize the importance of unique technical capabilities and service specificity, as when off-the-shelf solutions do not meet the buyer's specific needs, internal development becomes more attractive despite higher costs (Hassanzadeh and Cheng, 2016).

However, our qualitative evidence also reveals a strong element of path dependence. Early protocols built their own oracles because third-party options were either absent or immature. Later improvements in external services did not necessarily trigger migration away from the in-house solution. Once a proprietary oracle has been heavily audited, parameterized, and integrated into governance processes, its replacement is perceived as both risky and costly, even when functionally equivalent services become available on the market. This dynamic reflects findings from legacy system and ERP migration studies, where technological and organizational inertia constrain the adoption of superior solutions (Davis, 2015; Irani *et al.*, 2023). The immutability of smart contracts and the enshrinement of oracle logic into protocol code further amplify this path dependence compared to traditional IT settings.

Interestingly, perceptions of difficulty in building and maintaining proprietary oracles are not homogeneous. Some respondents describe a substantial ongoing burden, continuous tuning, audits, and governance overhead, while others depict the oracle as a relatively simple data pipe, shifting the main responsibility for robustness to protocol design. This divergence suggests that the boundary between “oracle work” and “protocol work” is itself contested. For some teams, security and robustness are primarily engineered into the oracle subsystem, while for others, they are addressed at the contract design and liquidation logic levels. From a theoretical perspective, this highlights the need to better understand how responsibilities for reliability and risk management are partitioned across layers of digital infrastructure. Academic research should then broaden the theoretical discourse on oracle architecture and patterns started by Pasdar et al. (2023)

Overall, our findings extend make-or-buy discussions by showing how technical specificity, historical timing, and protocol immutability combine to shape oracle sourcing decisions in ways that standard cost–capability models only partially capture.

5.3 Multi-sourcing, lock-in, and the paradox of flexibility

A third contribution concerns multi-sourcing and vendor lock-in. Supplier selection and multi-criteria decision-making studies often treat multi-sourcing as a strategy to mitigate risk, balance performance across suppliers, and improve bargaining power (de Boer, Labro and Morlacchi, 2001). In cloud computing, multi-cloud strategies are explicitly recommended as a way to reduce dependence on a single provider and avoid lock-in. At the same time, an extensive literature documents the persistence of vendor lock-in due to proprietary standards, data formats, and integration costs, with Opara-Martins et al. (2016) identifying lock-in as a major barrier to cloud migration.

In our sample, multi-sourcing is instead almost a standard for oracle supply. Many protocols combine multiple third-party oracles, and a sizeable fraction add a proprietary module on top. At face value, this appears consistent with risk-mitigation strategies in IT sourcing. Yet the detailed findings indicate different underlying motives. First, multiple providers are often used not to create symmetric redundancy, but to cover non-overlapping functional or network niches (different chains, different asset types, specialized features). This limits the substitutability between suppliers and may actually increase overall dependence on the combined oracle “stack”.

Second, quantitative responses on switching intentions and difficulty reveal a sort of paradox of flexibility. An overwhelming majority of respondents would not switch to another provider even if it offered the same service at a lower price, and many describe switching as difficult or very difficult. Qualitative comments clarify that, for some protocols, changing an

oracle would require withdrawing TVL, modifying core contracts, or even rewriting components embedded in the consensus or block-building logic. In several cases, respondents explicitly state that the system is immutable and that the current oracle configuration is “enshrined” in the protocol.

These observations align with the cloud lock-in literature, which shows that even when multiple providers exist, integration costs, proprietary interfaces, and architectural constraints can make switching prohibitively costly. In the oracle context, the situation is further compounded by blockchain immutability, as once an oracle is deeply embedded in protocol logic, the theoretical modularity of smart contracts does not translate into practical substitutability. Multi-sourcing, therefore, in this setting, does not necessarily guarantee exit options. It results instead in layered dependence, where a dominant provider remains indispensable while smaller providers are added for specific purposes.

From a theoretical standpoint, this suggests that models of supplier selection and outsourcing in digital infrastructures must account not only for the number of suppliers but also for the architecture of integration, that is, how deeply a supplier’s service is embedded into the client’s core logic, and whether that embedding is reversible.

