

# Integrating Blockchain technology within an Information Ecosystem

Francesco Salzano<sup>a</sup>, Lodovica Marchesi<sup>b</sup>, Remo Pareschi<sup>a</sup>, Roberto Tonelli<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Stake Lab, University of Molise, Campobasso, Italy*

<sup>b</sup>*Dep. of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy*

---

## Abstract

**Context:** Blockchain-based Information Ecosystems (BBIEs) are a type of information ecosystem in which blockchain technology is used to provide a trust mechanism among parties and to manage shared business logic, breaking the traditional scheme of Information Ecosystems dominated by a leading company and leveraging the decentralization of data management, information flow, and business logic. **Objective:** In this paper, we propose architecture and technical aspects concerning the creation of a BBIE, underlining the advantages supplied and the logic decomposition among the business and storage components. **Method:** The requirements are derived from the current needs of the collaborative business and the data collected by surveying practitioners. To get these needs we followed the Grounded Theory research approach. We validate our architectural schema against a case study dealing with the management of a wine supply chain, also involving different companies and supervision authorities. **Results:** The proposed solution integrates blockchain-based applications with the existing information system as a module of the ecosystem, leveraging on the low costs, scalability, and high-level security because of the restricted access to the network. **Conclusion:** We must go a long way in deepening and refining the possibilities offered by technology in supporting innovative multi-organizational business models. BBIEs can contribute substantially to paving the way in such a direction.

*Keywords:* Information system, Blockchain, Blockchain Oriented Software Engineering (BOSE), Blockchain as a Service (BaaS), Identity Management System (IMS).

---

## 1. Introduction

The organizational transformations of companies have been marked by information systems since the second half of the 20th century [1, 2]. An information system is a combination of technologies, processes, and people that collaborate to create information that helps organizations achieve their objectives. This concept has evolved over time, influenced by technological advancements, changes in the business environment, and new theories on how information can be used to facilitate decision making and problem solving [3].

Indeed, information systems have a rich history that dates back to the 1950s and 1960s, when mainframe computers were utilized to automate business processes such as payroll and accounting. With the advent of a global communication infrastructure that connects different enterprises through the Internet, the Worldwide Web, mobile computing, and cloud computing, these systems have evolved into complex information ecosystems that involve multiple businesses [4]. Amazon and Walmart are suitable examples of information ecosystems that manage and coordinate the flow of goods, materials, and information at various stages of the supply chain, from suppliers to customers. These companies have integrated supply chain management systems that consist of inter-enterprise components, connected and coordinated to ensure an efficient and effective flow of goods and information. However, even though these information ecosystems involve multiple business partners, the decision-making power is almost entirely in the hands of a single company. These new requirements created new necessities that must be met to implement adequate systems to satisfy the company's requests.

Previous research underscored how, in this particular scenario, the implementation of blockchain and distributed ledger technologies (DLT) can potentially result in the creation of fairer and more democratic ecosystems [5]. Unlike traditional information ecosystems, where the dominant company manages trust relationships among partners, DLTs automatically manage trust relationships, leading to a "trustless" scenario [6]. These technologies create the foundation for decentralized systems, which promote a fair and transparent decision-making process and ensure equal distribution of power and benefits among all participants. This is achieved by eliminating the control of a single entity over the system. Additionally, the distributed infrastructure offered by DLTs and blockchain allows businesses to share their business logic and profit from the execution of Smart Contracts (SCs) [7].

The goal of this work is to define a general architectural schema dedicated to addressing the newly arisen needs that characterize the current business context, in which companies share business data among themselves with the aim of obtaining a constant view of the state of the supply chain. Thus, we propose and define a high-level architecture for the deployment of a BBIE. Such architecture includes both blockchains and non-blockchain components shared among several companies. To define our architecture, we surveyed practitioners from several organizations operating in different business fields. Hence, we considered the answers given by the respondents to get the necessities to be considered as a requirement for our architectural model.

We consider from the definition of the concept of a BBIE provided by previous work [8], an information ecosystem in which blockchain technology is used to provide a trust mechanism between parties and to manage shared business logic, breaking the traditional scheme of information ecosystems dominated by a leading company.

In this article, the same philosophy is generalized to any inter-organizational application area where the blockchain can guarantee trust and shared governance. A specific focus is given to enabling technological components to work together.

In a BBIE, decisions about the management and flow of information could be made collectively through a consensus mechanism [9], such as a vote of the participating nodes. This could give each participant a voice in decision-making and help ensure that the ecosystem is run fairly and equitably. Similarly, transactions could be validated and processed by a decentralized network of nodes rather than a single central authority, thus increasing transparency and security and reducing the risk of a single point of failure.

An important contribution to enhancing the adoption of this kind of information ecosystem comes from the availability of solutions based on the Blockchain-as-a-Service (BaaS) concept [10, 11]. BaaS is a cloud-based service that allows organizations to build, host, and use their blockchain applications, smart contracts, and functions without requiring infrastructure investment or in-house expertise in blockchain technology. Following this concept, companies can build decentralized applications (Dapps) to provide specific functionality and interact with the underlying ledger. In this way, companies that want to set up and share an information ecosystem can do it without overhauling their existing information systems, seamlessly scaling up to the ecosystem dimension. With this in mind, BaaS is figured as a facil-

itating component of a BBIE for companies and enterprises. Interoperability and integrability are essential to combine BaaS with information ecosystems (IEs). In fact, most IEs are legacy systems. In fact, according to the Legacy Dilemma, *we must trade off the cost of continuing to cope with the legacy system against the investment needed to improve it and the benefit of easier subsequent maintenance [12]*. As the dilemma may suggest, both the cost of the system improvement and the cost caused by the system’s lack can be unaffordable. Therefore, blockchain integration in IEs can leverage the BaaS paradigm.

Other components that should be considered in building blockchain-based information ecosystems are off-chain data storage (storing much of the data in standard databases) and Identity Management Systems (IMS), managing participants’ identities in the information ecosystem across the different system layers.

To evaluate the proposed architectural model, we conducted a case study considering all the needs that should be addressed and focusing on how each component carried its tasks to accomplish them.

The main contributions of our work are the following:

1. We propose the definition of "Blockchain-based Information Ecosystems" (BBIEs), a type of information ecosystem in which blockchain technology is used to provide a trust mechanism among parties and to manage shared business logic, breaking the traditional scheme of Information EcoSystems dominated by a leading company and leveraging the decentralization of data management, information flow, and business logic.
2. We survey 11 companies involved in providing business to business or business to customer services to better understand the needs and challenges of such systems.
3. We propose architecture and technical aspects concerning the creation of a BBIE, underlining the supplied advantages and the logic decomposition among the business and storage components.
4. To evaluate the proposed architectural model, we present a case study that deals with the management of an agri-food supply chain that involves different companies and supervision authorities.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the background; Section 3 provides a review of existing works; in Section 4 we

present how we designed and conducted our research using a questionnaire; Section 5 describes the proposed solution, highlighting the decomposition between off-chain and on-chain components; Section 6 shows a case study for a BBIE involving different companies to better explain and validate our solution. Finally, Sections 7 and 8 discuss the advantages and limitations of the proposed architecture and conclude the article.

## 2. Background

This section provides crucial background information to understand the present study and the technologies involved.

### *2.1. DLT, Blockchain, Smart Contracts, and dApps*

Distributed Ledger Technology (DLT) has emerged as a transformative innovation in information technology, potentially reshaping organizational structures, collaboration, and operations across various sectors of the economy and society [13]. DLT enables a shared ledger system, allowing distributed nodes to read and write data, with the ledger’s state maintained through consensus algorithms that vary based on the network’s degree of decentralization.

