

# Database and Distributed Computing Fundamentals of Blockchains

Sujaya Maiyya, Victor Zakhary, Divyakant Agrawal, Amr El Abbadi

PPL at Utpp





# DSL at UCSB









































• From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective





# Traditional Banking Systems

5

• From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective

21

• Identities and Signatures

ANYTOWN, USA	March 1, 20XX
Pay to the Kendra McWilliams	\$ 51.25
Fifty one and <sup>25</sup> /100	Dollars
For Math Tutor Gori	Bradford
*:00000000*:0101 #*000000000**	



- From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective
- Identities and Signatures
  - You are your signature [ID, username and password]

CORI BRADFORD 100 MAIN STREET ANYTOWN, USA	101 00-0000/1010
	DateMarck 1, 20XX
Paytothe Kendra McWilliams	\$ 51.25
Fifty one and 25/100	Dollars
MIDFIRST BANK method com method com	
ForMath Jutor	Cori Bradford
+:00000000+:0101 +*000000000	



- From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective
- Identities and Signatures
  - You are your signature [ID, username and password]
- Ledger

CORI BRADFORD 100 MAIN STREET ANYTOWN, USA	10 00-0000/101
	Date Marck 1, 20XX
Pay to the Kendra McWilliams	\$ 51.25
Fifty one and 25/100	Dollars
MIDFIRST BANK	
For Math Jutor	Cori Bradford
*:00000000*:0101 **000000000	. /



- From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective
- Identities and Signatures
  - You are your signature [ID, username and password]
- Ledger
  - The balance of each identity (saved in a DB)

CORI BRADFORD 100 MAIN STREET ANYTOWN, USA	10 00-0000/101
Alt 1000, 000	Date March 1, 20XX
Pay to the Kendra McWilliams	\$ 51.25
Fifty one and 25/100	Dollars
MIDFIRST MANK	
msdirat.com 888-643-3477	
ForMath Jutor	Cori Bradford
:00000000:0101 #000000000	. /



- From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective
- Identities and Signatures
  - You are your signature [ID, username and password]
- Ledger
  - The balance of each identity (saved in a DB)
- Transactions

CORI BRADFORD 100 MAIN STREET ANYTOWN, USA	101 00-0000/1010
	Date March 1, 20XX
Pay to the Kendra McWilliams	\$ 51.25
Fifty one and 25/100	Dollars
MIDFIRST BANK MENGS 3477	
ForMath Jutor	Cori Bradford
*:00000000*:0101 **000000000	



- From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective
- Identities and Signatures
  - You are your signature [ID, username and password]
- Ledger
  - The balance of each identity (saved in a DB)
- Transactions
  - Move money from one identity to another

100 MAIN STREET ANYTOWN, USA	DateMarck 1, 20XX_
Pay to the Kendra McWilliams	\$ 51.25
Fifty one and 25/100	Dollars
505-063-077 ForMath Jutor	Cori Bradford
:00000000:0101 = 000000000	



- From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective
- Identities and Signatures
  - You are your signature [ID, username and password]
- Ledger
  - The balance of each identity (saved in a DB)
- Transactions
  - Move money from one identity to another
  - Concurrency control to serialize transactions (prevent double spending)

100 MAIN STREET ANYTOWN, USA	00-0000/ Date
Pay to the Kendra McWilliams	\$ 51.25
Fifty one and 25/100	Dollars
MIDFIRST BANK mediatum Bible 405-3077	
ForMath Jutor	Pori Bradford
:00000000:0101 #000000000	



- From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective
- Identities and Signatures
  - You are your signature [ID, username and password]
- Ledger
  - The balance of each identity (saved in a DB)
- Transactions
  - Move money from one identity to another
  - Concurrency control to serialize transactions (prevent double spending)
  - Typically backed by a transactions log

CORI BRADFORD 100 MAIN STREET ANYTOWN, USA	00-0000
ANTIOWN, USA	Date_March 1, 20XX
Pay to the Kendra McWilliams	\$ 51.25
Fifty one and 25/100	Dollars
midirat.com 888-643-3477	
ForMath Jutor	Cori Bradford



- From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective
- Identities and Signatures
  - You are your signature [ID, username and password]
- Ledger
  - The balance of each identity (saved in a DB)
- Transactions
  - Move money from one identity to another
  - Concurrency control to serialize transactions (prevent double spending)
  - Typically backed by a transactions log
    - Log is persistent

CORI BRADFORD 100 MAIN STREET ANYTOWN, USA	101 00-0000/101
Pay to the Kendra McWilliams	Date_Marck 1, 20XX \$ 51.25
Fifty one and 25/100	Dollars
For Math Jutor 1:00000000:0101 #00000000	Cori Bradford



- From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective
- Identities and Signatures
  - You are your signature [ID, username and password]
- Ledger
  - The balance of each identity (saved in a DB)
- Transactions
  - Move money from one identity to another
  - Concurrency control to serialize transactions (prevent double spending)
  - Typically backed by a transactions log
    - Log is persistent
    - Log is immutable and tamper-free (end-users trust this)

CORI BRADFORD 100 MAIN STREET ANYTOWN, USA	10 00-0000/10 Date
Pay to the Kendra McWilliams	\$ 51.25
Fifty one and 25/100	Dollars
505-5177 ForMath Jutor	Cori Bradford
:00000000:0101 =000000000	//





# DSL at UCSB

























### Bitcoin





### Bitcoin





### Bitcoin



# Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System

- From Database and Distributed Computing Perspective
- Identities and Signatures
  - Public/Private key pair
- Ledger

DSL

- The balance of each identity (saved in the blockchain)
- Transactions
  - Move bitcoins from one identity to another
  - Concurrency control to serialize transactions (Mining and PoW)
  - Typically backed by a transactions log (blockchain)
    - Log is persistent (replicated across the network nodes)
    - Log is immutable and tamper-free (PoW and Hash pointers)

## Digital Signatures



# DSL at UCSB



• P<sub>k</sub>, S<sub>k</sub> **Keygen**(keysize)



# DSL at UCSB



- $P_k$ ,  $S_k \leftarrow Keygen(keysize)$
- Your P<sub>k</sub> is your identity (username, e-mail address)





# **Digital Signatures**

- $P_k$ ,  $S_k \leftarrow Keygen(keysize)$
- Your P<sub>k</sub> is your identity (username, e-mail address)
- Your S<sub>k</sub> is your signature (password)
- $P_k$  is made public and used to verify documents signed by  $S_k$
- S<sub>k</sub> is private





- P<sub>k</sub> is made public and used to verify documents signed by S<sub>k</sub>
- S<sub>k</sub> is private







• P<sub>k</sub> is made public and used to verify documents signed by S<sub>k</sub>

SB

 $P_k$ 

• S<sub>k</sub> is private





• P<sub>k</sub> is made public and used to verify documents signed by S<sub>k</sub>

SB

 $P_k$ 

• S<sub>k</sub> is private




• P<sub>k</sub> is made public and used to verify documents signed by S<sub>k</sub>

SB

 $P_k$ 

• S<sub>k</sub> is private





- P<sub>k</sub> is made public and used to verify documents signed by S<sub>k</sub>
- S<sub>k</sub> is private



SB

 $S_k$ 



- P<sub>k</sub> is made public and used to verify documents signed by S<sub>k</sub>
- S<sub>k</sub> is private



SB

S<sub>k</sub>

# **Digital Signatures**

- P<sub>k</sub> is made public and used to verify documents signed by S<sub>k</sub>
- S<sub>k</sub> is private



SB

S<sub>k</sub>

# **Digital Signatures**

- P<sub>k</sub> is made public and used to verify documents signed by S<sub>k</sub>
- S<sub>k</sub> is private



SB

S<sub>k</sub>

# **Digital Signatures**

- P<sub>k</sub> is made public and used to verify documents signed by S<sub>k</sub>
- S<sub>k</sub> is private



SB

Sk





- Unique to the signed document
- Mathematically hard to forge
- Mathematically easy to verify







- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients







- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients
  - Alice wants to move a bitcoin to Bob







- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients
  - Alice wants to move a bitcoin to Bob







- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients
  - Alice wants to move a bitcoin to Bob







- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients
  - Alice wants to move a bitcoin to Bob







- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients
  - Alice wants to move a bitcoin to Bob





- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients
  - Alice wants to move a bitcoin to Bob





- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients
  - Alice wants to move a bitcoin to Bob





- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients
  - Alice wants to move a bitcoin to Bob





- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients
  - Alice wants to move a bitcoin to Bob





- A bitcoin is a chain of digital signatures
  - Coin owners digitally sign their coins to transfer them to other recipients
  - Alice wants to move a bitcoin to Bob

