5.4 Risk allocation, trust, and perceived legal compliance

Our findings also help clarify how risk and responsibility are allocated between protocols and oracle providers. IS outsourcing research has traditionally emphasized the role of trust, contract completeness, and service-level agreements in defining who bears the consequences of failures (Hassanzadeh and Cheng, 2016). Cloud studies further highlight uncertainty about liability in the event of breaches or outages as a dimension of perceived lock-in and adoption risk (Opara-Martins, Sahandi and Tian, 2016).

In our survey, both proprietary and third-party oracles are evaluated very positively on ex-ante performance (timeliness, completeness, correctness). At the same time, almost no proprietary protocol has mechanisms to reimburse users in case of oracle failures, and a large majority of clients do not expect third-party providers to cover losses arising from misreporting, regardless of whether the oracle protocol formally advertises insurance or compensation schemes. In practice, they behave as if residual risk remains with the protocol. In other words, protocols are highly satisfied with how oracles perform in normal conditions but assume that extreme failures will be borne by the protocol and its users, not by the oracle supplier.

This pattern suggests a distinctive form of risk internalization. Rather than relying on ex-post compensation or formal liability, protocols invest in ex-ante robustness, through design choices such as conservative price feeds, TWAP windows, fallback mechanisms, and

governance safeguards, and accept residual risk as part of their own operational exposure. Conceptually, this differs from many traditional outsourcing settings, where detailed contracts specify penalties and remedies. It aligns more closely with arrangements in which a critical infrastructure is used “as is” and clients protect themselves primarily via redundancy and resilience measures.

A second interesting asymmetry concerns knowledge and trust. Most clients report understanding how the third-party oracle works, yet fewer than half feel certain about the trustworthiness of the reporters feeding it. This indicates a mechanism-level trust (in the oracle design) combined with agent-level opacity (about who actually reports data). It aligns with concerns in the cloud and platform governance literature that users may trust the technical architecture while remaining uncertain about the actors behind it (Huang and Nicol, 2013; Lynn *et al.*, 2021).

Finally, there is a discrepancy between the low salience of legal and regulatory compliance in selection decisions and the high ex post perceived legal adherence of third-party oracles. Legal aspects are rarely cited as primary reasons for choosing a provider, yet third-party oracles are rated as considerably more compliant with legal standards than proprietary solutions. Given the current regulatory opacity surrounding oracles in most jurisdictions, this likely reflects assumptive trust, the belief that established providers “must have” addressed legal issues more thoroughly, rather than a detailed assessment of their actual legal position. This suggests a potential decoupling between formal compliance and perceived legitimacy in the adoption of decentralized infrastructure. To consolidate the interpretation of results, Table 7 summarizes the main findings for each research theme and the corresponding contributions to current literature.

Table 7. Summary of findings and implications by research theme

Research Theme	Main Findings	Implications for academic literature
Protocol and sourcing context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Web3 is dominated by Lending/asset management protocols operating on EVM chains -Oracle architecture is hybrid and multisource -A single dominant provider appears in almost all configurations, with niche competitors added for specific assets or chains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reflecting ICT literature, a small set of critical suppliers serves almost the whole market. -The supplier landscape itself is part of understanding risks and dependencies.
Make-or-buy of the oracle module	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Proprietary oracles are built mainly to implement very specific technical features (illiquid assets, custom price logic, conservative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Technical specificity, historical timing, and smart-contract

