© MAY 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 11 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I11-1718229

Blockchain Platforms for Asset Management in India: Hyperledger Vs Ethereum, Implementation Costs, And Scalability Barriers

TANMAY KHODANKAR[1], ASHWINI GARKHEDKAR[2]
[1,2]*MCA Department, P E S Modern College of Engineering, Pune, India*

Abstract- ***India's asset management systems, especially land records, property registries and ownership documents, face major challenges such as fraud, ownership disputes, slow manual verification and fragmented documentation. These issues affect citizens, government departments, financial institutions and real-estate stakeholders. Blockchain technology provides an opportunity to improve asset management by creating tamper-resistant records, transparent transaction history and automated workflows through smart contracts. This paper studies the use of blockchain platforms for asset management in India with a comparative focus on Hyperledger Fabric and Ethereum. The study analyzes technical architecture, performance, privacy, cost, scalability and implementation barriers. It also considers Indian use cases such as Telangana land parcel initiatives, Karnataka Bhoomi-related digital land record modernization and national-level blockchain adoption efforts. The findings show that Hyperledger Fabric is more suitable for regulated government asset systems because it provides permissioned access, privacy channels, higher transaction throughput and lower operational cost. Ethereum is useful for public transparency and open applications, but its public-chain gas cost, lower throughput and regulatory challenges reduce suitability for high-volume government asset records. The paper concludes that a permissioned blockchain model with proper standards, legacy-system integration, legal recognition and rural digital infrastructure can support scalable blockchain-based asset management in India.***

Keywords: Blockchain, Asset Management, Hyperledger Fabric, Ethereum, Land Records, Smart Contracts, India, Scalability, Cost Analysis, Digital Governance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Asset management is an important part of economic and administrative development. In India, assets such as land parcels, property records, government infrastructure and ownership certificates directly affect citizens, businesses and public institutions.

Land and property records are also connected with taxation, loans, inheritance, construction permissions and dispute resolution. Therefore, accuracy and trust in asset records are essential for smooth governance.

Traditional asset management systems in India still suffer from several problems. Many records are maintained through paper documents or separate departmental databases. Revenue departments, registration offices, municipal bodies, courts and banks may maintain different versions of asset information. This fragmentation can lead to ownership disputes, duplicate records, document tampering and delay in verification.

Blockchain technology provides a possible solution because it stores transactions in a distributed and tamper-resistant ledger. Once a transaction is recorded and validated, it becomes difficult to alter without detection. Smart contracts can automate certain rules such as ownership transfer, mutation approval and verification status. These features make blockchain useful for land records, property registries and high-value asset tracking.

However, all blockchain platforms are not suitable for every use case. Public blockchains such as Ethereum provide openness and decentralization, but they may face high transaction cost, privacy limitations and lower throughput. Permissioned platforms such as Hyperledger Fabric provide controlled participation, better privacy and higher performance, which may be more suitable for government and enterprise asset management.

This paper compares Hyperledger Fabric and Ethereum for Indian asset management use cases. It studies performance, implementation cost, privacy, scalability, regulatory issues and practical deployment barriers. The paper also explains why pilot projects often succeed technically but face difficulty when scaled to state or national levels.

1.1 Objectives of the Study:

- To study the role of blockchain in improving asset management and property record systems in India.
- To compare Hyperledger Fabric and Ethereum for government-oriented asset management use cases.
- To analyze implementation cost, scalability and performance barriers in Indian deployment conditions.
- To understand how privacy, legal recognition and legacy integration affect blockchain adoption.
- To suggest a practical permissioned blockchain approach for large-scale asset record management.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

NITI Aayog (2020)

NITI Aayog discussed blockchain as an important digital governance technology for India. The strategy document highlights possible blockchain applications in land records, supply chains, identity systems and public service delivery. It recommends permissioned blockchain models for sensitive government systems because public departments require access control, accountability and interoperability.

