LEX LOCALIS-JOURNAL OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT
ISSN:1581-5374 E-ISSN:1855-363X
VOL. 24, NO. 1(2026)

Decentralized Finance and Digital Assets: A New Perspective on Financial Management and Risk

Dr Patryk Chmielarz

University of the National Education Commission, Krakow, Poland

ORCID: 0000-0003-0286-741X

e-mail: chmielarzp13@gmail.com

Abstract

Financial services are being transformed, how they are designed, accessed, and managed, by the rise of decentralized finance (DeFi) and digital assets. These innovations via blockchain networks, smart contracts, and tokenization offer alternatives to existing models for payments, lending, investment, and asset exchange. But the economic, institutional and operating risks of financial intermediation are not eroded when transactions are automated. In this conceptual study, the impact of DeFi and digital assets on financial management is explored, including capital allocation, treasury operations, risk management, and the governance of digital assets. It assesses what could be gained from this technology, alongside its potential technological vulnerabilities, market instability, regulatory uncertainty and inability to provide meaningful financial inclusion. An analysis approach is built to present a managerial perspective, which considers digital financial arrangements from an economic function, dependency and accountability standpoint. It points out that sustainable adoption requires coordination of technology with financial management, strong rights, organizational efficiency and appropriate governance. DeFi is therefore a reorganization of financial management and not the automatic replacement of existing financial institutions.

Keywords: decentralized finance, digital assets, financial management, smart contracts, financial risk, tokenization

1. Introduction

Financial management is related to the management of resources in the form of money for their acquisition, allocation, protection and productive use. Traditionally, the activities are handled by banks and securities markets, payment providers, custodians and regulatory institutions. Digital technology is bringing new methods to coordinate transactions and establish ownership. Of those advancements, decentralized finance (DeFi) has been particularly regarded as the function that could make a number of financial operations become possible utilizing programmable agreements on blockchain networks. In such environments, instruments for representing value or access rights or financial claims are represented by digital assets.

This shift is not just about crypto investing; it's about a transformation in the broader financial industry. Questions of relevance to businesses include those about payment efficiency, working capital, financial opportunities, asset protection and the reliability of financial information. Chen and Bellavitis (2020) provide an explanation of blockchain's influence on decentralizing businesses by altering the manner in which businesses are organized and transacted between the participants. Their point of view sees decentralisation as an organisational process that affects existing financial institutions and new businesses. But being able to restructure transactions does not mean that all decentralized schemes are necessarily economically better.

A balanced assessment is required to differentiate what is technologically possible and what is a proven value for management. A system can allow transfers to be processed at run-time without revealing user's redemption rights.There can be a system, that allows to process the transfers at run-time, without disclosing the user's rights to redeem them. Likewise, clear transactions can be concurrent to focused decision-making. Thus, the fundamental question is what impact digital financial infrastructure has on risk coverage and control.

This paper discusses this question in a conceptual narrative review. It engages the academic literature with the publications of international financial organizations, but does not claim that it is an original empirical or systematic finding. DeFi fundamentally reshapes where financial intermediation and responsibility lies. Good financial management thus needs to pay attention to the opportunity created by programmable transactions and to the dependencies that lie within those transactions.

2. Conceptual Foundations

2.1 Decentralized finance and financial intermediation

DeFi, or DeFi-based financial arrangements, are blockchain applications and smart contracts that carry out financial functions like asset exchanging, lending, and guaranteeing. A smart contract is a contract that is programmed to carry out specific actions once certain conditions are met. Schär (2021) explains an architecture which is built from layers of settlement infrastructures, assets, protocols, applications and interfaces. This multi-layered architecture provides a good reason why a seemingly simple service to a user can rely on multiple components.

One managerial lesson that is useful is the one about execution and responsibility. The way a transaction is executed is automatic, while responsibility involves who sets the rules for a transaction, who operates the surroundings of that transaction, and who reacts to failures. These functions could be split between various stakeholders: developers, governance participants, service providers, and users. In light of this, the decentralization of a platform cannot be judged by the way it is described, but rather by the use of actual control.

2.2 Digital Assets and Their Economic Characteristics

Digital assets come in all kinds of shapes and forms. Unbacked cryptocurrencies get their market value in a manner that isn't traditional in terms of a claim against an identifiable entity. Stablecoins aim to have a reference value, the processes vary, and the redemption procedures may differ. Participation rights in a protocol can be given in forms of governance tokens. Financial assets are things with claims documented using programmable infrastructure, such as instruments or property.