# Digital Signatures and Bitcoin





# Digital Signatures and Bitcoin





# Digital Signatures and Bitcoin





# Digital Signatures and Bitcoin





#### A Bitcoin Big Picture

# DSL at UCSB



#### A Bitcoin Big Picture



# DSL at UCSB







# DSL at UCSB













































#### What About's?







#### What About's?






#### What About's?







#### What About's?







# DSL at UCSB





• Signatures and public keys are combined using Hashing







- Signatures and public keys are combined using Hashing
- Takes any string x of any length as input
- Fixed output size (e.g., 256 bits)







- Signatures and public keys are combined using Hashing
- Takes any string x of any length as input
- Fixed output size (e.g., 256 bits)
- Efficiently computable.
- <u>Satisfies:</u>
  - Collision Free: no two x, y s.t. H(x) = H(y)
    - Message digest.
  - Hiding: Given H(x) infeasible to find x (one-way hash function)
    - Commitment: commit to a value and reveal later
  - Puzzle Friendly: Given a random puzzle ID and a target set Y it is hard to find x such that: H(ID | x) ε Y





# DSL at UCSB





# SHA256( Signature<sub>Alice-Bob</sub> || P<sub>k-Diana</sub> ) = 256-bit (32-byte) unique string













#### 256-bit (32-byte) unique string

SHA256(abc) =

ba7816bf8f01cfea414140de5dae2223b00361a396177a9cb410ff61f20015ad







#### 256-bit (32-byte) unique string

SHA256(abc) =

ba7816bf8f01cfea414140de5dae2223b00361a396177a9cb410ff61f20015ad

SHA256(abC) =

0a2432a1e349d8fdb9bfca91bba9e9f2836990fe937193d84deef26c6f3b8f76





#### What About's?







#### What About's?







- Spending the same digital cash asset more than once
- Impossible to do in physical cash
- Prevented in traditional banking systems through concurrency control







- Spending the same digital cash asset more than once
- Impossible to do in physical cash
- Prevented in traditional banking systems through concurrency control







- Spending the same digital cash asset more than once
- Impossible to do in physical cash
- Prevented in traditional banking systems through concurrency control

#### Signature<sub>Alice-Bob</sub>







- Spending the same digital cash asset more than once
- Impossible to do in physical cash
- Prevented in traditional banking systems through concurrency control









- Spending the same digital cash asset more than once
- Impossible to do in physical cash
- Prevented in traditional banking systems through concurrency control









- Spending the same digital cash asset more than once
- Impossible to do in physical cash
- Prevented in traditional banking systems through concurrency control







- Spending the same digital cash asset more than once
- Impossible to do in physical cash
- Prevented in traditional banking systems through concurrency control







- Spending the same digital cash asset more than once
- Impossible to do in physical cash
- Prevented in traditional banking systems through concurrency control







#### **Double Spending Prevention**

• Centralized





- Centralized
  - Transactions on coins go through a trusted 3<sup>rd</sup> party (Trent)







# **Double Spending Prevention**

- Centralized
  - Transactions on coins go through a trusted 3<sup>rd</sup> party (Trent)

50 BTC

Signature<sub>Trent-Bob</sub>



- Centralized
  - Transactions on coins go through a trusted 3<sup>rd</sup> party (Trent)





- Centralized
  - Transactions on coins go through a trusted 3<sup>rd</sup> party (Trent)





- Centralized
  - Transactions on coins go through a trusted 3<sup>rd</sup> party (Trent)





- Centralized
  - Transactions on coins go through a trusted 3<sup>rd</sup> party (Trent)





- Centralized
  - Transactions on coins go through a trusted 3<sup>rd</sup> party (Trent)





- Centralized
  - Transactions on coins go through a trusted 3<sup>rd</sup> party (Trent)





- Centralized
  - Transactions on coins go through a trusted 3<sup>rd</sup> party (Trent)









#### **Double Spending Prevention**

• Decentralized







- Decentralized
  - A network of nodes maintains a ledger





# **Double Spending Prevention**

#### • Decentralized

- A network of nodes maintains a ledger
- Network nodes work to agree on transactions order
  - Serializing transactions on every coin prevents double spending



# **Double Spending Prevention**

#### • Decentralized

- A network of nodes maintains a ledger
- Network nodes work to agree on transactions order
  - Serializing transactions on every coin prevents double spending
- What is the ledger?



# **Double Spending Prevention**

#### Decentralized

- A network of nodes maintains a ledger
- Network nodes work to agree on transactions order
  - Serializing transactions on every coin prevents double spending
- What is the ledger?
- How to agree on transaction order?


## **Double Spending Prevention**

#### Decentralized

- A network of nodes maintains a ledger
- Network nodes work to agree on transactions order
  - Serializing transactions on every coin prevents double spending
- What is the ledger?
- How to agree on transaction order?
- What incentives network nodes to maintain the ledger?



#### What is the Ledger?

# DSL at UCSB





### What is the Ledger?

• Blockchain







DSL at UCSB





• Transactions are grouped into blocks







- Transactions are grouped into blocks
  - Blocks are chained to each other through pointers (Hence blockchain)





- Transactions are grouped into blocks
  - Blocks are chained to each other through pointers (Hence blockchain)







- Transactions are grouped into blocks
  - Blocks are chained to each other through pointers (Hence blockchain)







- Transactions are grouped into blocks
  - Blocks are chained to each other through pointers (Hence blockchain)







- Transactions are grouped into blocks
  - Blocks are chained to each other through pointers (Hence blockchain)







- Transactions are grouped into blocks
  - Blocks are chained to each other through pointers (Hence blockchain)











## The Ledger's What About's?

• Where is the ledger stored?





- Where is the ledger stored?
  - Each network node maintains its copy of the ledger





- Where is the ledger stored?
  - Each network node maintains its copy of the ledger
- How is the ledger tamper-free?







- Where is the ledger stored?
  - Each network node maintains its copy of the ledger
- How is the ledger tamper-free?
  - 1. Blocks are connected through hash-pointers





- Where is the ledger stored?
  - Each network node maintains its copy of the ledger
- How is the ledger tamper-free?
  - 1. Blocks are connected through hash-pointers
    - Each block contains the hash of the previous block
    - This hash gives each block its location in the blockchain
    - Tampering with the content of any block can easily be detected (is this enough? NO)





































- How is the ledger tamper-free?
  - 1. Blocks are connected through hash-pointers
    - Each block contains the hash of the previous block
    - This hash gives each block its location in the blockchain
    - Tampering the content of any block can easily be detected (is this enough? NO)



- How is the ledger tamper-free?
  - 1. Blocks are connected through hash-pointers
    - Each block contains the hash of the previous block
    - This hash gives each block its location in the blockchain
    - Tampering the content of any block can easily be detected (is this enough? NO)
  - 2. Replacing a consistent blockchain with another tampered consistent block chain should be **made very hard**, How?



#### Network Nodes Big Picture





#### Network Nodes Big Picture





#### Network Nodes Big Picture





#### Making Progress

# DSL at UCSB





• The ledger is fully replicated to all network nodes







- The ledger is fully replicated to all network nodes
- To make progress:







- The ledger is fully replicated to all network nodes
- To make progress:
  - Network nodes group new transactions into a block







- The ledger is fully replicated to all network nodes
- To make progress:
  - Network nodes group new transactions into a block
  - Blocks are fixed in size (1MB)





- The ledger is fully replicated to all network nodes
- To make progress:
  - Network nodes group new transactions into a block
  - Blocks are fixed in size (1MB)
  - Network nodes validate new transactions to make sure that:




## Making Progress

- The ledger is fully replicated to all network nodes
- To make progress:
  - Network nodes group new transactions into a block
  - Blocks are fixed in size (1MB)
  - Network nodes validate new transactions to make sure that:
    - Transactions on the new block do not conflict with each other
    - Transactions on the new block do not conflict with previous blocks transactions





## Making Progress

- The ledger is fully replicated to all network nodes
- To make progress:
  - Network nodes group new transactions into a block
  - Blocks are fixed in size (1MB)
  - Network nodes validate new transactions to make sure that:
    - Transactions on the new block do not conflict with each other
    - Transactions on the new block do not conflict with previous blocks transactions
  - Network nodes need to agree on the next block to be added to the blockchain





## Making Progress

- The ledger is fully replicated to all network nodes
- To make progress:
  - Network nodes group new transactions into a block
  - Blocks are fixed in size (1MB)
  - Network nodes validate new transactions to make sure that:
    - Transactions on the new block do not conflict with each other
    - Transactions on the new block do not conflict with previous blocks transactions
  - Network nodes need to agree on the next block to be added to the blockchain