Olatoye et al. (2024)

Olatoye and co-authors reviewed blockchain applications in asset management and identified immutability, smart contracts, tokenization and decentralized verification as major benefits. Their work is useful because asset management requires reliable proof of ownership and a clear transaction history. The study supports blockchain as a tool for reducing fraud and improving auditability.

Leavins and Ramaswamy (2023)

Leavins and Ramaswamy emphasized the role of tamper-proof ledgers in improving internal controls. Their study is relevant to property and land management because ownership records require trust, traceability and verification. Blockchain can reduce unauthorized modification and improve confidence among stakeholders.

Raji et al. (2024)

Raji and co-authors compared the performance and scalability of Ethereum and Hyperledger-based systems. Their findings show that permissioned blockchain platforms generally provide better throughput and lower latency for enterprise applications. This supports the selection of Hyperledger Fabric for high-volume government asset record systems.

Telangana Land Parcel Initiatives

Telangana's blockchain-based land parcel initiatives show how blockchain can support geospatial immutability, real-time verification and reduced disputes. Such pilots indicate that blockchain can improve trust in land records when integrated with government data sources and field-level verification.

Karnataka Bhoomi and PropertyChain Initiatives

Karnataka's land record modernization efforts demonstrate the importance of digitizing revenue and registration records. Blockchain can strengthen such systems by creating a reliable record of changes, but success depends on data quality, administrative coordination and integration with existing government databases.

III. RESEARCH GAP

Existing studies explain the technical advantages of blockchain, but many do not provide an India-specific comparison between permissioned and public blockchain platforms for asset management. Global blockchain cost estimates often do not match Indian infrastructure, staffing and integration conditions.

Another gap is the lack of practical cost modeling for state-level deployments. Pilot projects may work for a limited number of records, but the real challenge is scaling the system to millions of assets while maintaining low transaction cost, acceptable latency and legal compliance.

Most available studies also focus on blockchain benefits but give less attention to barriers such as rural network limitations, poor legacy data quality, interdepartmental coordination and legal recognition of blockchain-based ownership titles. This paper attempts to address these gaps by combining platform comparison, cost interpretation and implementation barriers.

IV. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

This study follows a mixed-method research design based on literature review, technical comparison and cost-oriented analysis. The paper does not implement a live blockchain network; instead, it evaluates platforms using published performance metrics, pilot observations and realistic Indian deployment requirements.

4.2 Data Collection

Data was collected from research papers, government strategy documents, technical benchmark studies, blockchain pilot descriptions and public information related to Indian asset management systems. The study also considers cost components such as infrastructure, development, maintenance and legacy integration.

4.3 Analysis Framework

The analysis framework includes architecture comparison, consensus mechanism review, transaction throughput, latency, privacy model, smart contract flexibility, cost per transaction and regulatory suitability. These factors are important because asset management systems require both technical performance and administrative trust.

4.4 Scope of the Study

The scope is limited to blockchain use in asset management, especially land and property records in India. The paper compares Hyperledger Fabric and Ethereum and does not cover all blockchain platforms. It focuses on practical deployment barriers rather than only theoretical blockchain concepts.

V. PLATFORM COMPARISON

Hyperledger Fabric is a permissioned blockchain platform where network participants are known and controlled by an organization or consortium. It supports private channels, modular consensus, chaincode-based business logic and high transaction throughput. These features make it suitable for government departments, banks and enterprise asset systems.

Ethereum is a public blockchain platform that supports smart contracts and decentralized applications. It provides openness and strong ecosystem support, but public Ethereum has limitations for government asset management because transaction fees vary, throughput is limited and privacy is difficult without additional layers.