	<p>TWAP/VWAP design) or because no adequate 3rd-party solution existed at launch.</p> <p>-Oracle maintenance is costly (tuning, audits, governance), yet some teams see the oracle as a “simple data pipe” and shift robustness to protocol design.</p> <p>-Once deployed and audited, internal solutions are rarely abandoned, creating strong path dependence.</p>	<p>immutability jointly drive internalization decisions.</p> <p>-Emerges a new scenario of “legacy IT” in which on-chain immutability and audit costs make later migration to superior external services difficult, even as the market evolves.</p>
Drivers of third-party selection and multi-sourcing	<p>-Third-party selection is driven primarily by reputation, security, and technical/ecosystem fit, while explicit pricing, regulation, and innovation rank lower.</p> <p>-Multi-sourcing is common but mostly used to cover non-overlapping needs (different chains, assets, or features) rather than to create symmetric redundancy.</p> <p>-The dominant provider remains almost always present, even in multi-provider setups.</p>	<p>-The multi-criteria nature of supplier choice is confirmed, but in Web3, classical criteria such as quality, delivery, and price are re-weighted towards security, reputation, and ecosystem integration.</p> <p>-In our sample, multi-sourcing operates primarily as a complement to a dominant supplier rather than as a symmetric redundancy strategy and thus offers limited risk diversification.</p>
Trust, knowledge, and risk allocation in third-party relationships	<p>-Most respondents understand how the oracle mechanism works, but a smaller share knows who the reporters are, and even fewer are certain of their trustworthiness.</p> <p>-A large majority do not expect compensation from providers in case of misreporting or manipulation.</p> <p>-Protocols invest heavily in ex-ante robustness (design, parameters, redundancy) rather than ex-post coverage risk is largely internalized by the protocol and its users.</p>	<p>-Extends IS-outsourcing and cloud-trust literature by documenting a pattern of mechanism-level trust with actor-level opacity: users trust the architecture but have limited visibility on the agents behind it.</p> <p>-Challenges the assumptions that outsourcing critical services automatically transfers liability. Instead, risk remains primarily on the client side, with suppliers offering high ex-ante performance but weak ex-post remedies.</p>
Switching costs and lock-in	<p>-Almost all respondents would not switch providers even for an equivalent, cheaper service.</p>	<p>-In web3, the concept of lock-in and path dependencies is amplified due to smart-contract</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Self-reported switching difficulty is mixed, but qualitative evidence shows that changing oracles would require withdrawing TVL, modifying immutable contracts, or altering consensus/block-building logic. -Multi-sourcing often adds providers, but does not make the dominant one replaceable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> immutability and deep architectural embedding, even where alternatives exist. -Suggests that models of vendor lock-in in digital infrastructures must consider not just the competitiveness of suppliers but the depth and reversibility of integration into core protocol logic.
Oracle usage, dependence, and performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Third-party oracles are used more for real-time and cross-chain data, while proprietary solutions are more common for lower-frequency updates and some RWA data. -Protocols often avoid relying on 3rd-party bridges when they can instead deploy multi-chain versions of their product. -Both internal and external oracles score highly on timeliness, completeness, and correctness, but third-party solutions systematically receive higher satisfaction scores, are seen as more legally compliant and easier to use, and are not perceived as significantly more expensive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Extends vendor-evaluation and outsourcing-satisfaction literature to Web3 by showing when and why protocols prefer outsourcing versus internal development. -Highlights a tension between perceived superior performance of third-party oracles and structural dependence on a concentrated set of providers, reinforcing the importance of studying resilience, standardization, and potential systemic risk in oracle markets.

6. Conclusion

This study advances the emerging literature on blockchain oracles by offering the first exploratory investigation of oracle supplier selection from the viewpoint of Web3 protocols. By conceptualizing oracle providers as specialized ICT suppliers and analyzing survey evidence from protocols representing more than half of the economically relevant DeFi TVL, we show how strategic sourcing decisions in Web3 reproduce but also extend classical insights from supplier selection and IT outsourcing. Reputation, security, and ecosystem integration dominate cost considerations, while immutability and deep protocol integration generate forms of technological path dependence that significantly constrain switching opportunities and reinforce market concentration.

The study also contributes methodologically by revealing the feasibility and importance of direct engagement with protocol decision-makers to better understand the demand side of oracle provisioning. Given the heterogeneity of oracle architectures and the rapid evolution of DeFi systems, such expert-based evidence is essential to complement technical analyses of oracle mechanisms.

Like most Web3 research, however, this work faces limitations. The sample size limits our ability to perform cluster analysis or derive statistically generalizable findings across different protocol types. Although the analysis is focused on Web3, DeFiLlama is used to gather data, therefore creating a bias toward DeFi companies in Web3. But the rationale for doing so is that Web3 companies operating in DeFi with a large value locked are more solid and likely to select their oracles with greater care, though this remains to be proven with further research. Moreover, the rapid iteration and redeployment of smart contracts can make data stale within short timeframes. However, contract upgrades may simultaneously create rare windows of opportunity for changing oracle configuration, a phenomenon that deserves further investigation.