#### Consensus

• Types of systems: synchronous and asynchronous







- Types of systems: synchronous and asynchronous
- Problem statement: given n processes and one leader:
  - Agreement: all correct processes agree on the same value
  - Validity: If initiator does not fail, all correct processes agree on its value





- Types of systems: synchronous and asynchronous
- Problem statement: given n processes and one leader:
  - Agreement: all correct processes agree on the same value
  - Validity: If initiator does not fail, all correct processes agree on its value
- Types of failure:
  - Crash
  - Malicious (or Byzantine)



- Types of systems: synchronous and asynchronous
- Problem statement: given n processes and one leader:
  - Agreement: all correct processes agree on the same value
  - Validity: If initiator does not fail, all correct processes agree on its value
- Types of failure:
  - Crash
  - Malicious (or Byzantine)
- Important Impossibility Results:



- Types of systems: synchronous and asynchronous
- Problem statement: given n processes and one leader:
  - Agreement: all correct processes agree on the same value
  - Validity: If initiator does not fail, all correct processes agree on its value
- Types of failure:
  - Crash
  - Malicious (or Byzantine)
- Important Impossibility Results:
  - FLP, in asynchronous systems:
    - With even 1 crash failure, termination isn't guaranteed (no liveness)



- Types of systems: synchronous and asynchronous
- Problem statement: given n processes and one leader:
  - Agreement: all correct processes agree on the same value
  - Validity: If initiator does not fail, all correct processes agree on its value
- Types of failure:
  - Crash
  - Malicious (or Byzantine)
- Important Impossibility Results:
  - FLP, in asynchronous systems:
    - With even 1 crash failure, termination isn't guaranteed (no liveness)
  - Synchronous systems:
    - Termination is guaranteed if number of failed malicious processes (f) is at most 1/3 n





# DSL at UCSB





- Paxos is a consensus algorithm
  - Processes want to agree on a value (e.g., the next block to be added to the chain)







- Paxos is a consensus algorithm
  - Processes want to agree on a value (e.g., the next block to be added to the chain)
- Paxos is currently used to manage local data in global-scale systems
  - Spanner [OSDI'12, SIGMOD'17], Megastore [CIDR'11], etc





- Paxos is a consensus algorithm
  - Processes want to agree on a value (e.g., the next block to be added to the chain)
- Paxos is currently used to manage local data in global-scale systems
  - Spanner [OSDI'12, SIGMOD'17], Megastore [CIDR'11], etc
- Multi-Paxos, simplified:

Majority

Α





- Paxos is a consensus algorithm
  - Processes want to agree on a value (e.g., the next block to be added to the chain)
- Paxos is currently used to manage local data in global-scale systems
  - Spanner [OSDI'12, SIGMOD'17], Megastore [CIDR'11], etc
- Multi-Paxos, simplified:
  - Initially, a leader is elected by a majority quorum







- Paxos is a consensus algorithm
  - Processes want to agree on a value (e.g., the next block to be added to the chain)
- Paxos is currently used to manage local data in global-scale systems
  - Spanner [OSDI'12, SIGMOD'17], Megastore [CIDR'11], etc
- Multi-Paxos, simplified:
  - Initially, a leader is elected by a majority quorum
  - Replication: Leader replicates new updates to a majority quorum







- Paxos is a consensus algorithm
  - Processes want to agree on a value (e.g., the next block to be added to the chain)
- Paxos is currently used to manage local data in global-scale systems
  - Spanner [OSDI'12, SIGMOD'17], Megastore [CIDR'11], etc
- Multi-Paxos, simplified:
  - Initially, a leader is elected by a majority quorum
  - **Replication:** Leader replicates new updates to a majority quorum







- Paxos is a consensus algorithm
  - Processes want to agree on a value (e.g., the next block to be added to the chain)
- Paxos is currently used to manage local data in global-scale systems
  - Spanner [OSDI'12, SIGMOD'17], Megastore [CIDR'11], etc
- Multi-Paxos, simplified:
  - Initially, a leader is elected by a majority quorum
  - **Replication:** Leader replicates new updates to a majority quorum







- Paxos is a consensus algorithm
  - Processes want to agree on a value (e.g., the next block to be added to the chain)
- Paxos is currently used to manage local data in global-scale systems
  - Spanner [OSDI'12, SIGMOD'17], Megastore [CIDR'11], etc
- Multi-Paxos, simplified:
  - Initially, a leader is elected by a majority quorum
  - Replication: Leader replicates new updates to a majority quorum
  - Leader Election: If the leader fails, a new leader is elected





## Can Network Nodes Use Paxos?





## Can Network Nodes Use Paxos?







### Can Network Nodes Use Paxos?





#### Paxos Consensus

# DSL at UCSB





• All participants should be known a priori







- All participants should be known a priori
  - Permissioned vs Permissionless settings







- All participants should be known a priori
  - Permissioned vs Permissionless settings
  - Permissionless setting:
    - Network nodes freely join or leave the network at anytime





- All participants should be known a priori
  - Permissioned vs Permissionless settings
  - Permissionless setting:
    - Network nodes freely join or leave the network at anytime
- Tolerates only Crash failures





- All participants should be known a priori
  - Permissioned vs Permissionless settings
  - Permissionless setting:
    - Network nodes freely join or leave the network at anytime
- Tolerates only Crash failures
  - However, network nodes can be Malicious





- All participants should be known a priori
  - Permissioned vs Permissionless settings
  - Permissionless setting:
    - Network nodes freely join or leave the network at anytime
- Tolerates only Crash failures
  - However, network nodes can be Malicious
  - To make progress, at least 1/2 of the participants should be alive
  - Progress is not guaranteed (FLP impossibility)





- All **participants** should be known **a priori** 
  - Permissioned vs Permissionless settings
  - Permissionless setting:
    - Network nodes freely join or leave the network at anytime
- Tolerates only Crash failures
  - However, network nodes can be Malicious
  - To make progress, at least 1/2 of the participants should be alive
  - Progress is not guaranteed (FLP impossibility)
- Also, Paxos has high network overhead





## Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance (PBFT)

# DSL at UCSB





# Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance (PBFT)

 Goal: Implement a deterministic replication service with arbitrary malicious faults in an asynchronous environment





- Goal: Implement a deterministic replication service with arbitrary malicious faults in an asynchronous environment
- No assumptions about faulty behavior
- No bounds on delays





- Goal: Implement a deterministic replication service with arbitrary malicious faults in an asynchronous environment
- No assumptions about faulty behavior
- No bounds on delays
- Provides safety in asynchronous system and assume eventual time bounds for liveness



- Goal: Implement a deterministic replication service with arbitrary malicious faults in an asynchronous environment
- No assumptions about faulty behavior
- No bounds on delays
- Provides safety in asynchronous system and assume eventual time bounds for liveness
- Assumptions:



- Goal: Implement a deterministic replication service with arbitrary malicious faults in an asynchronous environment
- No assumptions about faulty behavior
- No bounds on delays
- Provides safety in asynchronous system and assume eventual time bounds for liveness
- Assumptions:
  - 3f+1 replicas to tolerate f Byzantine faults (optimal)



# Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance (PBFT)

- Goal: Implement a deterministic replication service with arbitrary malicious faults in an asynchronous environment
- No assumptions about faulty behavior
- No bounds on delays
- Provides safety in asynchronous system and assume eventual time bounds for liveness
- Assumptions:
  - 3f+1 replicas to tolerate f Byzantine faults (optimal)
    - quorums have at least 2f+1 replicas
    - quorums intersect in f+1, hence have at least one correct replica
  - Strong cryptography
  - Only for liveness: eventual time bounds

quorum A qu

quorum B



*3f+1* replicas










The algorithm has three main phases: (1) *pre-prepare* picks order of requests (2) *prepare* ensures order within views, (3) *commit* ensures order across views

(1) A client sends a request for a service to the primary













The algorithm has three main phases: (1) *pre-prepare* picks order of requests (2) *prepare* ensures order within views, (3) *commit* ensures order across views

(2) The primary multicasts the request to the backups













The algorithm has three main phases: (1) *pre-prepare* picks order of requests (2) *prepare* ensures order within views, (3) *commit* ensures order across views

(3) Backups multicast **PREPARE** message











The algorithm has three main phases: (1) *pre-prepare* picks order of requests (2) *prepare* ensures order within views, (3) *commit* ensures order across views

(4) If a replica receives at least 2f matching PREPARE message, multicasts a COMMIT message











The algorithm has three main phases: (1) *pre-prepare* picks order of requests (2) *prepare* ensures order within views, (3) *commit* ensures order across views

(5) If a replica receives at least 2f COMMIT messages, reply the result to the client





