
THINKDEFI RESEARCH SERIES

RESEARCH PAPER NO. 001

The Human Layer of Decentralized Finance

Why financial transformation succeeds or fails at the coordination layer

CENTRAL PROPOSITION

Technology creates possibility. Coordination creates implementation.

DENISE SHANKLIN

Founder & Executive Director, ThinkDeFi

July 2026 • Executive Briefing Edition • Publication Standard v1.0

About ThinkDeFi

ThinkDeFi is an independent research organization and institutional dialogue platform examining the infrastructure, institutional decisions, and human coordination shaping the future of finance.

Through research publications, private salons, and executive dialogue, ThinkDeFi convenes leaders across financial services, payments, fintech, digital assets, policy, and institutional infrastructure to move emerging financial systems from technological possibility toward responsible implementation.

About this paper

This paper is designed as an executive briefing and a foundation for ThinkDeFi salon dialogue. It synthesizes public institutional research with strategic analysis to frame the decisions organizations must make as programmable and decentralized infrastructure enters regulated financial markets.

Method and scope

The analysis is based on a qualitative review of primary publications from international standard-setting bodies, central-bank institutions, and market-infrastructure organizations. It focuses on institutional adoption and coordination; it does not evaluate individual protocols, tokens, or investment opportunities.

Research independence

ThinkDeFi research is developed to support informed institutional dialogue. Sponsorship or participation in ThinkDeFi programs does not confer editorial control over research findings or conclusions.

Disclaimer

This publication is intended for informational and strategic discussion purposes only. It does not constitute investment, legal, regulatory, accounting, or financial advice. Organizations should obtain advice appropriate to their circumstances before acting on the issues discussed.

THE CENTRAL PROPOSITION

Decentralized finance is not only a technology transition. It is a redesign of how institutions establish trust, allocate authority, align incentives, and coordinate execution.

Executive Summary

Financial infrastructure is entering a structural transition. Programmable ledgers, tokenized assets, smart contracts, and new forms of digital money are making it possible to combine ownership records, transaction logic, and settlement in ways that can reduce friction and enable new financial arrangements.

Yet technical capability does not produce institutional adoption on its own. The most difficult work begins when a promising system must cross organizational boundaries: legal rights must be recognized, governance authority must be legitimate, risk ownership must be explicit, compliance must operate across platforms, and participants must have confidence that the system will perform under both ordinary and stressed conditions.

This paper calls that decision environment the human coordination layer. It includes the institutional, behavioral, governance, and operational mechanisms through which a technology becomes usable, trusted, and scalable.

The argument is not that technology is secondary. Technology defines the frontier of what can be done. Coordination determines which possibilities survive contact with regulated markets, incumbent systems, competing incentives, and real customers.

Six findings for executive leaders

Finding	Executive implication
1. Adoption is a multi-party decision	A viable use case can stall when no institution has authority to resolve cross-boundary questions.
2. Trust must be designed	Code integrity is necessary, but legal enforceability, operational resilience, accountability, and recourse remain decisive.
3. Governance is infrastructure	Decision rights, upgrade processes, exception handling, and crisis authority must be defined before scale.
4. Incentives shape interoperability	Shared standards succeed only when participants' economic and strategic interests are sufficiently aligned.
5. Hybrid models are the likely bridge	Institutions will usually adopt through controlled coexistence with existing systems - not immediate replacement.
6. Coordination capability is strategic	Organizations that can convene stakeholders and convert ambiguity into operating agreements will influence market architecture.

EXECUTIVE TAKEAWAY

The adoption question is no longer simply, “Does the technology work?” It is, “Can the institutions around it reach, govern, and sustain the agreements required for it to work at scale?”

1. The Infrastructure Shift

Financial systems are coordination systems. They record claims, establish who may act, define how obligations are discharged, and provide mechanisms for assurance and recourse. Today, many of those functions are embedded across separate institutions, databases, messaging networks, operating procedures, and legal agreements.