Metric	Hyperledger Fabric	Ethereum
Network Type	Permissioned/private network	Public or private network
Participants	Known government/enterprise nodes	Open public validators or private nodes
Throughput	High, suitable for bulk transactions	Lower on public chain
Privacy	Channels and access control	Requires additional privacy tools
Cost Model	Infrastructure-based predictable cost	Gas-based public transaction cost
Suitability	Government asset records and registries	Open decentralized apps and token systems

VI. IMPLEMENTATION COST ANALYSIS

The total cost of ownership for blockchain-based asset management includes development cost, infrastructure cost, maintenance cost, security auditing and integration with legacy government systems. In India, legacy integration can become a major cost component because existing land records

may be stored across different formats and departments

A state-level pilot with millions of asset records requires servers or cloud nodes, development teams, smart contract or chaincode implementation, user dashboards, API integration, testing and staff training. Hyperledger Fabric may require more initial configuration, but its transaction cost remains predictable because it does not depend on public gas fees.

Ethereum-based public deployment may appear attractive because of its existing ecosystem, but frequent transactions in land record systems can become expensive due to gas charges. Private Ethereum variants can reduce this issue, but they still may not provide the same maturity in permissioned privacy and enterprise workflow as Fabric.

Cost Component	Explanation	Impact
Development	Blockchain logic, frontend, APIs, dashboards	High initial cost
Infrastructure	Cloud or data-center nodes, storage and networking	Medium recurring cost
Integration	Connection with revenue, registration and GIS systems	High complexity
Maintenance	Security updates, monitoring and support	Recurring operational cost
Training	Staff and departmental onboarding	Important for adoption

VII. SCALABILITY AND BARRIERS

Scalability is one of the most important challenges for blockchain-based asset management in India. A national or state-level system must handle millions of records and a large number of users. It must also support updates from multiple departments without slowing down transaction confirmation.

Hyperledger Fabric provides better scalability for controlled environments because it allows modular consensus and known validators. Ethereum public blockchain is less suitable for frequent government transactions because of lower throughput and public network dependency. Even if a private Ethereum network is used, privacy and governance design must be carefully planned.

Technical barriers include network latency in rural areas, limited digital infrastructure, data migration errors, cybersecurity risks and integration with old government software. Regulatory barriers include recognition of blockchain records, conflict between immutability and data correction rights, and unclear rules for smart contract-based ownership transfers.

Organizational barriers are equally important. Government departments may resist new systems if training, accountability and workflow changes are not clearly defined. Blockchain cannot solve poor data quality automatically; existing land records must first be verified, cleaned and standardized before being placed on a blockchain system.

VIII. PROPOSED ARCHITECTURE

A practical Indian asset management system can use a hybrid permissioned architecture based on Hyperledger Fabric. Government departments such as revenue, registration, municipal and survey offices can operate as authorized nodes. Banks and courts may receive verified access depending on policy requirements.

The system can store ownership transaction hashes and mutation records on the blockchain, while large documents such as maps, sale deeds and identity proofs can be stored in secure off-chain storage such as IPFS or government cloud repositories. This approach reduces blockchain storage load while maintaining document integrity through cryptographic hashes.

Aadhaar or digital identity verification can be used carefully as an external identity oracle, subject to legal permissions and privacy safeguards. Smart contracts or chaincode can automate mutation

workflows, document verification status and approval routing. A citizen-facing portal can allow users to check status, download verified records and track ownership history.

Layer	Function	Example
User Layer	Citizen and officer access	Web/mobile portal
Application Layer	Workflow and validation	Mutation approval, verification
Blockchain Layer	Immutable transaction log	Fabric channels and chaincode
Storage Layer	Documents and maps	IPFS/government cloud
Integration Layer	Legacy department systems	Revenue, registration, GIS

IX. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

The comparative analysis shows that Hyperledger Fabric is more suitable for regulated asset management in India. Its permissioned structure matches government requirements because asset records should not be modified by unknown public participants. Fabric also supports higher throughput, predictable cost and privacy channels.

Ethereum is valuable for decentralized public applications, tokenization experiments and open smart contract ecosystems. However, for land records and property registries, public Ethereum creates challenges related to gas cost, data privacy, legal recognition and transaction speed. Therefore, Ethereum may be more useful for academic prototypes or open verification layers rather than core government registries.