Several avenues emerge for future research. First, more specific analyses could connect protocol characteristics (e.g., asset types, chain) with different sourcing strategies. Second, the implications of extreme market concentration in the oracle sector require close monitoring. If a de facto monopolistic provider underperforms or embeds hidden risks, the consequences for web3 stability could be severe. Finally, regulatory and governance perspectives should examine how responsibility for oracle failures is allocated, and whether assurance mechanisms, transparency requirements, or incentive redesign could reduce systemic exposure.

References

- Al-Breiki, H. *et al.* (2020) 'Trustworthy Blockchain Oracles: Review, Comparison, and Open Research Challenges', *IEEE Access*, 8, pp. 85675–85685. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2992698>.
- Amindoust, A., Ahmed, S. and Saghafein, A. (2012) 'Supplier Selection and Performance', *American J. of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 5(1), pp. 49–52.
- Aubert, B.A., Rivard, S. and Patry, M. (2004) 'A transaction cost model of IT outsourcing', *Information & Management*, 41(7), pp. 921–932. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IM.2003.09.001>.
- Bartholic, M. *et al.* (2022) 'A Taxonomy of Blockchain Oracles: The Truth Depends on the Question', in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC)*. IEEE, pp. 1–15. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICBC54727.2022.9805555>.
- Beniiche, A. (2020) 'A study of blockchain oracles', *arXiv*, pp. 1–9.

Bhambhwani, S.M. and Huang, A.H. (2024) 'Auditing decentralized finance', *The British Accounting Review*, 56(2), p. 101270. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2023.101270>.

de Boer, L., Labro, E. and Morlacchi, P. (2001) 'A review of methods supporting supplier selection', *European Journal of Purchasing & Supply Management*, 7(2), pp. 75–89. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-7012\(00\)00028-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-7012(00)00028-9).

Buterin, V. (2014) *SchellingCoin: A Minimal-Trust Universal Data Feed* | *Ethereum Foundation Blog*, *Blog.ethereum.com*. Available at: <https://blog.ethereum.org/2014/03/28/schellingcoin-a-minimal-trust-universal-data-feed> (Accessed: 20 November 2025).

Caldarelli, G. (2023) 'Before Ethereum. The Origin and Evolution of Blockchain Oracles', *IEEE Access*, 11, pp. 50899–50917. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3279106>.

Caldarelli, G. and Ellul, J. (2021) 'The Blockchain Oracle Problem in Decentralized Finance—A Multivocal Approach', *Applied Sciences*, 11(16), p. 7572. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/app11167572>.

Caldarelli, G. and Ornaghi, M. (2025) 'Two thousand years of the oracle problem. Insights from Ancient Delphi on the future of blockchain oracles'. Available at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2511.03319>.

Chainalysis Team (2022) *Cross-Chain Bridge Hacks Emerge as Top Security Risk*, *Chainalysis.com*. Available at: <https://www.chainalysis.com/blog/cross-chain-bridge-hacks-2022/> (Accessed: 24 November 2025).

Chainalysis Team (2023) *Oracle Manipulation Attacks Rising: A Unique Concern for DeFi*, *Chainalysis.com*. Available at: <https://www.chainalysis.com/blog/oracle-manipulation-attacks-rising/> (Accessed: 24 November 2025).

Chainalysis Team (2025) *2025 Crypto Crime Mid-Year Update - Chainalysis*, *Chainalysis.com*. Available at: <https://www.chainalysis.com/blog/2025-crypto-crime-mid-year-update/> (Accessed: 24 November 2025).

Cong, L.W. et al. (2025) 'A primer on oracle economics', *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 94(June), p. 102800. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2025.102800>.

Damjan, M. (2018) 'The interface between blockchain and the real world', *Ragion Pratica*, 2018(2), pp. 379–406. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1415/91545>.

David, P. (1985) 'Clio and the economics of QWERTY_Am. economic reveiw may 1985.pdf', *American economic review*, vol 75. Available at: <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=ceb044e2-3393-4ad6-9dbb-3b38bc880478@sessionmgr110&vid=21&hid=123>.

Davis, A.R. (2015) 'A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Path Dependency and

Technology Option Evaluation when Valuing IT Opportunities', *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 6(1). Available at: www.ijbssnet.com (Accessed: 27 November 2025).