Blockchain, introduced alongside Bitcoin by Satoshi Nakamoto [14], extends beyond cryptocurrency applications [15], integrating with Smart Contracts to execute business logic [7, 16]. A blockchain functions as a replicated database across a network, storing information in sequentially linked blocks. Consensus algorithms must verify each transaction before adding it to the ledger [17, 9]. The immutable nature of blockchain ensures that once data is entered, it cannot be deleted, with each block containing a hash of the previous block, thus forming a chain. Blockchains are generally categorized into two types based on access and participation rights: permissioned (private) and permissionless (public) blockchains [18]. However, this distinction can be nuanced, as there are blockchains that blend elements of both to leverage their respective advantages [19, 20].

Smart Contracts, or self-executing contracts, are programs that automatically execute transactions when predefined conditions are met, simulating legal contract constraints. They are deployed on distributed networks, facilitating automated business logic within decentralized applications (dApps) [16, 21].

Developers utilize Smart Contracts on blockchain networks to create dApps that offer immutability and transparency, driving the demand for blockchain-based systems for enhanced security, transparency, and efficiency [6].

## 2.2. Types of DLTs

DLTs can be categorized by their ledger structure: chain-based, like blockchain, which relies on a linear sequence of blocks, and DAG-based (Directed Acyclic Graph), which allows for parallel processing of transactions and potentially higher scalability.

**Public (Permissionless) Blockchains:** These blockchains are open to anyone, exemplifying the decentralized ethos of blockchain technology. They offer unparalleled transparency, allowing any participant to view transactions and the ledger's state. Examples include Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Algorand, which provide a global, open-access environment for executing transactions and deploying smart contracts.

**Hybrid (Public Permissioned) Blockchains:** This category represents a blend between public accessibility and permissioned governance. While the ledger is open for public inspection, participating as a validator or deploying smart contracts requires specific permissions. Examples include Ripple (XRP Ledger) and Stellar, which combine the efficiency and scalability benefits of permissioned systems with the transparency of public access.

**Private (Permissioned) Blockchains:** Access and participation in these blockchains are restricted to verified parties, making them suitable for consortial business logic where low costs, scalability, and security are prioritized due to controlled network access. Governance models can be customized to meet the specific needs of its participants, often managed by a consortium. Hyperledger Fabric is an example of a platform that facilitates the creation of private, permissioned blockchain networks for enterprise applications [5].

**Directed Acyclic Graph-based (DAG) DLTs:** Offering an alternative to the sequential block structure of traditional blockchains, DAG-based DLTs enable independent transaction confirmation without a singular global consensus. This structure allows for higher scalability and efficiency, particularly beneficial for fast machine-to-machine communications in scenarios like IoT data collection, without the need for miners or transaction fees. Examples of DAG-based DLTs include IOTA and Nano, which are designed for fast, feeless transactions ideal for the Internet of Things (IoT) [22, 23].

### 3. Related Work

#### 3.1. Blockchain Technology: Applications and Impacts

Lu and Xu presented *originChain*, one of the first blockchain-based traceability systems built by replacing the centralized database with a blockchain achieving transparent tamper-proof traceability data, enhancing the data's availability [24].

Schneider et al. developed a theoretical framework to examine the impact of blockchain on ecosystems and business models. Their research showed that blockchain is a combination of technology and human actors from various organizations and society as a whole, who collaborate to create a unique form of agency that is distinct from that of either humans or machines [25].

Blockchain technology allows businesses to modify and develop new business models. A recent study by Taherdoost and Madanchian examined the current state of new blockchain-based business models. Their research highlighted how blockchain could benefit companies, including cost savings due to faster transaction times, disintermediation, less record-keeping than customers due to distributed ledger technology, and better data tracking and verification. Additionally, blockchain technology enhances a company's interactions with its customers, competitors, and suppliers [26].

Blockchain technology was first used in crypto-finance, but now businesses use it to share digital data among participants. It can provide new capabilities by changing how participants interact with digital transactions [27]. Business operations can benefit from the use of blockchain technology. This includes simplified disintermediation, authenticated transactions, and increased efficiency and trust between ecosystem participants [28, 29, 30].

Consequently, Blockchain-based applications have found a wide application in the field of supply chain management. A research effort in this direction was already made in previous work [10, 31, 32, 33] where an algorithmic optimization of the profit mechanisms in supply chain management is illustrated and implemented in the form of a SC to enable supply chains to keep balanced in terms of information and decision-making power while boosting business results similarly to vendor vertical integration systems managed by dominant corporate players. In other work, the security of data involved in the system was the crucial goal; for instance, Vo et al. proposed a supply chain management model based on Hyperledger Fabric to reduce the problem of data explosion and prevent data manipulation and disclosure of sensitive information [34].

A plethora of evidence demonstrated the vantage brought by DLTs and blockchain in tracing, certifying processing stages, and offering trust in various fields, such as renewable energy and vaccine supply chains [35, 36, 37], as well secure data sharing is widely proven and discussed [38, 39].

Several applications of IoT rely on centralized architectures, characterized by failure of a single point, trust management, and privacy concerns. Sharma et al. conducted a recent review of blockchain-based applications. They reported that blockchain-based architecture for IoT connects all devices in a distributed manner and provides a secure method to share resources or data [40]. Moreover, previous research showed that integrating IoT with the IOTA’s Tangle can manage monitoring tasks on the agrifood supply chains, reducing resource consumption, thus improving the sustainability of cultivation [41, 42].

### *3.2. Transformative Potential and Applications of Web3*

Web3 represents the vision of a new, blockchain-based web that evolves into a read/write/own version of the internet. In this paradigm, users participate in web communities and have a financial stake and greater control over them. Gan et al. have comprehensively surveyed the evolution and potential impact of Web3 across various sectors, emphasizing its role in fostering a decentralized, intelligent, and user-centric web experience [43]. This shift significantly transforms how information is created, distributed, and utilized across domains. Web3 ecosystems can leverage blockchains, cryptocurrencies, and decentralized finance (DeFi) to forge a more secure, transparent, and interoperable system in the banking and financial sector [44, 45]. These technologies introduce decentralized ledgers, smart contracts, tokenization, and peer-to-peer lending, offering benefits such as trust, immutability, traceability, and interoperability. Moreover, Web3 challenges traditional banking paradigms by empowering users, reducing intermediaries, and minimizing transaction fees. The research and academic sector stands to gain from Web3 through the adoption of blockchains, decentralized networks, and smart contracts, enhancing the quality, integrity, and accessibility of scientific outputs like publications, data, and peer reviews. Web3 fosters novel collaboration forms, recognition, and rewards for researchers through mechanisms such as decentralized autonomous organizations [46].



### 3.3. Decentralized Identity Management

Identity management refers to the policies and technologies that ensure only authorized individuals can access an organization’s resources. The management of digital identities supplied an approach to authorized and identified users in every kind of system. Besides the traditional centralized or federated identity management model, the Self-Sovereign Identity (SSI) model is among the most innovative. This model fits perfectly with the blockchain decentralized schema due to its bases on decentralized Identities and verifiable credentials (VCs). A DID is created from a private/public key pair and is a unique user identifier. On the other hand, VC is a document digitally signed by the assigned to a DID [47].

SSI is a promising paradigm evolution for identity management, nonetheless, in a recent work, Hoops and Matthes, showed that SSI-blockchain-based implementations have a dependency on a particular type of blockchain, which is in contrast with the interoperability requirement [48]. Therefore, SSI models must be further explored and developed to be considered an efficient improvement in the industrial sector.

