

Prediction Markets Entering 2027

From probability display to decision infrastructure: scale, regulation, corporate forecasting, hedging and the limits of the signal.

Published September 29, 2026 · Version 1.0 · Independent research

Educational and informational research only. Not financial, investment, trading, betting, legal, accounting or hedging advice.

DELTA ARC, LLC

thedeltaarc.com/reports/

At a glance

MARKET-STRUCTURE SNAPSHOT	ROE-DEFINED MEASURE
~5 per year	Average annual DCM event-contract listings, 2006–2020
131	Newly listed event contracts in 2021
~1,600	DCM-certified event contracts in 2025
13.6 billion	Robinhood-reported event contracts traded in Q2 2026

Source note: CFTC 2026 advance notice and Robinhood Q2 2026 results. The measures use different definitions and are not comparable measures of market value.

Executive finding

Prediction markets are moving from a specialized forecasting instrument into a distribution layer for event-driven financial products and data. The strongest evidence is structural: regulated exchanges are listing far more event contracts; retail brokers are distributing them at scale; established derivatives and exchange companies are investing in, partnering with, or building access to the category; and regulators are responding with fresh guidance, litigation positions and rulemaking questions.

That expansion does not make every displayed probability reliable. A market price is produced by a specific contract, venue, participant set and order book. It can be informative while still being thin, biased, temporarily distorted, inaccessible to relevant experts, or defined by resolution language that differs from the headline. The analytical opportunity entering 2027 is therefore not simply to repeat the price. It is to qualify the signal.

For enterprises, public prediction markets can contribute external context, while carefully governed internal markets can expose distributed beliefs about deadlines, demand, launches and operational risk. Neither should be confused with a complete forecast, a causal model or an automatically effective hedge. Decision value appears when market signals are combined with contract definitions, liquidity, source timing, base rates, operational exposure and accountable human judgment.

The measurable change in market structure

The CFTC's March 2026 advance notice provides the clearest comparable public count. It states that designated contract markets listed an average of approximately five event contracts per year from 2006 through 2020, that the count rose to 131 in 2021, and that DCMs certified approximately 1,600 event contracts in 2025. Those numbers describe newly listed contracts, not unique active markets, traders, dollars at risk or economic value. Even with that limitation, the change is too large to treat as a marginal product experiment.

Retail distribution is another measurable shift. Robinhood reported 13.6 billion event contracts traded through its Prediction Markets Hub in the second quarter of 2026, more than ten times the year-earlier level, and \$156 million of event-contract revenue for the quarter. Its definition counts each contract bought or sold and notes that a contract can trade from \$0.01 to \$1 and settle at \$1. The count is therefore not comparable to notional volume in stocks, options or futures, and it is not a market-wide total. It is still direct evidence that event contracts have become a material business line for a major retail platform.

Institutional infrastructure is expanding around the products. ICE announced an investment of up to \$2 billion in Polymarket at an approximately \$8 billion pre-investment valuation and an agreement to distribute Polymarket data to institutional customers. CME Group and FanDuel announced a jointly operated prediction-market access model. These announcements do not prove forecasting accuracy or permanent demand. They do show that established market-infrastructure and consumer-distribution companies consider the category strategically relevant.

What a prediction-market price does—and does not—mean

A binary contract that settles at \$1 if an event occurs and \$0 if it does not is commonly described as a probability market. A price of \$0.63 is often read as 63 percent. That interpretation is useful shorthand only after checking the instrument. Fees, bid-ask spreads, position limits, capital constraints, eligibility rules and uneven participation can separate a quoted price from a clean probability estimate.

Resolution language is the actual event definition. Two contracts can use similar titles while differing on the authority that decides the outcome, the cutoff time, geography, revision policy, threshold, treatment of delays or exceptional events. A cross-venue price gap may reflect disagreement. It may instead reflect two different questions. Any serious comparison must normalize those definitions before calling the gap an information signal.

The price is also not certainty. If a well-calibrated market assigns a 20 percent probability to five genuinely comparable events, one occurring would be consistent with the forecast. Evaluating a probabilistic system from one dramatic result is a category error. Calibration requires repeated forecasts, frozen time stamps, defined outcome rules and scoring across comparable observations.

Evidence on accuracy, bias and manipulation

The research record supports a balanced conclusion. Wolfers and Zitzewitz found that market-generated forecasts are generally accurate and often outperform moderately sophisticated benchmarks across the contexts they studied. Iowa Electronic Markets research reported strong election-forecast performance and rapid responses to information. These findings support the use of markets as information-aggregation mechanisms, not a claim of universal superiority.

The same literature identifies limits. Research on Google's internal markets documented an optimistic bias, greater optimism among newly hired employees, and correlated trading among employees connected by physical proximity or work relationships. Iowa research found that some probability ranges can show transitory

overconfidence at intermediate horizons, even when distortions diminish nearer resolution. Markets aggregate the participants they have; they do not automatically create independent information or representative participation.