The algorithm has three main phases: (1) *pre-prepare* picks order of requests (2) *prepare* ensures order within views, (3) *commit* ensures order across views

(6) The client waits for f+1 replies from different replicas with the same result





#### PBFT Consensus

DSL

- Tolerates Byzantine (Malicious) failures
  - To make progress, at least 2/3 of the participants should be correct
  - Progress is not guaranteed (FLP impossibility)
- However, PBFT is **Permissioned** 
  - All participants should be known a priori
- Also, PBFT has high network overhead O(N<sup>2</sup>) [number of messages]
  - Every node multi-casts their responses to every other node

DSL



DSL





















#### DSL



#### Nakamoto's Consensus

- Intuitively, network nodes race to solve a puzzle
- This puzzle is computationally expensive
- Once a network node finds (mines) a solution:
  - It adds its block of transactions to the blockchain
  - It multi-casts the solution to other network nodes
  - Other network nodes accept and verify the solution





#### Mining Details





#### Mining Details
























































































• TX<sub>reward</sub> is bitcoin's way to create new coins









- TX<sub>reward</sub> is bitcoin's way to create new coins
- The reward value is halved every 4 years (210,000 blocks)







- TX<sub>reward</sub> is self signed (also called coinbase transaction)
- TX<sub>reward</sub> is bitcoin's way to create new coins
- The reward value is halved every 4 years (210,000 blocks)
- Currently, it's 12.5 Bitcoins per block







- TX<sub>reward</sub> is self signed (also called coinbase transaction)
- TX<sub>reward</sub> is bitcoin's way to create new coins
- The reward value is halved every 4 years (210,000 blocks)
- Currently, it's 12.5 Bitcoins per block
- Incentives network nodes to mine



Version

































# DSL at UCSB





• Adjust difficulty every 2016 blocks







- Adjust difficulty every 2016 blocks
- Expected 20160 mins to mine (10 mins per block)







- Adjust difficulty every 2016 blocks
- Expected 20160 mins to mine (10 mins per block)
- Actual time = timestamp of block 2016 time stamp of block 1







- Adjust difficulty every 2016 blocks
- Expected 20160 mins to mine (10 mins per block)
- Actual time = timestamp of block 2016 time stamp of block 1
- New\_difficulty = old\_difficulty \* expected/actual





- Adjust difficulty every 2016 blocks
- Expected 20160 mins to mine (10 mins per block)
- Actual time = timestamp of block 2016 time stamp of block 1
- New\_difficulty = old\_difficulty \* expected/actual
- Difficulty decreases if actual > expected, otherwise, increases





























• Find a nonce that results in SHA256(block) < Difficulty







- Find a nonce that results in SHA256(block) < Difficulty
- The solution space is a set. Once a solution is found, a block is mined







- Find a nonce that results in SHA256(block) < Difficulty
- The solution space is a set. Once a solution is found, a block is mined
- Easily verified by network nodes







- Find a nonce that results in SHA256(block) < Difficulty
- The solution space is a set. Once a solution is found, a block is mined
- Easily verified by network nodes
- Cannot be precomputed
  - Depends on current block transactions and previous blocks





- Find a nonce that results in SHA256(block) < Difficulty
- The solution space is a set. Once a solution is found, a block is mined
- Easily verified by network nodes
- Cannot be precomputed
  - Depends on current block transactions and previous blocks
- Cannot be stolen
  - Reward Transaction is signed to the public key of the miner





- Find a nonce that results in SHA256(block) < Difficulty
- The solution space is a set. Once a solution is found, a block is mined
- Easily verified by network nodes
- Cannot be precomputed
  - Depends on current block transactions and previous blocks
- Cannot be stolen
  - Reward Transaction is signed to the public key of the miner
- Network nodes accept the first found block:
  - The problem is difficult, there is no guaranteed bound to find another block




# Mining Details

- Find a nonce that results in SHA256(block) < Difficulty
- The solution space is a set. Once a solution is found, a block is mined
- Easily verified by network nodes
- Cannot be precomputed
  - Depends on current block transactions and previous blocks
- Cannot be stolen
  - Reward Transaction is signed to the public key of the miner
- Network nodes accept the first found block:
  - The problem is difficult, there is no guaranteed bound to find another block
- What happens when 2 nodes concurrently mine a block? Fork



Forks











• Transactions in the forked blocks might have conflicts







- Transactions in the forked blocks might have conflicts
- Could lead to double spending







- Transactions in the forked blocks might have conflicts
- Could lead to double spending







- Transactions in the forked blocks might have conflicts
- Could lead to double spending
- Forks have to be eliminated







- Transactions in the forked blocks might have conflicts
- Could lead to double spending
- Forks have to be eliminated



















UCSB



UCSB







UCSB















- If 51% of the computation (hash) power are malicious:
  - They can cooperate to fork the chain at any block
- Can lead to double spending







- If 51% of the computation (hash) power are malicious:
  - They can cooperate to fork the chain at any block
- Can lead to double spending







- If 51% of the computation (hash) power are malicious:
  - They can cooperate to fork the chain at any block
- Can lead to double spending







- If 51% of the computation (hash) power are malicious:
  - They can cooperate to fork the chain at any block
- Can lead to double spending







- If 51% of the computation (hash) power are malicious:
  - They can cooperate to fork the chain at any block
- Can lead to double spending







- If 51% of the computation (hash) power are malicious:
  - They can cooperate to fork the chain at any block
- Can lead to double spending







- If 51% of the computation (hash) power are malicious:
  - They can cooperate to fork the chain at any block
- Can lead to double spending







- If 51% of the computation (hash) power are malicious:
  - They can cooperate to fork the chain at any block
- Can lead to double spending







- If 51% of the computation (hash) power are malicious:
  - They can cooperate to fork the chain at any block
- Can lead to double spending







- If 51% of the computation (hash) power are malicious:
  - They can cooperate to fork the chain at any block
- Can lead to double spending

















































 Let honest miners waste their mining power on an obsolete block









- •
- ٠
- •
- Start mining the next block (Advantage) •

Selfish Miner


•





- •
- ٠ obsolete block
- Start mining the next block (Advantage) •
- If an honest miner finds a block, a selfish miner • immediately announces their found block





•





- •
- Let honest miners waste their mining power on an . obsolete block
- Start mining the next block (Advantage) •
- If an honest miner finds a block, a selfish miner • immediately announces their found block
- This splits the power of honest miners •









- Block found, yay!
- Don't immediately announce it
- Let honest miners waste their mining power on an obsolete block
- Start mining the next block (Advantage)
- If an honest miner finds a block, a selfish miner immediately announces their found block
- This splits the power of honest miners

Selfish Miner

Honest Miner

 $TX_1$  $TX_2$ 

TX<sub>n</sub>

 $TX_1$  $TX_2$ 









- Block found, yay! •
- Don't immediately announce it •
- Let honest miners waste their mining power on an . obsolete block
- Start mining the next block (Advantage) •
- If an honest miner finds a block, a selfish miner • immediately announces their found block
- This splits the power of honest miners •







- Block found, yay! •
- Don't immediately announce it •
- Let honest miners waste their mining power on an . obsolete block
- Start mining the next block (Advantage) •
- If an honest miner finds a block, a selfish miner • immediately announces their found block
- This splits the power of honest miners •









- Block found, yay!
- Don't immediately announce it
- Let honest miners waste their mining power on an obsolete block
- Start mining the next block (Advantage)
- If an honest miner finds a block, a selfish miner immediately announces their found block
- This splits the power of honest miners





•

•

.

•

•

•

immediately announces their found block

This splits the power of honest miners







 $TX_2$ 

TX<sub>n</sub>

Block found, yay! •

 $TX_1$ 

 $TX_2$ 

TX<sub>n</sub>

- Don't immediately announce it •
- Let honest miners waste their mining power on an . obsolete block
- Start mining the next block (Advantage) •
- If an honest miner finds a block, a selfish miner • immediately announces their found block
- This splits the power of honest miners •

Eyal, Ittay, and Emin Gün Sirer. "Majority is not enough: Bitcoin mining is vulnerable." Communications of the ACM 61.7 (2018): 95-102.

Selfish Miner

 $TX_2$ 



Eyal, Ittay, and Emin Gün Sirer. "Majority is not enough: Bitcoin mining is vulnerable." Communications of the ACM 61.7 (2018): 95-102.