## 4. Method

In this Section, we provide the experimental plan followed to reach the goal of our work. With the aim of gathering the current needs of companies that operate adhering to business to business and business to client models, we define a first research question:

- **RQ1:** *What are the requirements to consider in designing a modular and scalable blockchain-based architecture to meet the specific needs of diverse organizations?*

To get insight beyond those we have already found in the literature, we set up a questionnaire targeted at professionals to bridge the gap between theory and practice. The obtained questionnaire results are dedicated to addressing **RQ1** alongside knowledge collected through literature review.

### 4.1. Questionnaire

We prepared a questionnaire to be answered by professionals from both companies that provide a business to business service and companies that provide a business to customer or citizen service.

The goal of the questionnaire was to collect data regarding the implementation and use of the architecture in the various companies involved; to understand how the companies manage user data, what are the typical problems in terms of data management, data security and interactions they deal with. The goal of the research was to understand how our architecture could improve collaboration between companies, process efficiency, and data security.

The questionnaire was strictly confidential. At the beginning, we ask some demographic questions to differentiate among respondents according to their employer, role and experience. The questionnaire then focused on three main aspects: the authentication systems used by the company, the interaction and exchange of data with other companies, and the presence or absence of a legacy system.

Regarding the authentication system, we asked if their company uses online authentication systems, and if so, what authentication strategies they used. Among these, we were particularly interested in:

- *Multi-factor authentication*, a security system that requires the use of more than one identity verification method, such as passwords, tokens or fingerprints, in order to access an account or platform
- *Single Sign-On*, an authentication system that allows users to access multiple applications or services with a single identification, simplifying the login process and improving the user experience
- *"In-house" authentication systems*, developed and managed directly by the company.
- *Biometric identification systems*, based on biometric characteristics such as fingerprints, facial recognition, iris, retina, hand geometry, voice prints or biometric signatures.
- *Identity-as-a-Service systems*, a cloud solution that provides identity management services, including authentication, authorization, and access management, allowing companies to centrally manage user identity through a platform based on subscription.

We also asked about user profiling, whether this was used, whether they considered it ethical and what data was collected. User profiling is the process of collecting and analyzing an individual's online personal data to create a

detailed profile that predicts behavior, preferences and characteristics, often used for advertising or targeted marketing purposes. The questionnaire also included two open questions on the main privacy issues in digital identity management and security risks, and some questions about digital identity theft. Digital identity theft [49] is a crime in which a malicious individual fraudulently acquires and uses another person’s personal information on digital platforms, in order to commit scams, financial fraud, or other crimes.

#### *4.2. Questionnaire Results*

We collected 11 responses from companies active in the ICT field, companies that provide a product to the final consumer, a company that deals with earth observation and a public administration. Regarding the role of the interviewees within their companies, five defined themselves as ”developers”, three as ”R&D director”, two are ”IT architect” and one is a ”managing partner”. More than half of the respondents (54.6%) have 5 or more years of experience in the sector. Only one fifth have less than 2 years.

The interview highlights how the vast majority of companies use online authentication systems. Only one respondents answers ”no”, whereas two others answer with ”not applicable”.

Regarding user profiling, which is the process of collecting and analyzing individual online personal data to create a detailed profile that predicts behavior, preferences, and characteristics, and is often used for advertising or targeted marketing purposes, we found that only two of the companies interviewed currently profile users (18%). However, 55% of the respondents believes that user profiling would be useful. All but one of the respondents who does not believe that profiling is useful also believe that profiling is not ethically correct. Approximately 73% of the respondents believe it is necessary for privacy reasons to have an identity management system that does not store user data.

The main privacy and security issues and risks that our respondents believe arise in digital identity management are:

- Identity theft, i.e. theft of user credentials outside the system, and consequent access to the system or to social profiles by malicious unauthorized persons.
- Inappropriate use of profiling data.

- Data Breach, i.e. theft of data kept in the system and consequent disclosure of sensitive information, with loss of reputation on the part of the firm and risk of legal action for compensation.
- Loss of data, and consequent loss of company's assets and competitive advantage.
- The management and storage of data is costly and difficult, due to the too stringent legislation.

Two-factor authentication is used by 45% of respondents, whereas 73% use Single Sign On authentication. Only 18% of respondents uses IDaaS (Identity as a Service) systems on the cloud.

82% of respondents believes that bio-metric authentications is useful. The same percentage of respondents believes that there are several, or even many, cases of identity theft, but nobody actually experienced identity theft in their organization.

All respondents said that other companies share data with their company, while only 27% say they share theirs. Although about 83% of the respondents believe that data is shared between companies efficiently, the literature and the risks themselves listed tell us the opposite.

Finally, 55% of the respondents use legacy systems, two-thirds of them declare that these systems are interfaced with new generation systems, and 80% of them believe that this interface can be improved.

Hence, when answering **RQ1**, the requirements to be taken into account that emerged from both the literature and the questionnaire are:

- traceability: refers to the ability to accurately track and reconstruct the history, usage, item locations, processes, or events;
- privacy: involves safeguarding sensitive information and controlling access to personal data to ensure confidentiality and prevent unauthorized use or disclosure.
- resilience: refers to the capability of a computer system or network to maintain functionality and operational continuity despite disruptions, failures, or attacks, often achieved through redundancy, fault tolerance, and rapid recovery mechanisms;
- secure identity management: involves the establishment and maintenance of trusted methods for authenticating and authorizing users;

- integrity: ensures that data remains accurate, consistent, and unaltered throughout its lifecycle, safeguarding against tampering;
- confidentiality: ensures that sensitive information is protected from unauthorized access, also maintaining secrecy of data;
- interoperability: refers to the ability of different computer systems, software applications, or components to seamlessly exchange and utilize data or services;
- secure data sharing: involves the controlled and protected sharing of information between authorized parties;
- data certification: provides assurance of data reliability and trustworthiness.

These requirements were carefully addressed in designing a modular and scalable blockchain-based architecture, so as to propose a solution that effectively meets companies' specific needs while promoting collaboration and innovation between different stakeholders.

#### 4.3. Grounded Theory

We design the architecture of our system following the principle of the Grounded Theory (GT) introduced by Glaser and Strauss [50]. To gather qualitative data that can then be analyzed using grounded theory principles, we used both closed and open-ended questions organized in the questionnaire. First, we briefly describe the grounded theory principles that guided our research and provide an overview of the questionnaire.

GT has been used as a research approach in various disciplines, including software engineering, where it has a long-standing reputation, as well as sociology, education, and management theory [51].

GT implies generating theory from data, rather than proving and testing theories, following an *inductive* paradigm rather than the traditional *hypothetico-deductive* model [50, 52]. Yet, while *hypothetico-deductive* modeling involves testing pre-formulated hypotheses or existing theories through data collection. This approach follows a deductive approach that aims to verify or deny the hypotheses. On the other hand, *inductive* modeling generates theories based on direct observation of data, without starting from pre-existing hypotheses.

We shaped our work relying on two components, namely a thorough examination of the existing literature and the gathering of primary data through surveys. Initially, we conducted an in-depth analysis of the current state of knowledge in the field through a literature review. Subsequently, we utilized surveys as the second component to collect firsthand data from a group of professionals. The goal was to identify the needs and the relevant components in the business of the surveyed organization’s professionals, combining them with the information originated from the state of the art.

Considering the necessities of organizations and professionals and the knowledge gathered by reviewing the state of the art, we posed one more research question to steer our work:

- **RQ2:** *How can a BBIE architecture address the collected requirements?*

## 5. Architecture for Blockchain-based Information Ecosystem

In this Section, we discuss the architecture we devised in order to answer **RQ2** as emerged from the results obtained in Section 4 taking into consideration the requirements to be addressed that emerged from the literature as well. In particular, we introduce a specific component related to Identity Management since this aspect emerged as a strong need from the companies addressed by the interviews. Aspects related to the state-of-the-art are discussed in Section 3, thus, to begin with, we summarize the capabilities of blockchain-based systems, in addition to the necessities that arise as a result of the questionnaire.