Financial management requires these differences because it is based on the economic substance of an asset. An instrument held for speculative appreciation is not the same as an instrument held for settlement or that has contractual cash flows. According to the Bank for International Settlements (BIS, 2025), tokenization involves embedding financial assets and transactions into programmable platforms. It also shows that tokenization doesn't have to be limited to permissionless DeFi, as it can evolve in institutionally regulated structures as well.

In the case of an organisation considering digital assets, classification should be done before investing. Management must determine the function and purpose of the asset, its rights, the basis for the asset's valuation, the restrictions on the transfer of the asset, and the dependence of the asset on other parties. The differences between the various types of tokens are ignored and can lead to inadequate controls when all tokens are considered a uniform investment category.

3. Financial Management Perspective

3.1 Transaction costs and the efficiency of organizations

There are hidden costs in financial transactions. These include compliance, dispute, settlement delays, verification and reconciliation. The cost may change if DeFi manages to automate these processes and implement shared records. However, Makarov and Schoar (2022) demonstrate that market power and rent-seeking are still possible in decentralized financial systems. Eliminating a conventional intermediary does not automatically result in eliminating economic concentration or the formation of perfectly competitive markets.

The managerial takeaway is that there needs to be a full comparison for efficiency to be possible. Let's now examine an imaginary exporter who is looking at a digital payment scheme. While a reduced transfer fee could be compensated for by charges to convert to a different currency, spending on cyber security and accounting complexity and potentially unknown access to local currencies all can have a negative impact. On the other hand, a deal with minor direct cost savings could be worth it for its more predictable reconciliation. The total payment process and its role in the overall operational reliability are more relevant.

3.2 Trust, Control, and Accountability

Financial management relies on people's trust in assets, authorisation of transaction and enforceability of obligations. Digital infrastructure is transforming the way these expectations are met. Public transaction logs can assist in verifying transactions; programmable rules can minimize discretionary intervention. But transparency doesn't make users "knows the system" or make effective remedies available to them.

According to Aramonte et al (2021) there exists a “decentralisation illusion”, wherein governance needs and structural attributes can focus power. Their analysis questions the notion that decentralization equates with dissemination of power.

A managerial assessment should, therefore, establish which individual(s) should have the capacity to change contracts, adjust the collateral, halt operations, or affect how the enterprise is run. For instance, a treasury department may agree to a protocol that has transactions visible to all, but ignore the power of a select group of administrators. Validation and an evaluation of decision-making authority are complementary tasks.

4. Opportunities for Financial Management

4.1 Payments and Treasury Operations

Programmable financial systems offer a chance to tie payments to contractual activities.Developing financial infrastructure that can be programmed opens opportunities to link payments with contractual events. The BIS (2025) mentions the possibility of incorporating processes that are currently performed separately in messaging, reconciliation and asset transfer to tokenized arrangements. These can all be relevant to treasury management as they relate to settling and the liquidity needed and/or working capital available.

The potential application is shown with a hypothetical manufacturer. The system of payments for this could be made available upon receipt of a payment-approved delivery confirmation. This can help to ease repetitive administrative tasks and enhance the transparency around unpaid debts. However the example relies on trustworthy confirmation processes. The erroneous information on the delivery lists would be magnified at a faster rate if payments were automated.

Payment needs will thus need to be aligned with the payment mechanism to meet the needs of the Treasury to be adopted. Management should consider if the instrument is accepted by the suppliers, how funds will be converted back to the operating currency of the organization and what will happen in the event of a service interruption. Having funds available on demand is of little benefit where payroll or supplier bills need to be paid and the organisation is unable to access them on time.

4.2 Asset Management and Capital Allocation

Digital financial markets open up markets for more instruments so that they can be traded in by investors and organisations. According to Chen and Bellavitis (2020), decentralized business models are related to opportunity to re-organize financial services and participation. The possibilities warrant exploration of the role digital assets play in productive financing, operational payments or speculative positions.

Purpose is the key for capital allocation. A company thinking about acquiring a digital asset will want to know the difference between a "strategic experiment" and resources needed to maintain an ongoing operation. There may be a small research allocation within a research program that is able to account for uncertainty that would be unacceptable in pension funds or essential working capital.

4.3 Transparency and Financial Monitoring

A shared transaction record can help provide transparency to some financial events. Schär (2022) notes that transparency and verifiability are of potential great importance, but also states that some of the benefits that can be gained from DeFi can also occur on a centralized platform.