Programmable infrastructure changes this arrangement. Tokenization can place information about an asset, its ownership, and the rules governing its use on a programmable platform. Smart contracts can automate linked actions and allow components of a transaction to occur together. The Bank for International Settlements describes these capabilities as potential sources of faster execution, atomic settlement, and new forms of contingent transfer (BIS, 2023a).

The opportunity is substantial precisely because the current financial system is fragmented. But the same fragmentation also creates the central implementation challenge. Moving an asset or payment process onto a new platform does not automatically move the legal rights, supervisory expectations, risk controls, customer protections, and institutional responsibilities surrounding it.

This produces a paradox: the use cases with the greatest theoretical benefit often require the most difficult coordination. BIS research describes a “tokenisation continuum” in which assets that are easiest to tokenize may yield modest per-transaction gains, while assets with greater potential value often carry more complex economic, legal, and technical constraints (BIS, 2023a).

THE INFRASTRUCTURE PARADOX

The more meaningful the transformation, the more institutions must coordinate across legacy systems, legal regimes, commercial interests, and risk boundaries.

From decentralization to institutional redesign

The next generation of financial infrastructure is unlikely to be defined by a simple contest between centralized and decentralized systems. A more realistic path is selective redesign: programmable capabilities will be adopted where they improve execution, while institutions continue to perform functions markets require - screening, risk absorption, fiduciary responsibility, dispute resolution, compliance, and customer protection.

This distinction matters for executives. The strategic question is not whether institutions disappear. It is how institutional roles, economics, and accountabilities change when transaction logic becomes more programmable and market infrastructure becomes more interconnected.

2. Why Technology Alone Does Not Transform Markets

Transformation programs commonly begin with technical feasibility and a high-value use case. They often slow later, when the initiative reaches the boundaries between technology and institutional authority.

A demonstration can prove that a transaction is technically possible. It cannot, by itself, determine whether a regulator recognizes the legal effect, whether an auditor accepts the control environment, whether treasury accepts the liquidity model, whether compliance can monitor the relevant activity, or who bears loss when an automated process behaves as designed but produces an unacceptable outcome.

Five recurring gaps between pilot and scale

Gap	What remains unresolved
Authority	Who may approve changes, halt activity, admit participants, or resolve exceptions?
Accountability	Who owns customer, conduct, cyber, operational, liquidity, and settlement risk?
Assurance	What evidence will regulators, boards, counterparties, and customers accept?
Interoperability	How will legal, data, identity, messaging, and settlement standards work across systems?
Economics	Who funds shared infrastructure, captures value, and absorbs transition costs?

These are not peripheral “change-management” issues. They are system-design requirements. If they are addressed late, the business case weakens, risk accumulates, and participants retreat to familiar arrangements.

The Financial Stability Board’s work on decentralized finance reaches a related conclusion from a risk perspective: DeFi may replicate or amplify familiar financial vulnerabilities even when services are delivered through different technological arrangements (FSB, 2023a). Technology changes the mechanism; it does not eliminate the need to govern leverage, liquidity mismatch, interconnectedness, operational risk, or market integrity.

3. The Human Coordination Layer

The human coordination layer is the set of agreements, institutions, behaviors, and decision mechanisms that allow technical infrastructure to operate as accepted financial infrastructure.

It is “human” not because it excludes technology, but because it governs choices that technology cannot legitimately make for society or an institution: whose interests take priority, what risks are acceptable, when an exception is justified, who may intervene, and how responsibility is assigned.

A six-part coordination framework

Dimension	The executive question
Trust	What combination of technical proof, institutional assurance, legal certainty, and recourse will participants rely on?
Governance	Who has decision rights, and how are upgrades, disputes, emergencies, and conflicts handled?
Incentives	Why will each participant join, invest, share data, adopt standards, and remain in the system?
Identity & compliance	How are parties, permissions, obligations, privacy, and cross-border requirements represented and enforced?
Operations	How will the system coexist with legacy processes, controls, people, vendors, and service-level expectations?
Legitimacy	Why should regulators, customers, counterparties, boards, and the public accept the arrangement?