As industrial business flows become increasingly complex, sharing business data and information among participants has become necessary. Currently, the leading company involved in the business flow manages trust in a centralized manner. However, the introduction of blockchain technology as a trusted component can make data sharing transparent, reliable, and tamper-proof. This makes blockchain technology an ideal inter-enterprise data keeper. In fact, blockchain applications are widely used in commercial companies such as supply chain management, healthcare, and collaborative economic optimization of businesses [53, 31, 5].

Although blockchain-based applications offer numerous advantages and innovative features, they can be limiting when used in an industrial context that typically involves several interconnected modules. To overcome this

limitation, our proposed solution integrates the blockchain-based application as an ecosystem module with the existing information system. The integrated blockchains with the information ecosystem created BBIE [8].

In the following of this Section, we list the components dedicated to implementing a general solution of a BBIE architecture.

### 5.1. Architecture

The proposed architecture is depicted in Figure 1. It comprises both on-chain and off-chain components to enhance performance and functionality. On-chain activities provide security, transparency, and immutability, while off-chain solutions offer scalability and efficiency improvements for specific transactions and processes.

#### 5.1.1. Off-chain components

All modules that belong to traditional information systems are considered entities outside the blockchain environment.

- *Storage*: The storage module of industrial ISs is an essential component that facilitates the collection, processing, and retrieval of vast amounts of data generated by industrial processes. This module is composed of both hardware and software designed to store and manage data from various sources, such as human input, sensors, and automated processes. The rise of cloud computing and big data technologies has enabled the development of scalable storage solutions for modern industrial systems [54]. In a BBIE, it is essential to determine which data should be stored in off-chain and on-chain storage. Our approach is to base this decision on the need to share the data while ensuring tamper-proof transparency. Moreover, the traditional storage module is responsible for preserving intra-enterprise data, guaranteeing that information is isolated from other parties involved in the business. Large volumes of data, such as documents and photos, must also be kept off-chain. The document's integrity and date can be ensured by storing the hash digest of the document along with a link to retrieve it on the blockchain.
- *Business layer*: Transactions can be expensive, so it is often recommended that complex computations are carried out off-chain instead of on-chain. In an off-chain context, the internal operations of a company's information system are executed by off-chain business logic.

This means that computations are performed outside of the blockchain-based system, for example on an intermediary service’s server. On the other hand, in an on-chain scenario, computations are executed and verified within the blockchain-based system [55].

- *IoT Devices*: IoT devices are equipped with sensors that enable real-time collection of data from industrial processes. This allows the capture and processing of large volumes of data. By passing this data through IOTA, and recording it on a blockchain, its integrity can be ensured as it becomes tamper-resistant and has an immutable audit trail.

Smart contracts on the blockchain can be automatically triggered based on predefined conditions in IoT data. This means that IoT sensors can update the blockchain with real-time information about the movement and condition of goods. This information can then trigger smart contracts for automated payments or notifications.

Therefore, IoT sensors play a crucial role in collecting and processing data from industrial processes and can enable automated smart contracts for various applications.

- *IOTA*: IOTA serves as a decentralized platform facilitating secure and feeless transactions between IoT devices through its Tangle technology. By utilizing IOTA, IoT sensors can seamlessly communicate data in real-time while ensuring integrity and reliability. Subsequently, the validated data is securely anchored onto a blockchain for transparent sharing and immutability, establishing a robust foundation for trust and accountability in data management systems
- *User Interface*: Interaction with the business layer is commonly facilitated through web or app interfaces, as well as dedicated API layers. However, this is not explicitly indicated in the diagram.

### 5.1.2. On-chain components

On-chain modules are parts of the BBIE that perform actions or store data directly on the blockchain network using its native features, including smart contracts and transactions.






Figure 1: Blockchain based information ecosystem architecture.

Companies have the option to either create their own blockchain or use a BaaS. In the scenario presented in the image, the latter option is shown, and the on-chain components are included in the BaaS component.

The BaaS provider utilizes a hybrid system of private and permissionless blockchains.

- *Private Blockchain*: is a network consisting of regular and validator nodes, which can be run by participant companies.
- *Permissioned Blockchain*: can either be accessible to everyone or restricted to authorized individuals only.
- *Shared business logic*: controlled via smart contracts execution.
- *Identity Management System*: manages participant identities and prevents unauthorized access to systems and resources.
- *An explorer*: runs on one or more nodes that hold a copy of the blockchain. It allows browsing the actual state of the blockchain without the mediation of the user interface, can be used by anyone, and enhances transparency.

- *A link to an external public blockchain:* is a link to an external public blockchain that can be used to record the hash digest of the last block that was mined locally. This process is called anchoring and it guarantees that the BBIE has the same level of immutability as a public blockchain. This anchoring can be done periodically, such as every 24 hours, or it can be triggered by a specific event.

#### 5.1.3. BBIE component interactions

BBIE components can execute their services based on specific needs. Interactions are event-reactive, such as HTTP calls and certain met conditions, including time passed since last anchoring, as discussed in 5.1.2. The BBIE modular services can be accessed in any order, allowing them to be tailored to the specific needs of different industries. To ensure clarity in the information ecosystem, off-chain business logic and BaaS services can be accessed by calling the API endpoints. Public blockchain services, such as certification transactions, as well as private and permissioned block anchoring transactions, can be accessed using the application binary interface (ABI). Contract ABIs are crucial components for interacting with Ethereum smart contracts, both from outside the blockchain and for contract-to-contract interactions [56]. The ABI interface is used by external users to retrieve information about the anchored state of data managed by BBIE. Other interactions, such as querying the database and interfacing with the business layer, are the same as those performed by traditional information systems.

#### 5.1.4. Actors

The proposed architecture comprises four types of actors:

- *The participants:* on one hand, each participant manages and runs a node of the private blockchain. On the other hand, its storage and business layer are managed off-chain. For simplicity, we show only three participants but there could be more.
- *The validators:* represented as bold V in Figure 1, are key participants in the ecosystem. They keep a copy of the blockchain and validate transactions through a consensus mechanism.
- *The Operators:* each participant has its own operators who can communicate with their storage, business layer, and the blockchain.

- *The External users*: users who can only communicate with the blockchain in read-only mode using an explorer, but they may access authorized documents contained in participants' archives.

There may be a channel that allows participants to communicate directly, but it's not specified in the figure. The solution presented integrates a blockchain-based application with the information system as a module of the ecosystem. The blockchains depicted in the image are intentionally generic.




Figure 2: Blockchain-based information ecosystem model.

The BBIE model is composed of two environments: an internal environment that interacts with the private network and an external environment that interacts with the public network. The private network includes Private and Permissioned blockchains, along with an off-chain business layer. Only individuals affiliated with the companies involved in the BBIE and authorized by the identity management system have access to this network. Figure 2 illustrates this model. External users, who are not affiliated with the companies involved in the shared business, can access certified data and traceability information by interacting with the public network. This network provides data that is stored on the public blockchain(s). Although there may be challenges in integrating different technologies to enable interoperability, BBIE

can overcome these challenges by utilizing communication standards such as REST APIs and ABI interfaces to integrate heterogeneous components.

As shown, the BBIE architecture needs the management of identities for the various actors involved. In general, there are two different issues: the identity management for the on-chain access and the identity management for the access to the storage and business layer.

The latter can be dealt of by means of usual technologies for DB management and, since they are well known, we do not include this part in our discussion. The former is more delicate for different reasons. First of all, data written on chain cannot be deleted or changed afterwards, differently from traditional DBs. Thus, it is not possible to remedy and correct potential errors or mistakes, both unwanted or fraudulent. Second, identity management should be compliant with data protection regulations, such as GDPR, since once sensitive data are recorded on chain they are exposed forever and the right to be forgotten cannot be implemented. Third, if one actor has granted the access to a node it can access all data on chain.