The analysis also shows that cost and scalability are not only technical issues. Real deployment requires clean data, legal acceptance, staff training, citizen awareness and coordination between departments. Without these supporting conditions, blockchain pilots may remain limited and fail to scale beyond small demonstrations.

X. DISCUSSION

Blockchain can improve trust in asset management, but it should not be treated as a complete replacement for administrative reform. If incorrect ownership data is entered into the blockchain, the system will preserve incorrect information. Therefore, data validation before blockchain entry is extremely important.

The strongest use of blockchain in asset management is auditability. Every change in ownership, mutation, approval or document verification can be recorded with a timestamp and responsible authority. This reduces hidden modification and improves accountability. Citizens can also gain confidence when they can verify the history of a property record. For India, the permissioned model is more realistic because government asset records require controlled access and legal responsibility. A consortium model involving revenue, registration, survey, municipal and judicial departments can provide shared trust without exposing sensitive records to an uncontrolled public network.

Scalability will depend on standardization. States should not build isolated blockchain systems that cannot communicate with each other. National standards for data formats, APIs, identity verification, smart contract rules and dispute resolution are required for long-term adoption.

XI. FUTURE SCOPE

Future research can focus on real-world deployment studies involving one million or more asset records. Such studies can measure actual transaction speed, user load, storage cost, downtime, citizen satisfaction and dispute reduction.

Another important future area is DPDP-compliant blockchain design. Since blockchain records are difficult to delete, systems must separate personal data from immutable transaction records and use privacy-preserving storage models.

Future systems can also explore integration with GIS mapping, satellite verification, digital signatures, Aadhaar-based identity verification under legal safeguards and AI-based fraud detection. These

technologies can work with blockchain to create a stronger asset management ecosystem.

Large-scale adoption will also require policy changes. Legal recognition of blockchain-based land titles, training for officials and affordable infrastructure support are necessary for moving from pilot projects to state-wide and national-level systems.

XII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Before implementing blockchain for asset management, government departments should first digitize and clean existing records. Blockchain should not be used to store unverified records because it may make incorrect data more permanent and harder to dispute later. A verification phase involving survey data, citizen objections and departmental cross-checking is necessary.

A national interoperability standard should be created so that different state systems can exchange data. Common APIs, property identifiers, document hash formats and audit log structures will help avoid isolated systems. Without standardization, blockchain adoption may create new digital silos instead of solving old ones.

Permissioned networks should include clearly defined roles. Revenue officers, registration departments, municipal bodies, banks and courts may need different levels of access. Role-based access control can protect sensitive information while still allowing authorized verification. The system should also keep complete audit logs of every official action. Citizen-facing services should remain simple. Users should not need to understand blockchain terms to use the system. The public interface should show verified ownership status, mutation request progress, document authenticity and dispute flags in plain language. This will improve adoption among rural and non-technical users.

Training and change management are necessary for successful implementation. Officials must understand how digital signatures, blockchain records, document hashes and approval workflows operate. If staff members are not trained properly, the system may be underused or used incorrectly.

XIII. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is based on secondary data, pilot observations and platform comparison. It does not include a live deployment of Hyperledger Fabric or Ethereum using real government asset records. Therefore, the findings should be understood as a practical research analysis rather than a completed field experiment.

The cost discussion is indicative because actual implementation cost depends on the number of assets, state-level infrastructure, vendor selection, security requirements, cloud policies and integration depth. Different states may face different costs depending on the quality of existing records and digital readiness.

Another limitation is that blockchain technology and regulations are continuously changing. Performance metrics, gas costs, privacy tools and government policies may evolve over time. Future research should validate the findings through real pilot measurements and stakeholder interviews.

The paper mainly compares Hyperledger Fabric and Ethereum. Other platforms such as Corda, Polygon, Quorum, Besu and private Layer-2 systems are not analyzed in detail. These platforms may also be relevant for specific use cases and can be studied separately.