- If an honest miner finds a block, a selfish miner immediately announces their found block
- This splits the power of honest miners



- If an honest miner finds a block, a selfish miner immediately announces their found block
- This splits the power of honest miners

Selfish Miner



- If an honest miner finds a block, a selfish miner immediately announces their found block
- This splits the power of honest miners





## DSL at UCSB





• High transaction-confirmation latency







- High transaction-confirmation latency
- Probabilistic consistency guarantees







- High transaction-confirmation latency
- Probabilistic consistency guarantees
- Very low TPS (Transactions per second) average of 3 to 7 TPS





- High transaction-confirmation latency
- Probabilistic consistency guarantees
- Very low TPS (Transactions per second) average of 3 to 7 TPS
- New block added every **10 minutes**.





## DSL at UCSB





• Two obvious options for increasing Bitcoin's transaction throughput:





• Two obvious options for increasing Bitcoin's transaction throughput: increase the size of blocks, or decrease the block interval





- Two obvious options for increasing Bitcoin's transaction throughput: increase the size of blocks, or decrease the block interval
- Why they don't work?



- Two obvious options for increasing Bitcoin's transaction throughput: increase the size of blocks, or decrease the block interval
- Why they don't work?
  - Decreases fairness giving large miners an advantage



- Two obvious options for increasing Bitcoin's transaction throughput: increase the size of blocks, or decrease the block interval
- Why they don't work?
  - Decreases fairness giving large miners an advantage
  - Requires more storage space and verification time



- Two obvious options for increasing Bitcoin's transaction throughput: increase the size of blocks, or decrease the block interval
- Why they don't work?
  - Decreases fairness giving large miners an advantage
  - Requires more storage space and verification time
  - Leads to higher number of **forks**

DSL



# Bitcoin Alternatives





### DSL at UCSB





 All solutions want to increase txn throughput by reducing consensus amongst all nodes to smaller set of nodes







• All solutions want to increase txn throughput by reducing consensus amongst all nodes to smaller set of nodes







• All solutions want to increase txn throughput by reducing consensus amongst all nodes to smaller set of nodes







• All solutions want to increase txn throughput by reducing consensus amongst all nodes to smaller set of nodes







 All solutions want to increase txn throughput by reducing consensus amongst all nodes to smaller set of nodes



DSL



### **SOLUTION 1**







#### Bitcoin NG (Next Generation)

## DSL at UCSB





#### Bitcoin NG (Next Generation)

• Bitcoin is **retrospective**: a block encases transactions from preceding 10 minutes.



#### DSL



#### Bitcoin NG (Next Generation)

- Bitcoin is **retrospective**: a block encases transactions from preceding 10 minutes.
- Bitcoin NG is **forward-looking**: elect a leader every 10 minutes and the leader vets for future transactions as they occur.





#### Bitcoin NG (Next Generation)

- Bitcoin is **retrospective**: a block encases transactions from preceding 10 minutes.
- Bitcoin NG is **forward-looking**: elect a leader every 10 minutes and the leader vets for future transactions as they occur.

Eyal, Ittay, et al. "Bitcoin-NG: A Scalable Blockchain Protocol." NSDI. 2016.




# Bitcoin NG: Keyblocks and Microblocks

# DSL at UCSB



# Bitcoin NG: Keyblocks and Microblocks

Observation: In Bitcoin, blocks provide two purpose: <u>consensus</u> and <u>txn verification</u>



# Bitcoin NG: Keyblocks and Microblocks

Observation: In Bitcoin, blocks provide two purpose: <u>consensus</u> and <u>txn verification</u>



# Bitcoin NG: Keyblocks and Microblocks

Observation: In Bitcoin, blocks provide two purpose: <u>consensus</u> and <u>txn verification</u>

<u>Keyblocks</u>: Used for Leader Election and created using Proof-of-work





# Bitcoin NG: Keyblocks and Microblocks

Observation: In Bitcoin, blocks provide two purpose: <u>consensus</u> and <u>txn verification</u>

<u>Keyblocks</u>: Used for Leader Election and created using Proof-of-work





## Bitcoin NG: Keyblocks and Microblocks

Observation: In Bitcoin, blocks provide two purpose: <u>consensus</u> and <u>txn verification</u>

<u>Keyblocks</u>: Used for Leader Election and created using Proof-of-work <u>Microblocks</u>: Contains txns and is generated by the epoch leader, signed by leader's private key







































































# DSL at UCSB













Fees



















• Encourages next leader to mine on top of the latest microblock







- Encourages next leader to mine on top of the latest microblock
- Current leader should be motivated to add more microblocks instead of 'hiding' them



### Forks in BitcoinNG

# DSL at UCSB





• Since microblocks generated **cheaply** and **quickly** by the leader







- Since microblocks generated **cheaply** and **quickly** by the leader
- → leads to **forks** on most leader switches causing **double spending**







- Since microblocks generated **cheaply** and **quickly** by the leader
- → leads to **forks** on most leader switches causing **double spending**







- Since microblocks generated **cheaply** and **quickly** by the leader
- → leads to **forks** on most leader switches causing **double spending**







- Since microblocks generated **cheaply** and **quickly** by the leader
- → leads to **forks** on most leader switches causing **double spending**







- Since microblocks generated **cheaply** and **quickly** by the leader
- → leads to **forks** on most leader switches causing **double spending**







- Since microblocks generated **cheaply** and **quickly** by the leader
- → leads to **forks** on most leader switches causing **double spending**







# DSL at UCSB





• Does **not** provide **strong consistency** guarantees







- Does **not** provide **strong consistency** guarantees
- Does not eliminate selfish mining by a malicious leader







- Does **not** provide **strong consistency** guarantees
- Does not eliminate selfish mining by a malicious leader
- Still has delay in commitment






#### Bitcoin-NG review

- Does **not** provide **strong consistency** guarantees
- Does not eliminate selfish mining by a malicious leader
- Still has delay in commitment
- But provides key insight in increasing throughput and reducing latency due to block separation







# **SOLUTION 2**





# Enhancing Bitcoin Security & Performance With Strong Consistency via Collective Signing





Enhancing Bitcoin Security & Performance With Strong Consistency via Collective Signing

To commit Bitcoin transactions irreversibly(strong consistency) within seconds





Enhancing Bitcoin Security & Performance With Strong Consistency via Collective Signing

To commit Bitcoin transactions irreversibly(strong consistency) within seconds

ByzCoin = Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance + Collective Signing



Enhancing Bitcoin Security & Performance With Strong Consistency via Collective Signing

To commit Bitcoin transactions irreversibly(strong consistency) within seconds

#### ByzCoin = Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance + Collective Signing

Kogias, Eleftherios Kokoris, et al. "Enhancing bitcoin security and performance with strong consistency via collective signing." *25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 16)*. 2016.





# DSL at UCSB







- Naïve, unrealistic but simple: PBFT + Bitcoin







- Naïve, unrealistic but simple: PBFT + Bitcoin

- **TRUSTEES**: 3*f*+1 replicas, at max *f* faulty





- Naïve, unrealistic but simple: PBFT + Bitcoin

- **TRUSTEES**: 3*f*+1 replicas, at max *f* faulty

- Trustees run PBFT to decide next block





- Naïve, unrealistic but simple: PBFT + Bitcoin

- **TRUSTEES**: 3*f*+1 replicas, at max *f* faulty

- Trustees run PBFT to decide next block

- COMMUNICATION COMPLEXITY : O(n<sup>2</sup>)

#### **DSL** Using PBFT for Bitcoin's open membership



# DSL at UCSB









# Using PBFT for Bitcoin's open membership Step 1: Opening the Consensus Group

• Fixed size dynamically changing sliding **SHARE window** 





- Fixed size dynamically changing sliding **SHARE window**
- Incentive = new block's transaction fee split by consensus group



- Fixed size dynamically changing sliding **SHARE window**
- Incentive = new block's transaction fee split by consensus group
- Voting power of miner = No. of blocks the miner has successfully mined in the current window



- Fixed size dynamically changing sliding **SHARE window**
- Incentive = new block's transaction fee split by consensus group
- Voting power of miner = No. of blocks the miner has successfully mined in the current window
- Last miner is leader. Leader proposes the block



### Step 1. ByzCoin's blockchain

# DSL at UCSB



































# Step 2: Decoupling Txn Verification from Leader Election





# Step 2: Decoupling Txn Verification from Leader Election













• 2 different kinds of blocks:





# Step 2: Decoupling Txn Verification from Leader Election

• 2 different kinds of blocks:





# Step 2: Decoupling Txn Verification from Leader Election

• 2 different kinds of blocks:





# Step 2: Decoupling Txn Verification from Leader Election

• 2 different kinds of blocks:




## Step 2: Decoupling Txn Verification from Leader Election

• 2 different kinds of blocks:



- Key blocks are created by mining PoW
- PBFT is used to obtain consensus on Micro blocks



## Step 2: Decoupling Txn Verification from Leader Election

• 2 different kinds of blocks:



- Key blocks are created by mining PoW
- PBFT is used to obtain consensus on Micro blocks
- To avoid race condition, separate keyblock chain from microblock chain







**DSL** 

• Every microblock should be signed by a majority of current trustees



- Every microblock should be signed by a majority of current trustees
- Byzcoin adapts a leader-based approach Collective Signing





- Every microblock should be signed by a majority of current trustees
- Byzcoin adapts a leader-based approach Collective Signing
- Leader requests that statements be publicly validated and co-signed by decentralized group of witnesses



- Every microblock should be signed by a majority of current trustees
- Byzcoin adapts a leader-based approach Collective Signing
- Leader requests that statements be publicly validated and co-signed by decentralized group of witnesses
- Optimize Schnorr multi-signatures using communication trees



- Every microblock should be signed by a majority of current trustees
- Byzcoin adapts a leader-based approach Collective Signing
- Leader requests that statements be publicly validated and co-signed by decentralized group of witnesses
- Optimize Schnorr multi-signatures using communication trees
- Communication complexity: O(N)



DSL

- Every microblock should be signed by a majority of current trustees
- Byzcoin adapts a leader-based approach Collective Signing
- Leader requests that statements be publicly validated and co-signed by decentralized group of witnesses
- Optimize Schnorr multi-signatures using communication trees
- Communication complexity: O(N)

SYTA, E., TAMAS, I., VISHER, D., WOLINSKY, D. I., L., GAILLY, N., KHOFFI, I., AND FORD, B. Keeping Authorities "Honest or Bust" with Decentralized Witness Cosigning. In 37th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (May 2016).





























### Step 4: Using CoSi to achieve PBFT





### Step 4: Using CoSi to achieve PBFT

Announcement





## Step 4: Using CoSi to achieve PBFT

Announcement









































## Step 4: Using CoSi to achieve PBFT



Response










#### Step 4: Using CoSi to achieve PBFT

# DSL at UCSB





#### Step 4: Using CoSi to achieve PBFT

• **PBFT** is made scalable to thousands of nodes by clubbing with CoSi





#### Step 4: Using CoSi to achieve PBFT

- **PBFT** is made **scalable** to thousands of nodes by clubbing with **CoSi**
- Need two-third super majority signatures in each phase





#### Step 4: Using CoSi to achieve PBFT

- **PBFT** is made **scalable** to thousands of nodes by clubbing with **CoSi**
- Need two-third super majority signatures in each phase
- Double spending by malicious leader circumvented due to overlap in the two phases on CoSi





# DSL at UCSB







































DSL



















SB





• Forks in microblock chain not possible due to **PBFT** 





- Forks in microblock chain not possible due to **PBFT**
- But **forks** possible in **keyblock** chain





- Forks in microblock chain not possible due to **PBFT**
- But **forks** possible in **keyblock** chain





- Forks in microblock chain not possible due to **PBFT**
- But **forks** possible in **keyblock** chain

#### How to resolve keyblock conflicts?

Deterministic function to decide on one of the contending forks

SB





















#### **SOLUTION 3**



#### DSL Elastico



#### A Secure Sharding Protocol For Open Blockchains



#### **DSL Elastico** A Secure Sharding Protocol For Open Blockchains



## DPF ST NC2R







Scale Bitcoin-like cryptocurrency by adapting 'shards'

Uniformly partitions the mining network into smaller committees, each of which processes a disjoint set of txns (or 'shards')





Scale Bitcoin-like cryptocurrency by adapting 'shards'

Uniformly partitions the mining network into smaller committees, each of which processes a disjoint set of txns (or 'shards')

Luu, Loi, et al. "A secure sharding protocol for open blockchains." *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2016.





#### Sharding in Elastico

# DSL at UCSB


# Sharding in Elastico

# **Been Stat UCSB**



# Sharding in Elastico

# Network of nodes DSLatUCSB



# Sharding in Elastico

# Se at UCSB





# Sharding in Elastico

# 





# Sharding in Elastico

# Committees





















### Naïve Strawman Solution

# DSL at UCSB

# Naïve Strawman Solution

- The list of nodes is known for each epoch
- Common random coin



# Naïve Strawman Solution

Assumptions:

- The list of nodes is known for each epoch
- Common random coin



H(coin || PK)

SB



# Naïve Strawman Solution

- The list of nodes is known for each epoch
- Common random coin





# Naïve Strawman Solution

- The list of nodes is known for each epoch
- Common random coin





# Naïve Strawman Solution

- The list of nodes is known for each epoch
- Common random coin





# Step 1: Identity establishment

# DSL at UCSB





# Step 1: Identity establishment





# Step 1: Identity establishment





# Step 1: Identity establishment





# Step 1: Identity establishment





# Step 1: Identity establishment

#### ID = H(epochRandomness || IP || PK || nonce) < D



The last **s** bits of ID specifies which (**s**-bit) committee id the node belongs to



# Step 1: Committee assignment based on ID

# DSL at UCSB



Node	ID	
1	000001101	
2	000001110	
3	000000010	
4	000001001	





Node	ID	1
1	000001101	
2	000001110	
3	000000010	
4	000001001	/

















# DSL at UCSB





How to **identify** other committee members?





How to **identify** other committee members?

• Naïve solution: Broadcast to all





How to **identify** other committee members?

• Naïve solution: **Broadcast** to all





How to **identify** other committee members?

• Naïve solution: **Broadcast** to all

Complexity O(n<sup>2</sup>)

• A special committee: **Directories** of size *c* 





How to **identify** other committee members?

• Naïve solution: **Broadcast** to all

Complexity O(n<sup>2</sup>)

• A special committee: **Directories** of size *c* Complexity **O(nc)** 



### Step 2: Directory committees

# DSL at UCSB





# Step 2: Directory committees

Directory server



Directory server



First *c* identities become directory servers






**Directory server** 



Directory server



First *c* identities become directory servers

Latter nodes send IDs to directories













Directory server







Directory server





Latter nodes send IDs to directories

First *c* identities become

directory servers





Directory server





Latter nodes send IDs to directories

First *c* identities become

directory servers

Directories send committee list to nodes















## Step 3: Block Proposals Within Committees

# DSL at UCSB



## Step 3: Block Proposals Within Committees





## Step 3: Block Proposals Within Committees

• Run classical **Byzantine agreement** protocol



## Step 3: Block Proposals Within Committees

SB

• Run classical Byzantine agreement protocol

DSL

• Members agree and sign on **one** set of txns



## Step 3: Block Proposals Within Committees

SB

• Run classical Byzantine agreement protocol

DSL

• Members agree and sign on **one** set of txns



## Step 3: Block Proposals Within Committees

- Run classical Byzantine agreement protocol
- Members agree and sign on **one** set of txns
- # of messages O(c<sup>2</sup>)

DSL





### Step 4: Final Committee

## DSL at UCSB





• A special committee to finalize on the next block







- A special committee to finalize on the next block
- Why??







- A special committee to finalize on the next block
- Why??
- To avoid forks SL at UCSB





- A **special** committee to **finalize** on the next block
- Why??
- To avoid forks
- To verify if each committee block is signed by enough committee members





- A **special** committee to **finalize** on the next block
- Why??
- To avoid forks
- To verify if each committee block is signed by enough committee members

• To generate random values for next epoch



































## **SOLUTION 4**



SB

# DSL at UCSB



To commit txns with low latency and scale to many users by avoiding forks





To commit txns with low latency and scale to many users by avoiding forks

A new Byzantine Agreement protocol (**BA\***) to reach consensus on the next set of txns



## To commit txns with low latency and scale to many users by avoiding forks

A new Byzantine Agreement protocol (**BA\***) to reach consensus on the next set of txns

Gilad, Yossi, et al. "Algorand: Scaling byzantine agreements for cryptocurrencies." *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. ACM, 2017.