Dickson, G.W. (1966) 'An Analysis Of Vendor Selection Systems And Decisions', *Journal of Purchasing*, 2(1), pp. 5–17. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-493x.1966.tb00818.x>.

Egberts, A. (2017) 'The Oracle Problem - An Analysis of how Blockchain Oracles Undermine the Advantages of Decentralized Ledger Systems', *SSRN Electronic Journal* [Preprint]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3382343>.

Eskandari, S. et al. (2021) 'SoK: oracles from the ground truth to market manipulation', in *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, pp. 127–141. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3479722.3480994>.

Farrell, J. (2004) 'Coordination and Lock-In : Competition with Switching Costs and Network Effects Part III of IV Network Effects Section', (December), pp. 1–55.

Frankenreiter, J. (2019) 'The Limits of Smart Contracts', *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics JITE*, 175(1), pp. 149–162. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1628/jite-2019-0021>.

Goeree, J.K. (2003) 'Bidding for the future: signaling in auctions with an aftermarket', *Journal of Economic Theory*, 108(2), pp. 345–364. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0531\(03\)00031-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0531(03)00031-0).

Hacken (2025) *The Hacken 2025 Half Year Web3 Security Report*, *Hacken.io*. Available at: <https://hacken.ghost.io/content/files/2025/07/hacken-2025-h1-web3-security-report-1.pdf> (Accessed: 24 November 2025).

Hanafizadeh, P. and Zare Ravasan, A. (2018) 'An empirical analysis on outsourcing decision: the case of e-banking services', *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 31(1), pp. 146–172. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-11-2016-0182>.

Handley, S., Skowronski, K. and Thakar, D. (2022) 'The single-sourcing versus multisourcing decision in information technology outsourcing', *Journal of Operations Management*, 68(6–7), pp. 702–727. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/joom.1174>.

Hassanzadeh, S. and Cheng, K. (2016) 'Suppliers Selection In Manufacturing Industries And Associated Multi-Objective Decision Making Methods: Past, Present And The Future', *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 12(1), p. 93. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n1p93>.

Heiss, J., Eberhardt, J. and Tai, S. (2019) 'From Oracles to Trustworthy Data On-Chaining Systems', in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain)*. IEEE, pp. 496–503. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/Blockchain.2019.00075>.

Huang, J. and Nicol, D.M. (2013) 'Trust mechanisms for cloud computing', *Journal of Cloud*

Computing, 2(1), pp. 1–14. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/2192-113X-2-9>.

Irani, Z. et al. (2023) 'The impact of legacy systems on digital transformation in European public administration: Lesson learned from a multi case analysis', *Government Information Quarterly*, 40(1), p. 101784. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.GIQ.2022.101784>.

Jullien, B., Pavan, A. and Rysman, M. (2021) 'Two-sided markets, pricing, and network effects', in *Handbook of Industrial Organization*. Elsevier B.V., pp. 485–592. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.hesind.2021.11.007>.

Kaleem, M. and Shi, W. (2021) 'Demystifying Pythia: A Survey of ChainLink Oracles Usage on Ethereum', in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*. Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH, pp. 115–123. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-63958-0_10.

Katz, M.L. and Shapiro, C. (1994) 'Systems Competition and Network Effects', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8(2), pp. 93–115. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.8.2.93>.

Kim, S. and Chung, Y.-S. (2003) 'Critical Success Factors for IS Outsourcing Implementation from an Interorganizational Relationship Perspective', *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 43(4), pp. 81–90. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2003.11647537>.

Lang, M., Wiesche, M. and Krcmar, H. (2016) 'WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT CRITERIA FOR CLOUD SERVICE PROVIDER SELECTION? A DELPHI STUDY', *Research Papers* [Preprint]. Available at: https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2016_rp/119 (Accessed: 27 November 2025).

Liebowitz, S.J. and Margolis, S.E. (1994) 'Network Externalities: An Uncommon Tragedy', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8(2), pp. 133–150. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.8.2.133>.

Liu, B., Szalachowski, P. and Zhou, J. (2021) 'A First Look into DeFi Oracles', in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Decentralized Applications and Infrastructures (DAPPS)*. IEEE, pp. 39–48. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/DAPPS52256.2021.00010>.