Without loosing generality, we describe the identity management in a permissioned blockchain, since it is representative of all the other cases and it is also the most common one in BaaS. Identity management in a permissioned blockchain, where participants are known and trusted, is still a critical aspect, albeit with some differences compared to public, permissionless blockchains. In a permissioned blockchain, the network is restricted to a specific set of participants who are known and authorized to participate.

We devised two different aspects. The first is about the identity management for the blockchain infrastructure itself. In fact in permissioned blockchain participants in the infrastructure management have different roles and these roles define what they are allowed to do within the network. For example in a first level, that can be almost thought of as a physical level for the network infrastructure, we can consider simple nodes or validator nodes. The former can keep a copy of the entire ledger, can provide access points to the ledger to external users, and can send transactions requests or act as a proxy for requesting transactions. The latter are also entitled, in addition, to validate transactions and blocks and can update the state of the ledger.

In a second level, that can be thought of as a more pure logical level, we can consider addresses with different privileges. These may be entitled to act on the first level, so that they can decide or approve new nodes joining to the blockchain network or can decide to upgrade a simple node to the role of validator.

The second refers to the actors who need to use the infrastructure for reading and writing operations. These actors need to be gathered into categories according to their roles and setting their permissions and privileges according to the roles. These actors do not need to participate in keeping up and maintaining the infrastructure, although they could also do this in principle, but only need to operate on the ledger through read and write operations. Within this categorization, the Identity Management Module can be set to allow reading operations only on part of the ledger or on the entire ledger, and to allow writing operations on part or on the whole ledger as well.

Here we envision two different control levels on the access. The first one is ruled by a permissioning Dapp, namely a set of smart contracts that can be deployed on the blockchain and rule the permissions at the global ledger level. The paradigm of this control level is the one provided by Consensus on the Hyperledger-Besu blockchain infrastructure<sup>1</sup>. The second one is obtained as usual by deploying Dapp(s) on the blockchain which provide access control policies to the data they manage and have access to.

In the first case the Dapp has a global control on the blockchain and is able to set a pool of Administrator Users, identified through their public address and managed by the usual private-public key pair, with overall privileges. An administrator can decide to enroll other nodes on the blockchain, can decide which addresses are entitled for smart contract deploying and also which addresses can be enrolled as Administrators.

In the second case, which is the standard in public Blockchains, the Dapp can be deployed on the ledger and can be set with different privileges and access rights for the Owner (the actor who deployed the set of smart contracts) and for other users, with policies decided by mean of public or private methods or variables in the smart contracts and by mean of address identification.

In summary, the architecture that we devised allows for the satisfaction of the requirements given as the output of the conducted GT, therefore we discuss on the way of that is accomplished before evaluating our BBIE architecture against a case study. Our Architecture enables privacy granting by leveraging the proposed identity management system, also relying on the properties of the DLT involved, in detail, in the on-chain world, identities are shaped into addresses, which are public and completely missing of user-

---

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/Consensus/permissioning-smart-contracts/tree/main>

related data.

Resilience is implied in the decentralized and distributed nature of the ledgers, indeed, given the not centralized schema, the BBIE architecture can rely on the no single point of failure granted by the distributed ledger.

The security of the identity management is achieved by minimizing the user data in the off-chain world through the OAuth-based encoded tokens and the public key derived by the private key generated in the wallet creation stage when dealing with the blockchains. In this sense, this management model also ensures the confidentiality property, only those who have the role and the privileges to get access to the resources of the BBIE can pass the authorization layer of the IMS.

Data integrity is guaranteed by the use of the blockchain's immutability property. BBIE architecture grants interoperability to the communicating components and external modules exploiting services exposed through API, ABI, and formatting responses into standardized object notations.

Secure data sharing, traceability, and data certification are enabled by the capabilities of distributed ledger technologies, as outlined in 3.

## **6. Case Study**

In the following, we will illustrate a case study crafted by considering the Grounded Theory-arisen requirements. The goal of such a case study is to evaluate whether our architecture addresses the gathered needs. The analyzed case study deals with the management and monitoring of an agrifood supply chain. The agrifood companies work together to share the numerous growing, harvesting, and processing stages needed to bring a finished product to the final customers.

The needs of this cooperative business encompass sharing data among parties, real-time monitoring of the measures related to the entire supply chain of the goods, and the implementation of a reliable traceability system to guarantee food quality and safety. On the other hand, Identity Management is a paramount aspect in both tracing the identity of involved parties and authorizing and authenticating users.

Thus, we start discussing our case study taking care of the requirements addressed by real-time monitoring, data sharing, and the traceability system enabled in a BBIE. In detail, real-time monitoring and trusted traceability have become crucial in ensuring food safety, quality, and sustainability in the growing and production processes. DLT and IoT, when used together,

are cost-effective solutions that meet all requirements. Indeed, IoT devices are able to obtain environmental and product-related measures; the DLT can collect these measurements by sharing them with those involved in the agrifood supply chain.

First, we clarify the role of the three types of DLTs involved in the given case study.

1. **DAG-based DLT:** IOTA, chosen as DAG-based DLT due to its ability to act as a mediating link between a vast number of IOT sensors and the BBIE takes care of processing in real-time the stream of data received from the IoT sensors devoted to collecting environmental measures and food features. Having no transaction costs, IOTA stands out as an efficient gathering point as well as extremely low latency thanks to the absence of consensus algorithms, allowing for in-site sustainable monitoring. IOTA collects data received through streams coming out from IoT devices leveraging several protocols, such as MQTT (Message Queuing Telemetry Transport), CoAP (Constrained Application Protocol), HTTP, or WebSocket. For this case study, the MQTT protocol is a good fit, as it is designed to be efficient and lightweight, making it suitable for devices with limited processing power and memory resources.
2. **Permissioned blockchain:** the permission blockchain, for instance, Hyperledger Fabric (HLF) is employed to certify information among the parties involved in the consortium, it is in charge of sharing validated data regarding the production process and solving the visibility problem. Moreover, it takes care of sharing information about certified data collected in IOTA, enhancing the security and trustability of such data among collaborative parties.
3. **Public blockchain:** allows BBIEs to ensure that customers have knowledge of material information, such as the provenance and other key characteristics of the final product, as well as the steps followed in the production, providing the widest transparency achievable.

While IOTA is connected with the IoT sensors with the MQTT protocol, blockchains supply their services with the BaaS; the BaaS provider utilizes a combination of private and public blockchains to ensure the authenticity of data pertaining to inner consortium companies' progress on a private blockchain, as well as data related to the completion of entire processes on both public and private blockchains.

Another aspect requiring interoperability is the communication between IOTA and the on-chain business logic. In the context of a BBIE, SCs are implemented and executed on the permissioned blockchain, incorporating specific logic to interact with the IOTA network which is enabled by specific libraries such, as IOTA.go <sup>2</sup>. This demonstrates the integrability of BBIEs, bringing an open road to the development of Dapps that are able to leverage the main features of the two kinds of DLT.

This hybrid system provides a reliable and secure mechanism that verifies the accuracy of information while allowing for flexible data sharing across multiple parties. Its deployment enables organizations to ensure the trustworthiness of shared information among stakeholders. By leveraging blockchain-based features, the hybrid BaaS guarantees the confidentiality of business information that remains within the consortium. Simultaneously, it supplies public access to traceability information for customers, also ascertaining the traceability and immutability of data. Furthermore, in the previous steps, data collected via IoT sensors are managed by IOTA, which is capable of handling and executing transactions more efficiently than chain-based DLTs; fitting optimally in an IoT scenario characterized by a vast volume of transactions, such as the food supply chain monitoring.