Transaction data might assist with reconciling or monitoring for the needs of financial management. Recorded transfers, however, do not necessarily indicate a commercial purpose, and do not prove that the underlying assets are legally transferred to the other party. Internal documentation, authorisation and suitable reporting procedures are still needed for organisations.

Peng et al. (2025) recognize data-driven culture as a mediation factor between the capability of big data analytics and firm performance. This discovery provides further weight to the argument of managers; access to the transaction data should be supported by organizational processes that can interpret and utilise that information.

4.4 Financial Access and Participation

The accessibility of DeFi has prompted the notion that it may increase access to the financial system. The OECD (2024) has found significant drawbacks of complexity, non-custodial options, and consumer risk. A protocol can be a source of financial services that are affordable, suitable or understandable. Inclusion assessment should focus on users' ability to benefit, not assume they are taking more risk. For example, a small enterprise can use a lending protocol, but it may not have proper collateral or know how to track the state of liquidation. This is without the guarantee of an increase in financial capacity.The management/policy

question is thus, does a service meets a perceived financial constraint? The number of accounts or transactions is not the only factor to take into account when making evaluations, but rather, the usability, recourse, affordability, and suitability of the accounts or transactions. There is no implication that participation equates to improvement in financial well-being.

5. Risk in Digital Financial Environments

5.1 Market Risk and Valuation Uncertainty

Market risk is the risk of fluctuations in the value of assets impacting financial positions. For digital asset portfolios, management needs to consider the implications of price changes regarding liquidity, collateral, and organizational commitments. Volatility and increasingly complex crypto asset activities are highlighted in the International Monetary Fund and Financial Stability Board (IMF & FSB, 2023) as issues of importance to macroeconomic and financial stability.

To a particular organization the practical concern is the exposure in relation to its loss absorption capability. Assuming liquidity is not a concern, the risk of a hypothetical business keeping money for a large equipment purchase will change from one who has a long-term investment time horizon. Where they have comparable possessions, their monetary duties have various impacts. One needs to take into consideration the objective and time horizon when interpreting historical returns. A portfolio assessment focusing on a "typical performance" may not capture a potential event of a major drop. This relationship becomes clear when using scenario analysis, also known as converting the market's movements into effects on cash availability and contractual obligations.

5.2 Liquidity, Collateral, and Liquidation

The liquidity refers to the ease with which obligations can be met, and transactions can be carried out without undue loss. The ability to trade and withdraw on DeFi can rely on market depth, protocol conditions, and the value of the collateral as well as on the function of the infrastructure. The FSB (2023) lists some vulnerabilities that DeFi could be vulnerable to or even exacerbated, including leverage, liquidity and maturity mismatches, operational fragilities and interconnectedness.

Consider the example below to see why collateral is sensitive. If a borrower secures a $100,000 loan with $150,000 in assets, then he has collateralized the loan with a fixed asset of $150,000. At 30% the value of a collateral becomes $105,000. Depending on the protocol requirements, liquidation may happen before the borrower can make contributions to the protocol's liquidation fund. This hypothetical calculation is not for a specific platform, but an indication of the need to calculate borrowing capacity in adverse circumstances. In this regard, liquidity management should review both the normal withdrawal process and stressed exit. Monies that may seem to be accessible at steady market intervals might be hard to obtain when market participants try and withdraw at the same time.

5.3 Stablecoin Risk

There is a need to evaluate the arrangements supporting the reference value of stablecoins. The BIS (2025) doubts if stablecoins meet basic monetary standards such as the predictable acceptance of money at a fixed value, or the stability of the financial system. The institutional approach accents the difference between a price target and a reliable monetary execution. Management should explore the custody aspect of the instrument, the rights it grants to the bearer, redemption restrictions, and reserve arrangements, for treasury purposes.

A hypothetical business might be able to receive stablecoin payments, but not be able to redeem them directly from the stablecoin issuer. The access to operating cash is then reliant on secondary market and conversion providers. Only then can a risk assessment be made along the entire conversion path. Stability at the point of receipt is neither a requirement for nor an indicator of stability or availability at the point of conventional currency.

5.4 Technological and Economic Security

Failure of technology can lead to direct financial impacts. Werner et al. (2022) differentiate technical security from economic security, highlighting the need of analysis of both software behaviour and financial incentives. Zhou et al. (2023) analyze DeFI incidents and show the relevance of price information-related vulnerabilities and account manipulation vulnerabilities between protocols. Their work contributes to a view of security as an issue which is not just about explicit programming faults. This is relevant to managerial due diligence.