Liu, B., Zhou, J. and Lim, Y.Z. (2022) 'Being Accountable Never Cheats: An Incentive Protocol for DeFi Oracles', in: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), pp. 1–10. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/dapps55202.2022.00009>.

Lynn, T. et al. (2021) *Data Privacy and Trust in Cloud Computing: Building trust in the cloud through assurance and accountability*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Martin, L. (2012) 'The Make-or-Buy Decision in ICT Services: Empirical Evidence from Luxembourg BT - Internet Econometrics', in S. Allegrezza and A. Dubrocard (eds) *Internet Econometrics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 234–258. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230364226_11.

Mühlberger, R. et al. (2020) 'Foundational Oracle Patterns: Connecting Blockchain to the Off-chain World', *Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing*, 393 LNBIP, pp. 35–51. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58779-6_3.

Murimi, R.M. and Wang, G.G. (2021) 'On elastic incentives for blockchain oracles', *Journal of Database Management*, 32(1), pp. 1–26. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4018/JDM.2021010101>.

Opara-Martins, J., Sahandi, R. and Tian, F. (2015) 'Critical review of vendor lock-in and its impact on adoption of cloud computing', *International Conference on Information Society, i-Society 2014*, pp. 92–97. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/I-SOCIETY.2014.7009018>.

Opara-Martins, J., Sahandi, R. and Tian, F. (2016) 'Critical analysis of vendor lock-in and its impact on cloud computing migration: a business perspective', *Journal of Cloud Computing*, 5(1), p. 4. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13677-016-0054-z>.

Page, W.H. and Lopatka, J.E. (2000) 'Network externalities', *Encyclopedia of Law and Economics*, 1, pp. 952–980.

Park, J. et al. (2021) 'Smart contract data feed framework for privacy-preserving oracle system on blockchain', *Computers*, 10(1), pp. 1–12. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/computers10010007>.

Pasdar, A., Dong, Z. and Lee, Y.C. (2021) 'Blockchain Oracle Design Patterns', pp. 1–25. Available at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09349>.

Pasdar, A., Lee, Y.C. and Dong, Z. (2023) 'Connect API with Blockchain: A Survey on Blockchain Oracle Implementation', *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(10), pp. 1–39. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3567582>.

Philion, H. (2024) [Tweet on oracle risk], post on X, 26 August, x.com. Available at: <https://x.com/HugoPhilion/status/1828126025537991087> (Accessed: 24 November 2025).

Salop, S. (2021) 'Dominant Digital Platforms: Is Antitrust Up to the Task?', *Yale Law Journal Forum*, 130(May 2019), pp. 563–587.

Schneider, S. and Sunyaev, A. (2014) 'Determinant factors of cloud-sourcing decisions: reflecting on the IT outsourcing literature in the era of cloud computing', *Journal of Information Technology* 2014 31:1, 31(1), pp. 1–31. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1057/JIT.2014.25>.

Sztorc, P. (2015) *Truthcoin Peer-to-Peer Oracle System and Prediction Marketplace*, *bitcoinhivemind.com*. Available at: <https://bitcoinhivemind.com/papers/truthcoin-whitepaper.pdf> (Accessed: 15 February 2023).

Tsentsura, K. (2025) *Sui Blockchain DeFi Exploit: \$200M Lost in Cetus Oracle Manipulation*, *Yellow.com*. Available at: <https://yellow.com/news/sui-blockchain-defi-exploit-dollar200m-lost-in-cetus-oracle-manipulation> (Accessed: 24 November 2025).

Weber, C.A., Current, J.R. and Benton, W.C. (1991) 'Vendor selection criteria and

methods', *European Journal of Operational Research*, 50(1), pp. 2–18. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217\(91\)90033-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(91)90033-R).

Wu, J. *et al.* (2025) 'Safeguarding Blockchain Ecosystem: Understanding and Detecting Attack Transactions on Cross-chain Bridges', in *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, pp. 4902–4912. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3696410.3714604>.

Wu, M.-Y. and Weng, Y.-C. (2010) 'A study of supplier selection factors for high-tech industries in the supply chain', *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 21(4), pp. 391–413. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783361003606662>.