The identities must be managed all across the flows among the listed components, thus we illustrate the Identity Management scheme by means of a use case where we identified five actors in a BaaS where the covered need is the management of an agrifood supply chain. These are two agrifood companies with their different employees, two certification agencies with their employees, one set of BaaS providers which manage the ledger and provide the Blockchain services.

A further actor could be included as a Blockchain software provider, namely a software company specialized in writing specifically tuned Dapps for customers for their needs. In our use case, the two agrifood companies can contact the software/Dapp provider for the deployment and configurations of the system for managing the supply chain. Such a role of Dapp provider/developer can actually be played by one or more of the participants to the blockchain infrastructure and be included in the BaaS global system.

In the following, we assume this latter configuration where the BaaS also includes the Dapps specifically developed for the two companies. Since the

---

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/iotaledger/iota.go>



use case also includes two public body actors, the certification agencies, it is straightforward that the Dapp developed takes into account these roles.

In particular, the actors involved are:

- A company for the production of wine, responsible for cultivating, harvesting, fermenting, aging, and bottling wine. The company manages the winemaking process, and needs cork stoppers for the bottling phase.
- A company for the production of cork stoppers, specialized in manufacturing closures specifically for wine bottles, ensuring quality and compatibility with wine storage and aging requirements.
- A public administration in charge of sanitary and health verifications, such as the Italian ASL (Azienda Sanitaria Locale which translates to Local Health Authority). It plays a crucial role in ensuring the safety and quality of food products within the agrifood supply chain.
- Another public administration in charge of rules and compliance verifications, and in quality certification, such as the Sardinian Laore. By certifying and promoting the quality and authenticity of products, such as traditional food products with Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) or Protected Geographical Indication (PGI) status, it helps to enhance the reputation and marketability of the products.
- The set of BaaS providers. A pool of bodies which includes the ASL (has the right to keep all the ledger for sanitary reasons), private companies specialized in blockchain technologies, and other public administrations which may grant the blockchain is provided to every customer with no discrimination or favors.

All actors perform steps along the chain and involve employees with different roles and permissions to be managed.

Figure 3 displays the described supply chain. Each processing operation in a single processing stage is traced and certified on the consortial blockchain, gathering also data dedicated to monitoring and quality guaranteeing from IoT devices that pass through IOTA DAG-based DLT. At the conclusion of each processing phase, information is permanently recorded on the permissionless blockchain, also granting access to such data to the final customers.

Enterprises gain visibility of the processing state in each phase of the product’s lifecycle, by obtaining certified insights through data recorded on blockchains in the consortial network. The same visibility is guaranteed to the authorities that oversee the goods’ conformity, thus enabling the respect of compliance policies and regulations.

All identities of the entities cooperating are managed by the Identity Managed System according to business-defined policies.




Figure 3: The overall supply chain of the discussed case study.

In summary, companies involved in the supply chain achieved efficient and sustainable real-time monitoring of their products while having data shared and secured by the blockchain ledger. In addition, identities are managed in two different manners, one is infrastructural, given by the authorized nature of permissioned blockchains, and the other one is logic-related, thoroughly addressing the requirements of proper access control.

## 7. Discussion

The fundamental objective of any information system is to deliver precise, secure, easily accessible, and pertinent information that can assist organizations in making informed decisions and achieving their goals. To fulfill these

requirements, information systems should include traceability systems, authentication protocols, and analytics tools. In this discussion, we will explain how the industrial adoption of a BBIE can be accomplished and how it can offer clear advantages over the previous information ecosystems in meeting the above-mentioned requirements.

### *7.1. Managing Identities in BBIEs.*

An Identity Management System allows organizations to efficiently and securely manage access to resources and applications. This helps mitigate the risk of security breaches and streamlines the management of user and device identities [57].

When it comes to managing identities and access, blockchain technology can offer a decentralized and unalterable register for identity data, which can help to reduce the reliance on central authorities. However, it's important to understand that blockchain technology is not a replacement for traditional identity and access management systems. Instead, it can work alongside these systems to provide an extra level of security, transparency, and trust. *OAuth2* is a widely used protocol for authorization that allows users to authenticate themselves with different applications without revealing their login credentials. It can also be integrated with identity management systems to provide additional user information, such as role and permissions, [58], as discussed in Section 6.

In the context of BBIE, *OAuth2* is a valuable instrument for identity management. The token that encapsulates the data for the *OAuth2* protocol can be sent in the calls to the Business Logic and through the BaaS, which can be directed to a private or permissioned blockchain. Private or permissioned blockchains can utilize enterprise-level security features like encryption and access controls to enhance security further. Blockchain SCs can handle the token to verify the identity and apply management logic, ensuring compliance with enterprise policies. When anchoring the private blockchain blocks on public ones, the identities are already managed and verified, making them safe to be part of the blockchain.

The scheme can be further integrated since blockchain services requester may interact directly with the blockchain, and blockchain addresses might be managed to define an access control list. For example, in Ethereum, smart contracts are executed on the blockchain and their code is readily accessible to all parties. However, the contract owner can exercise authority over who is authorized to interact with the contract and write data to the blockchain. By

default, any individual can interact with a deployed smart contract and call upon its functions, modifying its state and writing data to the blockchain. Yet, the contract's code may be structured to implement access controls that limit those who can execute certain actions. For instance, the contract owner may create a modifier function that verifies the sender's Ethereum address, only permitting certain addresses to execute specific actions. Moreover, the contract owner may establish a whitelist of authorized addresses that are allowed to perform specific actions while refusing any transactions that originate from an unauthorized source.

SSI management model could be a valid option in managing identities in a BBIE, nonetheless, even though such identity management models are surely promising and may be disruptive, interoperability is not currently granted. Thus, we deem that it needs to be more mature aiming to reach for standardization.

### *7.2. BBIE integration with legacy or pre-existing systems.*

Applications using blockchain technology can make use of the BaaS concept to share their infrastructure. In this system, the SCs function as a service, which can be accessed via the BaaS service interface. The interface can be customized to meet the specific requirements of different systems that need to communicate with it. Currently, most inter-enterprise information systems are designed using either Service-Oriented Architecture or Microservice Architecture [59]; in both architectures, entities communicate via messages. Thus, it suffices for blockchain service providers to handle requests using common communication protocols like REST APIs. This allows pre-existing and legacy systems to seamlessly interact with the BBIE regardless of their internal organization or communication protocols.

### *7.3. Advantages of Blockchain Integration with Enterprise Information Ecosystem.*

Blockchain integration allows for the shared control of information, resulting in a transparent and fair division of rights, profits, and control. With an infrastructure not controlled by a single entity and supported by a blockchain component, organizations can share consortial business logic in the form of smart contracts. The code of these smart contracts is executed by every node and can be read transparently, along with the ledger's state, providing visibility of the consortial state. Blockchain and smart contracts are already widely adopted in many contexts (e.g., supply chain management

[60]), such as supply chain management, to solve the visibility problem and ensure equitable profit distribution when dealing with collaborative business. In addition, blockchains also provide Enterprises with the advantage of transparent information verification in Information Ecosystems. This is achieved by following a series of steps:

1. Clients, such as other entities in the ecosystem, front-ends, and devices, call Smart Contracts exposed by private Blockchain-as-a-Service platforms.
2. Once consensus is reached, SCs execute requested operations and interact with distributed ledgers to provide transparency between business parties.
3. The last block of a private or permissioned blockchain can be anchored on an external public blockchain periodically or by event-controlled triggering. This process can be done using ABI interfaces which allows public access to the processed data. In addition, recording data on the public blockchain can also be performed during process or job closure. This makes the data accessible to the public while still managing the sender and contract addresses.