The dimensions are interdependent. Strong technology with weak governance creates uncertainty. Clear governance with misaligned economics produces non-participation. Efficient execution without legal recognition produces unusable output. Compliance without workable identity standards creates friction that can erase the intended benefit.

Executives should therefore treat coordination as an architecture with explicit components - not as a series of stakeholder meetings after the platform has been selected.

4. Trust Architecture

Traditional finance does not rely on trust in a single institution or technology. It relies on a layered trust architecture: law, supervision, capital and liquidity requirements, operational controls, audit, contractual obligations, market conventions, brand reputation, and mechanisms for correction or compensation.

Decentralized systems introduce additional sources of assurance, including transparent rules, cryptographic verification, distributed validation, and automated execution. These capabilities can reduce reliance on particular intermediaries, but they do not answer every institutional trust question.

Four forms of trust must converge

Form	Evidence participants need
Technical trust	Security, integrity, availability, privacy, scalability, and predictable execution.
Legal trust	Recognized ownership, enforceable obligations, finality, jurisdiction, and remedies.
Institutional trust	Clear accountability, governance legitimacy, competent operators, and credible oversight.
Relational trust	Confidence built through repeated performance, transparency, shared norms, and fair treatment.

A system may be technically trust-minimized while remaining institutionally trust-dependent. For example, a token representing an off-chain asset still depends on reliable links to registries, custodians, issuers, or other parties that establish the relationship between the digital representation and the underlying claim. BIS research emphasizes that these “ramps” create legal and technical coordination requirements that cannot be solved by code alone (BIS, 2023a).

Trust architecture is therefore a design discipline: leaders must determine what must be proven, by whom, to whom, at what frequency, and with what recourse when proof is insufficient or the system fails.

5. Coordination Failures

Many emerging financial systems encounter coordination failure before they encounter a hard technological limit. The failure may appear as slow adoption, fragmented pilots, duplicated infrastructure, unclear standards, or an inability to move beyond a narrow participant group.

Common failure patterns

Pattern	What it looks like	Strategic response
Technology-first governance	Rules are discussed after architecture is fixed.	Define decision rights and risk ownership during use-case design.
Pilot isolation	A proof of concept succeeds without integration, legal, or operating commitments.	Design the pilot around a credible path to production and named owners.
Standards without incentives	Participants endorse interoperability but protect proprietary advantage.	Align the business model and transition economics with shared standards.
Ambiguous decentralization	A system is described as decentralized although control is concentrated.	Map actual control, influence, dependencies, and intervention rights.
Compliance translation gap	Requirements are stated in policy language but not represented in workflows or code.	Create joint legal, compliance, operations, and engineering design authority.
No failure compact	Normal operations are specified; stressed operations are not.	Agree escalation, pause, recovery, loss allocation, and communication protocols.

The FSB's global recommendations emphasize effective governance, risk management, data access, disclosures, and cross-border cooperation for crypto-asset activities (FSB, 2023b). IOSCO's DeFi recommendations similarly focus on identifying responsible persons, managing conflicts, addressing material risks, and supporting cross-border enforcement cooperation (IOSCO, 2023). Together, they reinforce a central point: distributed technical arrangements do not remove the need for identifiable responsibility and coordinated oversight.

6. Institutional Adoption Pathways

Institutional adoption is more likely to proceed through staged integration than sudden replacement. The appropriate sequence will vary by use case, but the underlying logic is consistent: expand technical and organizational scope only as legal certainty, controls, operating capacity, and participant alignment mature.

A practical maturity pathway

Stage	Institutional objective	Evidence required to advance
1. Strategic alignment	Define the problem, intended value, boundaries, and non-negotiable requirements.	Executive sponsor; shared use-case thesis; initial regulatory and risk view.
2. Controlled experiment	Test technical feasibility and surface cross-functional constraints.	Measured results; dependency map; named risk and decision owners.
3. Governed pilot	Operate with real participants or assets inside explicit limits.	Legal basis; control design; operating model; exception and recovery process.
4. Network integration	Connect institutions, platforms, data, identity, compliance, and settlement.	Interoperability agreements; service levels; shared governance and economics.
5. Scaled operation	Expand volume, participants, products, or jurisdictions responsibly.	Resilience under stress; supervisory confidence; sustainable economics; auditability.