Even though a contract can do what it says, it can have detrimental results due to its economizing requirements. A hypothetical lending application could have a price source that won't be reliable during thin trading. If executed correctly, then incorrect valuations would be applied. The overall goal of the security review should therefore be to take into account the entirety of the dependency structure of the transaction. Questions that are relevant are how prices are being obtained, how exceptional circumstances are dealt with and if external services are susceptible to a disruption. While a software audit can be a helpful document, it shouldn't be seen as a catch-all immunity from financial or operational issues.

5.5 Custody and Organizational Control

To safeguard assets, it is necessary to have clear authority about transactions. With self-custody the organization has to deal with access and signing. Delegation alters the assessment of the provider to one based on their treatment of the assets, controls, and contractual responsibilities. An illustrative control arrangement would involve the involvement of different personnel to initiate and approve transfers with documented recovery procedures. An empirical analysis of human capital in digital transformation offers a pertinent organizational lens to grasp digital financial arrangements capabilities (Kampoowale et al., 2026). The application to DeFi is a conceptual extension and not something that is directly proved in the decentralized financial markets. The problem is not only technological, but organizational as

well. Information technology, finance and management staff have all got a part to play in knowing and understanding transactions that need to be approved as well as the requirements for recovery, and management must set responsibility. In case of employee absence or lack of availability or error, controls should be workable. An absolute custody will result in an unbalanced distribution of operational responsibility.

5.6 Governance and Interconnectedness

Governance governs the transformation of the financial rules and who will get the benefit. Fees, assets accepted and decision making processes could change for participants of the protocol. Aramonte et al. (2021) relate governance concentration to vulnerabilities on a larger scale and the FSB (2023) highlights the importance of links between DeFi, centralized crypto services and traditional finance.

In the case of the organizations, diversification should not be limited to the number of holdings. Stablecoins, data providers, or blockchain infrastructure can be used in three different protocols. If they are funded simultaneously, it may give the impression of diversification, but they actually have a similar failure mechanism. Consider a practical assessment that would create a dependency mapping and establish exposure limits before that. Management could then consider how to proceed if one key component failed, as there may be other arrangements that would be available. This perspective not only acknowledges that interconnection is a real management problem, but also exempts it from being considered a digital market property.

6. Regulation and Institutional Responsibilities

The enforceability, the legitimacy and viability of digital financial activities are shaped by regulation. IOSCO (2023) suggests assessing the DeFi arrangements based on their activities, identifying responsible persons, mitigating conflict of interest, and enhancing the risk disclosure.IOSCO (2023) proposes an evaluation of the arrangements of DeFi on the basis of their activities, to identify responsible persons, to address possible conflicts of interest, and to enhance risk disclosure. These recommendations take issue with the notion that decentralization necessarily lifts regulatory responsibility.

The Financial Action Task Force (FATF, 2021) also discusses the application of the virtual asset standards to relevant providers and arrangements. The financial integrity obligations outlined in its guidance focus on considering practical functions and control.

Compliance evaluation should take place prior to operation by organisations. Questions that come to mind include if the activity is okay, who is offering services, what type of information needs to be kept, and how conflicts would be handled. These questions call for jurisdiction specific analysis, not assumptions, because of the location of software or lack of a traditional "office.

It's not an easy policy problem because of the issue of proportionate oversight. Requirements should include risks that are known to be a problem, but allow for some innovation that is beneficial. OECD (2022) builds the DeFi policy around knowledge of the nature and consequences of DeFi. A balanced approach, therefore, considers the financial function and exposure that each digital arrangement entails, not as a single, uniform approach.

7. Discussion and Conclusion

DeFi and digital assets add a new viewpoint that is a shift towards financial action being more integrated into programmable infrastructure. They have the potential to transform the processes of coordinating transactions, monitoring them and executing them. But, automation does not solve all the issues of valuation, liquidity, incentives and accountability. Some risk becomes more apparent, others creep into software dependencies and governance.

The difference between technology innovation and profitability, thus, is key. Evaluating a service by how it helps the organisation achieve its goals and its actions in challenging circumstances. Possibly valuable properties are: Accessibility, transparency, and continuous operation, which will depend on the setting of appropriate controls and usable financial rights.

The evidence also demonstrates that permissionless DeFi can be differentiated from the overall tokenized finance project. Financial infrastructure can be made programmable and customized by an institution to not replicate the features of the existing crypto markets. But a decentralized system isn't a distributed authority or sufficient protection.