### Algorand: Goals

# DSL at UCSB





### Algorand: Goals

• Prevents Sybil attacks







### Algorand: Goals

- Prevents Sybil attacks
  - → By using Weighted users proportional to money in their account






- Prevents Sybil attacks
  - → By using Weighted users proportional to money in their account
- Scalability DSL at UCSB





• Prevents Sybil attacks

→ By using Weighted users proportional to money in their account

Scalability
→ Use of BA\*: Runs consensus on a small set of nodes





• Prevents Sybil attacks

→ By using Weighted users proportional to money in their account

Scalability

 $\rightarrow$  Use of **BA**\*: Runs consensus on a small set of nodes

Resilient to denial of service





• Prevents Sybil attacks

→ By using Weighted users proportional to money in their account

Scalability

 $\rightarrow$  Use of **BA**\*: Runs consensus on a small set of nodes

- Resilient to denial of service
  - → Randomly choose committee using Cryptographic Sortition based on weight





• Prevents Sybil attacks

→ By using Weighted users proportional to money in their account

Scalability

 $\rightarrow$  Use of **BA**\*: Runs consensus on a small set of nodes

- Resilient to denial of service
  - → Randomly choose committee using Cryptographic Sortition based on weight
  - → **Replace** participants after each round

DSL



#### Algorand: Assumptions

# DSL at UCSB



#### Algorand: Assumptions

Honest majority of money \$\$





#### Algorand: Assumptions

- Honest majority of money \$\$
- An adversary cannot manipulate the network at large scale



#### Algorand: Assumptions

- Honest majority of money \$\$
- An adversary cannot manipulate the network at large scale

#### Strong synchrony

Tolerates temporary asynchronous network but must be followed by a longer synchronous network

DSL



#### Algorand: Overview

# DSL at UCSB





• Gossip protocol







• Gossip protocol





• Gossip protocol



#### DSL

- Gossip protocol
  - Each node collects pending txns

	SB
Gossip	
1 2 3	
ULDD	

#### DSL

- Gossip protocol
  - Each node collects pending txns







- Gossip protocol
- Block proposal







- Gossip protocol
- Block proposal







- Gossip protocol
- Block proposal
  - Sortition ensures **small fraction** of users selected based on their **weights**

Cryptographic Sortition





- Gossip protocol
- Block proposal
  - Sortition ensures **small fraction** of users selected based on their **weights**



SB



- Gossip protocol
- Block proposal
  - Sortition ensures **small fraction** of users selected based on their **weights**

Cryptographic Sortition





- Gossip protocol
- Block proposal
  - Sortition ensures **small fraction** of users selected based on their **weights**
  - Provides *proof* of selection and *priority* for each block









- Gossip protocol
- Block proposal
  - Sortition ensures small fraction of users selected based on their weights
  - Provides *proof* of selection and *priority* for each block





- Gossip protocol
- Block proposal
  - Sortition ensures small fraction of users selected based on their weights
  - Provides *proof* of selection and *priority* for each block







- Gossip protocol
- Block proposal
  - Sortition ensures **small fraction** of users selected based on their **weights**
  - Provides *proof* of selection and *priority* for each block



SB



- Gossip protocol
- Block proposal
  - Sortition ensures small fraction of users selected based on their weights
  - Provides *proof* of selection and *priority* for each block
- Agreement using BA\*







# DSL at UCSB





• Two phase protocol







- Two phase protocol
  - Phase 1: 2 steps





# UCSB

# BA\* Overview

- Two phase protocol
  - Phase 1: 2 steps
  - Phase 2: 2 11 steps





- Two phase protocol
  - Phase 1: 2 steps
  - Phase 2: 2 11 steps
- Each step calls **Sortition** to create a committee





- Two phase protocol
  - Phase 1: 2 steps
  - Phase 2: 2 11 steps
- Each step calls **Sortition** to create a committee
- Each committee member will broadcast their vote for their block



- Two phase protocol
  - Phase 1: 2 steps
  - Phase 2: 2 11 steps
- Each step calls **Sortition** to create a committee
- Each committee member will **broadcast** their **vote** for their block
  - Vote for highest priority block



- Two phase protocol
  - Phase 1: 2 steps
  - Phase 2: 2 11 steps
- Each step calls **Sortition** to create a committee
- Each committee member will **broadcast** their **vote** for their block
  - Vote for highest priority block
  - All users can see this message



- Two phase protocol
  - Phase 1: 2 steps
  - Phase 2: 2 11 steps
- Each step calls **Sortition** to create a committee
- Each committee member will **broadcast** their **vote** for their block
  - Vote for highest priority block
  - All users can see this message
- Users that receive more than a threshold of votes for a block will hold onto that block




DSL



# ATOMIC SWAPS DSL at UCSB









#### Atomic Swaps

- Allow transactions to span multiple blockchains
  - E.g., swap Bitcoin with Ethereum
- The goal:
  - Swap assets across multiple blockchains
- If all parties conform to the protocol:
  - All swaps take place
  - If some coalition deviates from the protocol, then no conforming party ends up worse off
  - No coalition has an incentive to deviate from the protocol

<u>TierNolan</u>, Atomic swap using cut and choose, <u>https://bitcointalk.org/index.php?topic=193281.msg2224949#msg2224949</u> (2013) Herlihy, Maurice. "Atomic cross-chain swaps." *PODC 2018* 





#### Atomic Swaps

- Exchanges enable trading among different cryptocurrenices
  - Usually happens through USD (\$)
- Exchanges make the system centralised
- Atomic swaps allow trading different assets without an arbiter
- Atomic swaps use:
  - Smart Contracts
  - Hashlocks
  - Timelocks





#### Smart Contracts

- Digital self-executing contract
- Stores rules for negotiating the terms of an agreement
- Automatically verifies fulfillment, and then executes the agreed terms
- E.g., move 10 Bitcoins from Alice to Bob if Bob provides a secret (s)
- Contracts are published in the blockchain
- Contracts are executed if its conditions are met
  - Bob provides secret (s) to the contract





- Landowner wants to rent out her place to a tenant
  - Send house unlock code to Tenant if they transfer funds to landowner







Blockchain

#### Example

• Publish Contract in the blockchain







• Tenant transfers funds to landowner































Hashlock h







- Hashlock h
  - Transfer X Bitcoins from Alice to Bob if Bob provides a secret s such that h = H(s)
  - H is a cryptographic one-way hash function
  - The contract irrevocably transfers ownership of X Bitcoins from Alice to Bob





- Hashlock h
  - Transfer X Bitcoins from Alice to Bob if Bob provides a secret s such that h = H(s)
  - H is a cryptographic one-way hash function
  - The contract irrevocably transfers ownership of X Bitcoins from Alice to Bob
- Timelock t





- Hashlock h
  - Transfer X Bitcoins from Alice to Bob if Bob provides a secret s such that h = H(s)
  - H is a cryptographic one-way hash function
  - The contract irrevocably transfers ownership of X Bitcoins from Alice to Bob
- Timelock t
  - If Bob fails to produce that s before time t elapses, then X Bitcoins are refunded to Alice



































Bitcoin blockchain







Bitcoin blockchain







• Now, h is announced in Bitcoin blockchain and made public

Bitcoin blockchain







• Now, h is announced in Bitcoin blockchain and made public

Bitcoin blockchain







• Now, h is announced in Bitcoin blockchain and made public







• Now, h is announced in Bitcoin blockchain and made public







• Now, for Alice to execute T<sub>2</sub> and redeem Y Ethereum, she reveals s



----- T<sub>2</sub>

Bob

Bob's Y Ethereum are locked in T<sub>2</sub>'s smart contract

Bitcoin blockchain



Alice's X bitcoins are locked in T<sub>1</sub>'s smart contract

Alice

S





• Now, for Alice to execute T<sub>2</sub> and redeem Y Ethereum, she reveals s







• Now, for Alice to execute T<sub>2</sub> and redeem Y Ethereum, she reveals s







• Revealing s, executes T<sub>2</sub>. Now s is public in Ethereum's blockchain

Ethereum blockchain



Bob

Bob's Y Ethereum are locked in T<sub>2</sub>'s smart contract

Bitcoin blockchain



Alice's X bitcoins are locked in T<sub>1</sub>'s smart contract

Alice





• Now, Bob uses s to execute T<sub>1</sub> and redeem his Bitcoins

Ethereum blockchain



smart contract

Bob

Bitcoin blockchain



Alice's X bitcoins are locked in T<sub>1</sub>'s smart contract

Alice





• Now, Bob uses s to execute T<sub>1</sub> and redeem his Bitcoins

Ethereum blockchain



Bob's Y Ethereum are locked in T<sub>2</sub>'s smart contract

Bitcoin blockchain



Alice's X bitcoins are locked in T<sub>1</sub>'s smart contract

Alice

Bob





## Atomic Swap Example: What can go wrong?

• Alice locks her X Bitcoins in Bitcoin's blockchain through T<sub>1</sub>



#### DSL



# Atomic Swap Example: What can go wrong?

- Alice locks her X Bitcoins in Bitcoin's blockchain through T<sub>1</sub>
- Bob sees T<sub>1</sub> but refuses to insert T<sub>2</sub>



#### DSL



# Atomic Swap Example: What can go wrong?

- Alice locks her X Bitcoins in Bitcoin's blockchain through T<sub>1</sub>
- Bob sees T<sub>1</sub> but refuses to insert T<sub>2</sub>
- Now, Alice's Bitcoins are locked for good
  - A conforming party (Alice) ends up worse off because Bob doesn't follow the protocol