XIV. STAGE-WISE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

A practical deployment should follow a stage-wise approach. In the first stage, one district or municipal region can be selected for a controlled pilot. Existing land records should be cleaned, digitized and matched with survey maps. In the second stage, blockchain nodes can be deployed for revenue and registration departments with limited citizen access.

In the third stage, mutation workflows, document verification, ownership transfer approvals and dispute

flags can be recorded on blockchain. In the fourth stage, banks, courts and municipal authorities can be integrated for authorized verification. Finally, the system can be expanded state-wide after performance, legal and usability testing.

Stage	Activity	Expected Output
Stage 1	Record digitization and verification	Clean asset database
Stage 2	Blockchain pilot network setup	Controlled permissioned nodes
Stage 3	Mutation and transfer workflow	Auditable ownership changes
Stage 4	Department integration	Shared verification access
Stage 5	Citizen portal expansion	Public trust and transparency

CONCLUSION

This paper studied blockchain platforms for asset management in India with a focus on Hyperledger Fabric and Ethereum. The study shows that blockchain can help address important problems such as tampering, fragmented records, slow verification and ownership disputes. However, platform selection is critical for practical success.

Hyperledger Fabric is more suitable for Indian government asset management because it provides permissioned access, high throughput, privacy channels and predictable operational cost. Ethereum has strong ecosystem value but is less suitable for high-volume regulated land and property systems due to gas cost, privacy concerns and public-chain limitations.

The success of blockchain-based asset management will depend on more than technology. Legal recognition, clean legacy data, rural connectivity, departmental coordination, user training and national standards are equally important. A hybrid Fabric-based model with off-chain document storage and controlled government participation can provide a practical path for India.

In conclusion, blockchain can become a useful tool for improving trust and transparency in asset management, but it must be implemented carefully with proper governance, privacy protection and long-term scalability planning.

REFERENCES

[1] NITI Aayog. (2020). "Blockchain: The India Strategy - Part I", Government of India, Policy Report, pp. 1-60.

[2] Olatoye, F. O., Elufioye, O. A., Okoye, C. C., Nwankwo, E. E. and Oladapo, J. O. (2024). "Blockchain in Asset Management: An Extensive Review of Opportunities and Challenges", International Journal of Science and Research Archive, Vol. 11, Issue 1, pp. 2111-2119.

[3] Raji, I. O. et al. (2024). "Performance and Scalability Analysis of Ethereum, Hyperledger Fabric and IOTA", International Journal of Engineering Research in Computer Science and Engineering, Vol. 11, Issue 12.

[4] Khan, M. M. et al. (2025). "Scalability and Efficiency Analysis of Hyperledger Fabric and Private Ethereum", Computers, Vol. 14, Issue 4, Article 132.

[5] Androulaki, E. et al. (2018). "Hyperledger Fabric: A Distributed Operating System for Permissioned Blockchains", Proceedings of the Thirteenth EuroSys Conference, Article 30, pp. 1-15.

[6] Wood, G. (2014). "Ethereum: A Secure Decentralised Generalised Transaction Ledger", Ethereum Project Yellow Paper, pp. 1-32.

[7] Christidis, K. and Devetsikiotis, M. (2016). "Blockchains and Smart Contracts for the Internet of Things", IEEE Access, Vol. 4, pp. 2292-2303.

[8] Casino, F., Dasaklis, T. K. and Patsakis, C. (2019). "A Systematic Literature Review of Blockchain-Based Applications", Telematics and Informatics, Vol. 36, pp. 55-81.

[9] Yaga, D., Mell, P., Roby, N. and Scarfone, K. (2018). "Blockchain Technology Overview",

National Institute of Standards and Technology, NISTIR 8202, pp. 1-66.

[10] Treleaven, P., Brown, R. G. and Yang, D. (2017). "Blockchain Technology in Finance", Computer, Vol. 50, Issue 9, pp. 14-17.

[11] Tapscott, D. and Tapscott, A. (2016). "Blockchain Revolution: How the Technology Behind Bitcoin is Changing Money, Business, and the World", Portfolio/Penguin, First Edition.