Manipulation must be measured rather than assumed away. A trader may move a thin market temporarily, but sustaining a false price can invite offsetting trades when informed participants have capital and access. The resilience of one market design cannot be generalized to every venue. Depth, concentration, surveillance, incentives, participant diversity and the cost of counter-trading determine how much a price can resist pressure.

Corporate forecasting: where the mechanism can help

Inside a company, the relevant problem is often not lack of data but fragmented knowledge. Sales may see changing customer language, operations may see a schedule risk, finance may see margin pressure, and leadership may receive each signal at a different time. A well-designed internal market can force those beliefs into a defined, time-bound question and continuously update an aggregate view.

Suitable questions have objective resolution, a useful decision deadline and distributed information. Examples include whether a product will ship by a stated date, whether a qualified pipeline cohort will cross a defined conversion threshold, whether a supplier event will interrupt production, or whether a regulatory milestone will occur within a period. Questions about vague success, unknowable counterfactuals or outcomes controlled by a single participant are poor candidates.

The market should supplement—not erase—accountability. If a contract shows a 68 percent chance that a launch will miss its date, the next action is not to admire the number. It is to identify the evidence behind the movement, the operational dependency, the accountable owner and the cost of intervention. The signal becomes useful when it is routed into a decision process.

Hedging: a narrower claim than forecasting

The word hedge is frequently used too broadly. A forecast becomes a financial hedge only when a position has an economically meaningful relationship to an exposure and can offset some loss under defined conditions. That requires attention to contract settlement, basis risk, position size, liquidity, counterparty and venue rules, accounting treatment, tax, legal authority and the possibility that the operational loss and contract payoff will not align.

A manufacturer exposed to a weather-sensitive shipment, for example, may learn from a weather contract without having a usable hedge. The geography, time window or official measurement station might not match the shipment's actual risk. A political or regulatory contract may inform scenario planning while remaining too indirect to offset a business loss. Information value and hedge effectiveness are different questions.

Entering 2027, corporate use is more likely to mature first as monitoring, scenario prioritization and timing intelligence than as a universal replacement for conventional hedging instruments. Firms considering transaction use should involve qualified legal, compliance, tax, accounting and risk professionals rather than

treating a visible market as an automatically suitable exposure offset.

Regulation is part of the product

In the United States, the federal framework is active rather than settled. The CFTC withdrew its 2024 event-contract proposal in February 2026 and then opened a new advance notice of proposed rulemaking in March. Its staff separately reminded designated contract markets of core-principle and product-submission obligations. The Commission has also asserted federal jurisdiction in litigation involving state challenges. Those actions show both federal oversight and live boundary disputes; they do not justify a simple claim that every event contract is lawful everywhere.

Registration should be verified at the time of use through the CFTC and National Futures Association, not inferred from branding, an app-store listing or a partner logo. Product availability can differ by jurisdiction and can change through litigation, regulation, venue policy or intermediary controls. A report written on one date cannot guarantee later access or status.

For an enterprise, regulation is only one governance layer. Employment rules, confidentiality, material nonpublic information, data protection, incentive design, record retention, model-risk standards and internal trading policies can all matter. A company can build an analytically interesting market and still create a governance failure if participation reveals protected plans or rewards conduct that conflicts with employees' duties.

A decision-quality framework for 2027

Delta Arc evaluates a prediction-market signal through six controls. First, define the resolution event. Second, inspect executable liquidity rather than a headline volume number. Third, identify the participant and access boundary. Fourth, compare the market with an appropriate base rate, forecast or external reference. Fifth, attach time and evidence to meaningful changes. Sixth, name the business decision the signal can actually affect.

This approach separates four layers that are often collapsed: observation, interpretation, scenario and action. Observation records the price, spread, depth, time and contract rules. Interpretation explains what the movement may indicate. A scenario states a conditional future, not a fact. Action assigns the next review, hedge analysis or operational response. The separation makes later evaluation possible.

Founder of Delta Arc operating observation: decision systems create more value when they route qualified change to an accountable owner than when they maximize the number of signals displayed. This is a practitioner statement, not a market-wide empirical estimate. It is included because the same design rule applies across demand intelligence, CRM intelligence and prediction-market intelligence.

Three scenarios entering 2027

Base case—broader distribution, uneven analytical quality. Event contracts continue to reach more retail and professional users through familiar intermediaries. Data distribution becomes a separate commercial layer.

Most interfaces emphasize access and price; fewer explain resolution, liquidity and calibration. This creates demand for independent interpretation rather than eliminating it.

Institutional acceleration—event data becomes a monitored input. Exchanges, information vendors, risk teams and corporate strategy groups treat selected market series as another alternative-data feed. Adoption is likely to concentrate where contracts have clear resolution, recurring decisions and a defensible connection to exposure. Governance and procurement standards become competitive differentiators.

Fragmented constraint—legal and jurisdictional conflict narrows products or access. State-federal disputes, product-specific restrictions or compliance costs slow distribution in parts of the market. The forecasting mechanism remains relevant, but product design and availability diverge. Under this scenario, source verification and status dates become even more important.