## 8. Conclusion and Future Work

In this study, we introduced a novel approach that utilizes blockchain technology to decentralize the management of information ecosystems, challenging the conventional model dominated by leading companies. We coined the term Blockchain-Based Information Ecosystems (BBIEs) to describe the integration of blockchain as a service (BaaS) into information ecosystems. This integration is represented through a detailed architecture comprising various components, notably an identity management system (IMS).

Our research showcases BBIEs' flexible structure that allows for the seamless addition of new features. BBIEs leverage blockchain to ensure trust among parties, manage shared business logic, and decentralize data management and information flow. This ecosystem enables distributed identity management, with data securely recorded on the blockchain, and incorporates the OAuth2 protocol for enhanced security. Moreover, the BaaS component facilitates interaction with legacy systems, addressing the legacy system dilemma and promoting shared control over information and business logic.

We posit that BBIEs hold the potential to revolutionize not only blockchain's traditional applications, such as traceability, but also to foster innovative

business models in the industrial sector. By fully harnessing blockchain technology, BBIEs can support novel, multi-organizational business models, offering a fresh perspective beyond the conventional applications.

However, this is just the beginning. Further research and development are required to refine this framework, ensuring it aligns and synergizes with inter-company processes within the global communication infrastructure. By advancing BBIEs, we aim to pave the way for their significant contribution to the evolution of information systems.

## 9. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge financial support under the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP), Mission 4 Component 2 Investment 1.5 - Call for tender No.3277 published on December 30, 2021 by the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MUR) funded by the European Union – Next Generation EU. Project Code ECS0000038 – Project Title eINS Ecosystem of Innovation for Next Generation Sardinia – CUP F53C22000430001- Grant Assignment Decree No. 1056 adopted on June 23, 2022 by the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MUR), F53C22000430001 the HALO (Hazard-Analysis and Anti-Counterfeiting Ledger Oriented Protection) project, funded by Sardegna Ricerche, CUP: F23C23000310008, and the W.E. B.E.S.T. (Wine EVOO Blockchain Et Smart Contract) PRIN 2020 project, financed by the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MUR), CUP: F73C22000430001.

## References

- [1] B. Farbey, F. F. Land, D. Targett, A taxonomy of information systems applications: the benefits' evaluation ladder, *European Journal of Information Systems* 4 (1) (1995) 41–50. [arXiv:https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1995.5](https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1995.5), [doi:10.1057/ejis.1995.5](https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1995.5).  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1995.5>
- [2] W. DeLone, E. McLean, Information systems success revisited (2002) 2966–2976 [doi:10.1109/HICSS.2002.994345](https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2002.994345).
- [3] R. Boaden, G. Lockett, Information technology, information systems and information management: definition and development, *European Journal of Information Systems* 1 (1) (1991) 23–32. [arXiv:https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1991.1](https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1991.1)

doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1991.4, doi:10.1057/ejis.1991.4.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1991.4>

- [4] J. Peppard, J. Ward, *The strategic management of information systems: Building a digital strategy*, John Wiley and Sons, 2016.
- [5] S. Dalla Palma, R. Pareschi, F. Zappone, What is your distributed (hyper) ledger?, in: *2021 IEEE/ACM 4th International Workshop on Emerging Trends in Software Engineering for Blockchain (WETSEB)*, IEEE, 2021, pp. 27–33.
- [6] M. Marchesi, L. Marchesi, R. Tonelli, An agile software engineering method to design blockchain applications, *CEE-SECR '18*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2018. doi:10.1145/3290621.3290627.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290621.3290627>
- [7] V. Buterin, et al., A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform, white paper 3 (37) (2014) 2–1.
- [8] F. Salzano, R. Pareschi, L. Marchesi, R. Tonelli, Blockchain-based information ecosystems, in: *Proceedings of the Fifth Distributed Ledger Technology Workshop (DLT 2023)*, Bologna, Italy, 2023, pp. 25–26.
- [9] B. Lashkari, P. Musilek, A comprehensive review of blockchain consensus mechanisms, *IEEE Access* 9 (2021) 43620–43652. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3065880.
- [10] P. Bottoni, C. Di Ciccio, R. Pareschi, D. Tortola, N. Gessa, G. Massa, Blockchain-as-a-service and blockchain-as-a-partner: Implementation options for supply chain optimization, *Blockchain: Research and Applications* (2022) 100119doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcra.2022.100119>.
- [11] M. Samaniego, U. Jamsrandorj, R. Deters, Blockchain as a service for iot, in: *2016 IEEE International Conference on Internet of Things (iThings) and IEEE Green Computing and Communications (GreenCom) and IEEE Cyber, Physical and Social Computing (CPSCom) and IEEE Smart Data (SmartData)*, 2016, pp. 433–436. doi:10.1109/iThings-GreenCom-CPSCom-SmartData.2016.102.

- [12] K. Bennett, Legacy systems: Coping with success, *IEEE software* 12 (1) (1995) 19–23.
- [13] A. Sunyaev, A. Sunyaev, Distributed ledger technology, *Internet computing: Principles of distributed systems and emerging internet-based technologies* (2020) 265–299.
- [14] S. Nakamoto, Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system, *Decentralized business review* (2008) 21260.
- [15] P. Tasatanattakool, C. Techapanupreeda, Blockchain: Challenges and applications, in: *2018 International Conference on Information Networking (ICOIN)*, 2018, pp. 473–475. doi:10.1109/ICOIN.2018.8343163.
- [16] N. Szabo, Formalizing and securing relationships on public networks, *First monday* (1997).
- [17] A. S. Rajasekaran, M. Azees, F. Al-Turjman, A comprehensive survey on blockchain technology, *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments* 52 (2022) 102039.
- [18] D. Guegan, Public blockchain versus private blockchain (2017).
- [19] L. Marchesi, M. Marchesi, R. Tonelli, M. I. Lunesu, A blockchain architecture for industrial applications, *Blockchain: Research and Applications* (2022) 100088.
- [20] M. Garriga, S. D. Palma, M. Arias, A. D. Renzis, R. Pareschi, D. A. Tamburri, Blockchain and cryptocurrencies: A classification and comparison of architecture drivers, *Concurr. Comput. Pract. Exp.* 33 (8) (2021). doi:10.1002/cpe.5992.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpe.5992>
- [21] W. Zou, D. Lo, P. S. Kochhar, X.-B. D. Le, X. Xia, Y. Feng, Z. Chen, B. Xu, Smart contract development: Challenges and opportunities, *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 47 (10) (2019) 2084–2106.
- [22] J. Mayer, P. Niemietz, D. Trauth, T. Bergs, A concept for low-emission production using distributed ledger technology, *Procedia CIRP* 98 (2021) 619–624.