Hybrid models can be strategically useful in this progression. They provide a bridge between existing institutional assurances and new programmable capabilities. However, “hybrid” should not become a euphemism for indefinite duplication. Leaders should specify what the bridge is intended to prove, which legacy functions may be retired, and what conditions trigger the next decision.

Recent BIS work on next-generation monetary and financial systems emphasizes unified or interconnected programmable arrangements combining central-bank money, commercial-bank money, and government bonds, alongside governance and regulatory safeguards (BIS, 2025). Whether or not a particular architecture prevails, the direction illustrates why adoption is an ecosystem decision rather than a stand-alone technology deployment.

7. The Executive Coordination Agenda

The human layer becomes manageable when executives translate it into a set of decisions with owners, evidence, and timing. The following agenda can be used by boards, executive committees, innovation leaders, risk functions, and multi-institution working groups.

Before approving a program

- Name the institutional problem in terms independent of the chosen technology.
- Identify every party whose participation, data, approval, liquidity, asset, or legal recognition is required.
- Map where authority and accountability actually sit - not only where the architecture suggests they sit.
- Separate benefits created by programmability from benefits that depend on market structure or regulatory change.
- Define the conditions under which the program should advance, pause, redesign, or stop.

Before moving from pilot to production

- Establish a joint governance body with clear decision rights and escalation paths.
- Document legal characterization, settlement finality, customer treatment, data responsibilities, and recourse.
- Test failure modes across technology, operations, counterparties, liquidity, cybersecurity, and communications.
- Agree how upgrades, participant admission, standards changes, and emergency intervention will occur.
- Demonstrate that participant economics remain viable beyond subsidized experimentation.

Before scaling across institutions or borders

- Assess whether controls and evidence travel across jurisdictions and institutional risk frameworks.
- Establish interoperable identity, compliance, messaging, and data standards.
- Define supervisory access and reporting in ways that preserve legitimate privacy and confidentiality.
- Measure concentration, dependency, contagion, and exit risks across the full network.
- Create a shared narrative that explains the arrangement accurately to customers, boards, regulators, and markets.

A NEW LEADERSHIP CAPABILITY

Competitive advantage will increasingly belong to institutions that can coordinate ecosystems - not only deploy technology. Convening, translating, negotiating, governing, and sustaining shared commitments are becoming core infrastructure capabilities.

8. Implications by Stakeholder

Stakeholder	Priority question
Banks & payment companies	Which functions should remain institutionally controlled, which can become programmable, and how does the new model affect deposits, liquidity, compliance, and customer trust?
Fintech & digital-asset firms	How can technical innovation meet institutional standards without losing the speed and openness that create its value?
Market infrastructure providers	What common services, standards, and governance mechanisms can reduce fragmentation while preserving competition?
Policymakers & regulators	How can oversight focus on economic function, actual control, and risk while supporting responsible experimentation and cross-border coherence?
Investors	Does adoption depend on a durable network of aligned participants, or on a technical advantage competitors can replicate?
Enterprise leaders	What organizational changes, skills, operating models, and partnerships are required to capture value - not merely run a pilot?

9. Questions for the ThinkDeFi Salon

The purpose of the salon is not to produce easy consensus. It is to identify the agreements, tensions, and open questions that will determine how financial infrastructure evolves.

01	Where does the next generation of global payments genuinely require decentralization - and where does it require better coordination among existing institutions?
02	Which forms of trust can be embedded in technology, and which must remain legal, institutional, or relational?
03	Who should hold the authority to intervene in programmable financial systems, under what conditions, and with what accountability?
04	What incentives would persuade competing institutions to adopt shared infrastructure and interoperable standards?
05	How should identity, compliance, privacy, and permissioning work across jurisdictions without recreating today's friction?
06	What evidence would give boards, regulators, counterparties, and customers confidence to move from pilot to scale?
07	What would a credible "failure compact" look like for cross-institution digital-asset and payment networks?
08	Which leadership capabilities are missing from today's financial-transformation teams?