This review is constrained by the conceptual design and the changing state of financial arrangements in the digital world. It does not claim to establish causal effects nor to make empirical comparisons of organizational outcomes. Future studies may determine if specific applications can enhance working capital or payment dependability or financial eligibility vs. traditional options.

In total, DeFi is a reconfiguration of financial managing and risk. To ensure sustainable use, one needs to look at the economic rationale, try to articulate dependencies, protect assets, and hold people accountable. These requirements align digital innovation to the days-old financial management obligations.

References

1. Aramonte, S., Huang, W., & Schrimpf, A. (2021). DeFi risks and the decentralisation illusion. *BIS Quarterly Review*, December, 21–36. https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_qt2112b.htm
2. Bank for International Settlements. (2025). The next-generation monetary and financial system. In *Annual economic report 2025*. https://www.bis.org/publ/arpdf/ar2025e3.htm
3. Chen, Y., & Bellavitis, C. (2020). Blockchain disruption and decentralized finance: The rise of decentralized business models. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 13*, Article e00151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2019.e00151
4. Financial Action Task Force. (2021). *Updated guidance for a risk-based approach to virtual assets and virtual asset service providers*. https://www.fatf-gafi.org/en/publications/Fatfrecommendations/Guidance-rba-virtual-assets-2021.html
5. Financial Stability Board. (2023). *The financial stability risks of decentralised finance*. https://www.fsb.org/2023/02/the-financial-stability-risks-of-decentralised-finance/
6. International Monetary Fund, & Financial Stability Board. (2023). *IMF–FSB synthesis paper: Policies for crypto-assets*. https://www.fsb.org/2023/09/imf-fsb-synthesis-paper-policies-for-crypto-assets/
7. International Organization of Securities Commissions. (2023). *Final report with policy recommendations for decentralized finance (DeFi)*. https://www.iosco.org/library/pubdocs/pdf/IOSCOPD754.pdf
8. Makarov, I., & Schoar, A. (2022). *Cryptocurrencies and decentralised finance (DeFi)* (BIS Working Papers No. 1061). Bank for International Settlements. https://www.bis.org/publ/work1061.htm
9. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). *Why decentralised finance (DeFi) matters and the policy implications*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/109084ae-en
10. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *The limits of DeFi for financial inclusion: Lessons from ASEAN*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/f00a0c7f-en

11. Schär, F. (2021). Decentralized finance: On blockchain- and smart contract-based financial markets. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review, 103*(2), 153–174. https://doi.org/10.20955/r.103.153-74
12. Schär, F. (2022). DeFi's promise and pitfalls. *Finance & Development, 59*(3). https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/fandd/issues/2022/09/defi-promise-and-pitfalls-fabian-schar
13. Werner, S. M., Perez, D., Gudgeon, L., Klages-Mundt, A., Harz, D., & Knottenbelt, W. J. (2022). *SoK: Decentralized finance (DeFi)* [Preprint]. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2101.08778
14. Zhou, L., Xiong, X., Ernstberger, J., Chaliasos, S., Wang, Z., Wang, Y., Qin, K., Wattenhofer, R., Song, D., & Gervais, A. (2023). SoK: Decentralized finance (DeFi) attacks. In *2023 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)* (pp. 2444–2461). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/SP46215.2023.10179435
15. Iqbal, M. S., Abdul Rahim, Z., Alshammari, A. M. K., & Iftikhar, H. (2024). Innovative strategies for overcoming barriers to technology adoption in small and medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of the International Council for Small Business, 5*(4), 331–344. https://doi.org/10.1080/26437015.2024.2367440
16. Kampoowale, I., Hussien Musa, A. M., Adam Abdalla, A. A., Iftikhar, H., Abdelraheem, A. A. E., & Elamin Elboukhari, Y. A. (2026). Assessing the mediating role of human capital in the relationship between digital transformation and firm performance. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management, 37*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMTM-02-2025-0122
17. Peng, D., Iftikhar, H., Kampoowale, I., Ali Hussin, H. A. A., & Mohammed Ali, N. B. (2025). Linking big data analytics to firm performance: Exploring the mediating effects of data-driven culture and networking capability. *Business Process Management Journal*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-07-2025-1232
18. Shah, U., Fayyaz, A. B., Iftikhar, H., & Hayat, R. S. (2025). Exploring stakeholder perspectives on barriers to green financing in Pakistan's transportation sector. *Asian Journal of Water, Environment and Pollution, 22*(4), 111–122. https://doi.org/10.36922/AJWEP025160121