- [23] M. Khan, D. Schaefer, J. Milisavljevic-Syed, A review of distributed ledger technologies in the machine economy: challenges and opportunities in industry and research, *Procedia CIRP* 107 (2022) 1168–1173.
- [24] Q. Lu, X. Xu, Adaptable blockchain-based systems: A case study for product traceability, *Ieee Software* 34 (6) (2017) 21–27.
- [25] S. Schneider, M. Leyer, M. Tate, The transformational impact of blockchain technology on business models and ecosystems: A symbiosis of human and technology agents, *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management* 67 (4) (2020) 1184–1195. doi:10.1109/TEM.2020.2972037.
- [26] H. Taherdoost, M. Madanchian, Blockchain-based new business models: A systematic review, *Electronics* 12 (6) (2023). doi:10.3390/electronics12061479.  
URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9292/12/6/1479>
- [27] Q. He, M. Meadows, D. Angwin, E. Gomes, J. Child, Strategic alliance research in the era of digital transformation: Perspectives on future research, *British Journal of Management* 31 (3) (2020) 589–617.
- [28] A. D. Dwivedi, G. Srivastava, S. Dhar, R. Singh, A decentralized privacy-preserving healthcare blockchain for iot, *Sensors* 19 (2) (2019) 326.
- [29] P. Rimba, A. B. Tran, I. Weber, M. Staples, A. Ponomarev, X. Xu, Quantifying the cost of distrust: Comparing blockchain and cloud services for business process execution, *Information Systems Frontiers* 22 (2020) 489–507.
- [30] Y. Abbas, A. Martinetti, J.-J. Moerman, T. Hamberg, L. A. van Dongen, Do you have confidence in how your rolling stock has been maintained? a blockchain-led knowledge-sharing platform for building trust between stakeholders, *International journal of information management* 55 (2020) 102228.
- [31] P. Bottoni, N. Gessa, G. Massa, R. Pareschi, H. Selim, E. Arcuri, Intelligent smart contracts for innovative supply chain management, *Frontiers in Blockchain* 3 (2020) 535787.

- [32] P. Bottoni, R. Pareschi, D. Tortola, N. Gessa, G. Massa, Distributed ledgers to support revenue-sharing business consortia: a hyperledger-based implementation, in: 2021 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC), 2021, pp. 1–6. doi:10.1109/ISCC53001.2021.9631473.
- [33] P. Bottoni, C. Di Ciccio, R. Pareschi, D. Tortola, N. Gessa, G. Massa, Blockchain-as-a-service and blockchain-as-a-partner: Implementation options for supply chain optimization, *Blockchain: Research and Applications* 4 (2) (2023) 100119. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcra.2022.100119.
- [34] K. T. Vo, A.-T. Nguyen-Thi, T.-A. Nguyen-Hoang, Building sustainable food supply chain management system based on hyperledger fabric blockchain, in: 2021 15th international conference on advanced computing and applications (ACOMP), IEEE, 2021, pp. 9–16.
- [35] K. Yavaprabhas, M. Pournader, S. Seuring, Blockchain as the “trust-building machine” for supply chain management, *Annals of operations research* 327 (1) (2023) 49–88.
- [36] H. Hu, J. Xu, M. Liu, M. K. Lim, Vaccine supply chain management: An intelligent system utilizing blockchain, iot and machine learning, *Journal of business research* 156 (2023) 113480.
- [37] K. Almutairi, S. J. Hosseini Dehshiri, S. S. Hosseini Dehshiri, A. X. Hoa, J. Arockia Dhanraj, A. Mostafaeipour, A. Issakhov, K. Techato, Blockchain technology application challenges in renewable energy supply chain management, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 30 (28) (2023) 72041–72058.
- [38] H. Taherdoost, The role of blockchain in medical data sharing, *Cryptography* 7 (3) (2023). doi:10.3390/cryptography7030036. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2410-387X/7/3/36>
- [39] S. Jiang, J. Cao, H. Wu, K. Chen, X. Liu, Privacy-preserving and efficient data sharing for blockchain-based intelligent transportation systems, *Information Sciences* 635 (2023) 72–85. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2023.03.121.

- [40] P. Sharma, R. Jindal, M. D. Borah, A review of blockchain-based applications and challenges, *Wireless Personal Communications* (2022) 1–43.
- [41] S. Pullo, R. Pareschi, V. Piantadosi, F. Salzano, R. Carlini, Integrating iota’s tangle with the internet of things for sustainable agriculture: A proof-of-concept study on rice cultivation, in: *Informatics*, Vol. 11, MDPI, 2023, p. 3.
- [42] P. A. Mboyerwa, K. Kibret, P. Mtakwa, A. Aschalew, Greenhouse gas emissions in irrigated paddy rice as influenced by crop management practices and nitrogen fertilization rates in eastern tanzania, *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems* 6 (2022) 868479.
- [43] W. Gan, Z. Ye, S. Wan, P. S. Yu, Web 3.0: The future of internet, in: Y. Ding, J. Tang, J. F. Sequeda, L. Aroyo, C. Castillo, G. Houben (Eds.), *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023, WWW 2023, Austin, TX, USA, 30 April 2023 - 4 May 2023*, ACM, 2023, pp. 1266–1275. doi:10.1145/3543873.3587583.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3543873.3587583>
- [44] S. Erni, R. Walker, C. Albuquerque, T. Olsen, S. Soni, S. Ganesh, Web3 experiments start to take hold in banking, *Bain & Company* (2022).
- [45] A. Banerjee, R. Byrne, I. D. Bode, M. Higginson, Web3: Beyond the hype, *McKinsey & Company* (2023).
- [46] W. Ding, J. Hou, J. Li, C. Guo, J. Qin, R. Kozma, F.-Y. Wang, Desci based on web3 and dao: A comprehensive overview and reference model, *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* 9 (5) (2022) 1563–1573. doi:10.1109/TCSS.2022.3204745.
- [47] D. D. F. Maesa, A. Lisi, P. Mori, L. Ricci, G. Boschi, Self sovereign and blockchain based access control: Supporting attributes privacy with zero knowledge, *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 212 (2023) 103577.
- [48] F. Hoops, F. Matthes, A universal system for openid connect sign-ins with verifiable credentials and cross-device flow, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09488* (2024).

- [49] A. Bhargav-Spantzel, A. C. Squicciarini, E. Bertino, Establishing and protecting digital identity in federation systems, in: Proceedings of the 2005 Workshop on Digital Identity Management, DIM '05, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2005, p. 11–19. doi: 10.1145/1102486.1102489.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1102486.1102489>
- [50] B. Glaser, A. Strauss, Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research, Routledge, 2017.
- [51] K.-J. Stol, P. Ralph, B. Fitzgerald, Grounded theory in software engineering research: a critical review and guidelines, in: Proceedings of the 38th International conference on software engineering, 2016, pp. 120–131.
- [52] R. Suddaby, From the editors: What grounded theory is not (2006).
- [53] A. R. Bedin, M. Capretz, S. Mir, Blockchain for collaborative businesses, *Mobile Networks and Applications* 26 (2021) 277–284.
- [54] I. A. T. Hashem, I. Yaqoob, N. B. Anuar, S. Mokhtar, A. Gani, S. U. Khan, The rise of “big data” on cloud computing: Review and open research issues, *Information systems* 47 (2015) 98–115.
- [55] F. Idelberger, G. Governatori, R. Riveret, G. Sartor, Evaluation of logic-based smart contracts for blockchain systems, in: Rule Technologies. Research, Tools, and Applications: 10th International Symposium, RuleML 2016, Stony Brook, NY, USA, July 6-9, 2016. Proceedings 10, Springer, 2016, pp. 167–183.
- [56] R. Li, H. Asaeda, Fsc: Flexible smart contract interaction with access control for blockchain, in: ICC 2021-IEEE International Conference on Communications, IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [57] M. S. Ferdous, R. Poet, A comparative analysis of identity management systems, in: 2012 International Conference on High Performance Computing & Simulation (HPCS), IEEE, 2012, pp. 454–461.
- [58] N. Alshuqayran, N. Ali, R. Evans, A systematic mapping study in microservice architecture, in: 2016 IEEE 9th International Conference on

Service-Oriented Computing and Applications (SOCA), IEEE, 2016, pp. 44–51.

- [59] A. Andriyanto, R. Doss, P. Yustianto, Adopting soa and microservices for inter-enterprise architecture in sme communities, in: 2019 International Conference on Electrical, Electronics and Information Engineering (ICEEIE), Vol. 6, IEEE, 2019, pp. 282–287.
- [60] M. Rogerson, G. C. Parry, Blockchain: case studies in food supply chain visibility, *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal* 25 (5) (2020) 601–614.