From dialogue to intelligence

ThinkDeFi will use salon dialogue to test the framework in this paper, identify points of institutional convergence and disagreement, and shape a post-salon intelligence brief. Participant comments should be attributed only with explicit permission; the convening is designed to support candor as well as useful public insight.

Conclusion

The evolution of decentralized finance is often framed as a technological revolution. It is more accurately understood as a coordination transformation.

Programmable infrastructure can change how value moves, how assets are represented, how transactions are executed, and how financial services are assembled. But sustainable adoption depends on arrangements that make those capabilities legitimate and dependable: governance, incentives, legal recognition, operational resilience, regulatory coordination, and trust.

The systems that succeed will not necessarily be those with the most advanced technology in isolation. They will be the systems whose participants can align infrastructure, authority, risk, and institutional purpose into a coherent operating model.

The future of finance will not be determined solely by protocols. It will be determined by coordination.

References

- Bank for International Settlements (BIS). 2023a. The Tokenisation Continuum. BIS Bulletin No. 72. <https://www.bis.org/publ/bisbull72.htm>
- Bank for International Settlements (BIS). 2023b. Blueprint for the Future Monetary System: Improving the Old, Enabling the New. Annual Economic Report, Chapter III. <https://www.bis.org/publ/arpdf/ar2023e3.htm>
- Bank for International Settlements (BIS). 2025. The Next-generation Monetary and Financial System. Annual Economic Report, Chapter III. <https://www.bis.org/publ/arpdf/ar2025e3.htm>
- Committee on Payments and Market Infrastructures (CPMI). 2024. Tokenisation in the Context of Money and Other Assets: Concepts and Implications for Central Banks. <https://www.bis.org/cpmi/publ/d225.htm>
- Financial Stability Board (FSB). 2023a. The Financial Stability Risks of Decentralised Finance. <https://www.fsb.org/2023/02/the-financial-stability-risks-of-decentralised-finance/>
- Financial Stability Board (FSB). 2023b. High-level Recommendations for the Regulation, Supervision and Oversight of Crypto-asset Activities and Markets. <https://www.fsb.org/2023/07/high-level-recommendations-for-the-regulation-supervision-and-oversight-of-crypto-asset-activities-and-markets-final-report/>
- International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO). 2023. Policy Recommendations for Decentralized Finance (DeFi): Final Report. <https://www.iosco.org/library/pubdocs/pdf/IOSCOPD754.pdf>
- Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation (DTCC). 2024. Bringing Traditional Assets to Digital Networks: Exploring the Tokenization of a Private Fund Using a Public Blockchain. <https://www.dtcc.com/-/media/Files/Downloads/WhitePapers/DTCC-Digital-Assets-Tokenization-POC-with-Citi.pdf>

About the Author

Denise Shanklin is the Founder & Executive Director of ThinkDeFi, an independent research organization and institutional dialogue platform focused on financial infrastructure modernization, institutional adoption, and the human coordination systems shaping the future of finance. She brings decades of experience leading complex enterprise transformation initiatives across technology, operations, governance, stakeholder alignment, and implementation risk.

Through ThinkDeFi, Denise develops research and convenes executive salons designed to help leaders examine the institutional and human decisions that determine whether emerging financial systems become trusted, responsible, and scalable.

ThinkDeFi Research Series

The ThinkDeFi Research Series examines the systems, decisions, and institutional relationships shaping the future of financial infrastructure. Each publication is designed to support executive understanding, informed dialogue, and practical action.

CONTINUE THE DIALOGUE

Research • Salon Series • Institutional Partnerships

thinkdefi.org | contact@thinkdefi.org

Publication metadata

Field	Details
Publication	ThinkDeFi Research Paper No. 001
Edition	Executive Briefing Edition
Standard	ThinkDeFi Research Publication Standard v1.0
Publication date	July 2026
Author	Denise Shanklin, Founder & Executive Director
Website	thinkdefi.org