These are scenarios, not forecasts. More than one can occur at the same time across different contract classes, venues and jurisdictions. Delta Arc will update the report when primary-source evidence changes the structure of the analysis.

What to measure next

Volume growth alone will not answer whether the category is creating better decisions. The next evidence set should include calibration by contract class and horizon; bid-ask spread and executable depth; concentration of price-setting activity; the frequency and impact of rule changes or disputed resolutions; distribution through registered intermediaries; and documented enterprise decisions that used a signal before the outcome was known.

For corporate implementations, measurement should start before launch. Record the baseline forecast, decision date, market estimate, comparison forecast, intervention and result. Use proper scoring rules across repeated questions. Test whether participation adds independent information or merely reproduces the organizational hierarchy. Review who benefited from access and who had relevant information but could not participate.

A credible research program must be willing to publish non-results. If a market did not outperform a simpler forecast, if liquidity made the price unusable, or if a contract definition changed, that finding is part of the record. Independent reporting earns authority by preserving uncertainty rather than removing it from the page.

Methodology and evidence boundary

Prepared from public regulator records, official registries, issuer disclosures and academic research available through September 29, 2026. Corporate figures remain attributed to the reporting company. Legal and registration status is time-sensitive. Delta Arc received no compensation from any named source or market participant.

Source register

- 1. CFTC. Prediction Markets Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.** March 16, 2026.
<https://www.cftc.gov/LawRegulation/FederalRegister/proposedrules/2026-05105.html>
Primary regulatory record; includes the Commission's event-contract listing counts and questions under review.
- 2. CFTC. CFTC Staff Issues Prediction Markets Advisory.** March 12, 2026.
<https://www.cftc.gov/PressRoom/PressReleases/9193-26>
Primary statement of DCM obligations and product-submission responsibilities.
- 3. CFTC. Understanding Prediction Markets and Event Contracts.** accessed September 29, 2026.
<https://www.cftc.gov/LearnandProtect/PredictionMarkets>
Primary consumer and market-structure explanation, including the distinction between registered and unregistered entities.
- 4. CFTC. Designated Contract Markets.** accessed September 29, 2026.
<https://www.cftc.gov/IndustryOversight/IndustryFilings/TradingOrganizations?Status=Designated>
Official registry used to verify DCM status; registration is time-sensitive and should be checked directly.
- 5. CFTC. CFTC Withdraws Event Contracts Rule Proposal and Staff Sports Event Contracts Advisory.** February 4, 2026.
<https://www.cftc.gov/PressRoom/PressReleases/9179-26>
Primary record of the withdrawal of the 2024 proposal and the announced new rulemaking direction.
- 6. Robinhood Markets. Second Quarter 2026 Results.** July 29, 2026.
<https://investors.robinhood.com/news-releases/news-release-details/robinhood-reports-second-quarter-2026-results>
Issuer-reported event-contract volume and revenue. Not independently audited market-wide volume.
- 7. Robinhood Markets. August 2026 Operating Data.** September 10, 2026.
<https://investors.robinhood.com/news-releases/news-release-details/robinhood-markets-inc-reports-august-2026-operating-data>
Issuer-reported monthly event-contract volume and methodology.
- 8. Intercontinental Exchange. ICE Announces Strategic Investment in Polymarket.** October 7, 2025.
<https://ir.theice.com/press/news-details/2025/ICE-Announces-Strategic-Investment-in-Polymarket/default.aspx>
Corporate announcement of investment terms and institutional data-distribution plan.
- 9. CME Group. FanDuel and CME Group Unveil New Prediction Markets Platform.** November 12, 2025.
<https://investor.cmegroup.com/news-releases/news-release-details/fanduel-and-cme-group-unveil-new-prediction-markets-platform>
Corporate announcement of distribution and product scope; not an independent performance assessment.
- 10. American Economic Association. Prediction Markets.** Spring 2004.
<https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/0895330041371321>
Peer-reviewed synthesis by Justin Wolfers and Eric Zitzewitz on information aggregation and market design.
- 11. NBER / authors. Using Prediction Markets to Track Information Flows: Evidence from Google.** January 2009.
<https://users.nber.org/~jwolfers/papers/GooglePredictionMarketPaper.pdf>
Corporate-market evidence documenting both information aggregation and systematic optimistic/social-proximity biases.
- 12. University of Iowa. Market Design, Manipulation, and Accuracy in Political Prediction Markets.** 2014.
<https://www.biz.uiowa.edu/faculty/trietz/papers/IEM%20PS%20Manipulation.pdf>
Academic evidence on accuracy, market design and manipulation attempts in the Iowa Electronic Markets.
- 13. University of Iowa. Longshots, Overconfidence and Efficiency on the Iowa Electronic Market.** 2019.
<https://www.biz.uiowa.edu/faculty/trietz/papers/longshots.pdf>
Academic evidence on calibration and transitory overconfidence in binary markets.

Citation

Delta Arc. "Prediction Markets Entering 2027: From Probability Display to Decision Infrastructure." Delta Arc Reports, version 1.0, September 29, 2026. <https://thedeltaarc.com/reports/prediction-markets-entering-2027/>