# Atomic Swap Example: What can go wrong?

- Alice locks her X Bitcoins in Bitcoin's blockchain through T<sub>1</sub>
- Bob sees T<sub>1</sub> but refuses to insert T<sub>2</sub>
- Now, Alice's Bitcoins are locked for good
  - A conforming party (Alice) ends up worse off because Bob doesn't follow the protocol
- Prevention
  - Use timelocks to expire a contract
  - Specify that an expired contract is refunded to the creator of this contract





## Atomic Swap Example: Timelocks





# Atomic Swap Example: Timelocks





# Atomic Swap Example: Timelocks

 $T_4$ : Refund  $T_2$  to Bob if Alice does not execute  $T_2$  before **24** hours

 $T_2$ : Move Y Ethereum to Alice if Alice provides secret s | h = H(s) T<sub>3</sub>: Refund T<sub>1</sub> to Alice if Bob does not execute T<sub>1</sub> before **48** hours T<sub>1</sub>: Move X bitcoins to Bob if Bob provides secret s | h = H(s)



# Atomic Swap Example: Timelocks

 $T_4$ : Refund  $T_2$  to Bob if Alice does not execute  $T_2$  before 24 hours

 $T_2$ : Move Y Ethereum to Alice if Alice provides secret s | h = H(s) T<sub>3</sub>: Refund T<sub>1</sub> to Alice if Bob does not execute T<sub>1</sub> before 48 hours T<sub>1</sub>: Move X bitcoins to Bob if Bob provides secret s | h = H(s)



# Atomic Swap Example: Timelocks

#### How to determine the time period of a timelock?

 $T_4$ : Refund  $T_2$  to Bob if Alice does not execute  $T_2$  before 24 hours

 $T_2$ : Move Y Ethereum to Alice if Alice provides secret s | h = H(s)

Bob

T<sub>3</sub>: Refund T<sub>1</sub> to Alice if Bob does not execute T<sub>1</sub> before 48 hours T<sub>1</sub>: Move X bitcoins to Bob if Bob provides secret s | h = H(s)





### Timelocks

Bob

- Timelocks are set to prevent any conforming party to end up worse off
- If Alice sets her timelock to 12 hours and Bob to 24 hours
  - Alice can wait until her contract expires (gets a refund)
  - Then, Alice executes T<sub>2</sub> claiming T<sub>2</sub>'s Ethereum coins

 $T_4$ : Refund  $T_2$  to Bob if Alice does not execute  $T_2$  before **24** hours

T<sub>2</sub>: Move Y Ethereum to Alice if Alice provides secret s | h = H(s)

T<sub>3</sub>: Refund T<sub>1</sub> to Alice if Bob does not execute T<sub>1</sub> before **12** hours T<sub>1</sub>: Move X bitcoins to Bob if Bob provides secret s  $\mid$  h = H(s)







### Timelocks

Bob

- Bob's timelock should be set to achieve the following:
  - Forces Alice to reveal **s** before Alice's contract expires
  - Allows enough time for Bob to execute T<sub>1</sub> after Alice executes T<sub>2</sub>
  - If Alice does not reveal s, both contracts should expire and be refunded

T<sub>4</sub>: Refund T<sub>2</sub> to Bob if Alice does not execute T<sub>2</sub> before **24** hours

 $T_2$ : Move Y Ethereum to Alice if Alice provides secret s | h = H(s)









### Atomic Swap Modeling

• A cross-chain swap is modeled as a directed graph D = (V,A)







- A cross-chain swap is modeled as a directed graph D = (V,A)
- Vertices V are parties and arcs A are proposed asset transfers







- A cross-chain swap is modeled as a directed graph D = (V,A)
- Vertices V are parties and arcs A are proposed asset transfers
- Assumptions:
  - Every party is rational
    - E.g., Bob sets his timelock to 6 hours instead of 24 hours



- A cross-chain swap is modeled as a directed graph D = (V,A)
- Vertices V are parties and arcs A are proposed asset transfers
- Assumptions:
  - Every party is rational
    - E.g., Bob sets his timelock to 6 hours instead of 24 hours
  - The directed graph must be strongly connected
    - There is a path between any two pairs of nodes



- A cross-chain swap is modeled as a directed graph D = (V,A)
- Vertices V are parties and arcs A are proposed asset transfers
- Assumptions:
  - Every party is rational
    - E.g., Bob sets his timelock to 6 hours instead of 24 hours
  - The directed graph must be strongly connected
    - There is a path between any two pairs of nodes
  - There is known time bound  ${\boldsymbol \Delta}$ 
    - A should be enough for one party to publish a contract to a blockchain and for a second party to confirm that the contract has been published



- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin





- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin









- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin





- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin





- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin





- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin





- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin





- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin





- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin





- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin





- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin





- Alice wants to buy Carol's car with Bitcoins
- Carol wants to sell her car for Ethereum
- Luckily, Bob wants to exchange Ethereum for Bitcoin















































### Multi-party Atomic Swap Example Δ Δ Δ Δ A-B B-C C-A A С B


#### Multi-party Atomic Swap Example Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ A-B B-C C-A A С B



#### Multi-party Atomic Swap Example Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ A-B B-C C-A A C B



#### Multi-party Atomic Swap Example Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ A-B B-C C-A A 2Δ 6Δ 4Δ C B



# Multi-party Atomic Swap Example

• v' is the leader (A in this case)





- v' is the leader (A in this case)
- D(v, v') the length of the longest path from node v to v'





- v' is the leader (A in this case)
- D(v, v') the length of the longest path from node v to v'
- D(A, A) = 0, D(B, A) = 2, D(C, A) = 1





- v' is the leader (A in this case)
- D(v, v') the length of the longest path from node v to v'
- D(A, A) = 0, D(B, A) = 2, D(C, A) = 1
- Diam(D) is the diameter of Graph D
  - Longest path from one node to another (including itself)
  - Diam(D) = 3





- v' is the leader (A in this case)
- D(v, v') the length of the longest path from node v to v'
- D(A, A) = 0, D(B, A) = 2, D(C, A) = 1
- Diam(D) is the diameter of Graph D
  - Longest path from one node to another (including itself)
  - Diam(D) = 3
- Hashlock on  $(u,v) = 2 \cdot (D(v, v') + 1) \cdot \Delta$





- v' is the leader (A in this case)
- D(v, v') the length of the longest path from node v to v'
- D(A, A) = 0, D(B, A) = 2, D(C, A) = 1
- Diam(D) is the diameter of Graph D
  - Longest path from one node to another (including itself)
  - Diam(D) = 3
- Hashlock on  $(u,v) = 2 \cdot (D(v, v') + 1) \cdot \Delta$
- D(v, v') + 1 [path from u to v'] creation path





- v' is the leader (A in this case)
- D(v, v') the length of the longest path from node v to v'
- D(A, A) = 0, D(B, A) = 2, D(C, A) = 1
- Diam(D) is the diameter of Graph D
  - Longest path from one node to another (including itself)
  - Diam(D) = 3
- Hashlock on  $(u,v) = 2 \cdot (D(v, v') + 1) \cdot \Delta$
- D(v, v') + 1 [path from u to v'] creation path
- D(v, v') + 1 [path from v' to u] redemption path





#### Multi-party Atomic Swap Example Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ A-B B-C C-A A **′**4∆ 6Δ 5Δ B



#### Multi-party Atomic Swap Example Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ A-B B-C C-A • Hashlock on $(u,v) = (Diam(D) + D(v, v') + 1) \cdot \Delta$ A ∕4∆ 6Δ 5Δ B



- Hashlock on  $(u,v) = (Diam(D) + D(v, v') + 1) \cdot \Delta$
- Hashlock on A-B =  $(3 + 2 + 1) \cdot \Delta = 6\Delta$







- Hashlock on  $(u,v) = (Diam(D) + D(v, v') + 1) \cdot \Delta$
- Hashlock on A-B =  $(3 + 2 + 1) \cdot \Delta = 6\Delta$
- Hashlock on B-C =  $(3 + 1 + 1) \cdot \Delta = 5\Delta$







- Hashlock on  $(u,v) = (Diam(D) + D(v, v') + 1) \cdot \Delta$
- Hashlock on A-B =  $(3 + 2 + 1) \cdot \Delta = 6\Delta$
- Hashlock on B-C =  $(3 + 1 + 1) \cdot \Delta = 5\Delta$
- Hashlock on C-A = (3 + 0 + 1).  $\Delta = 4\Delta$





# Lightning Network







# What is Lightning Network?

"Lightning is a decentralized network using smart contract functionality in the blockchain to enable instant payments across a network of participants."



https://lightning.network/



# The Setting: Two-party transactions

- Alice and Bob frequently need to transact with each other:
  - Alice → Bob: \$x

Bob → Alice: \$y

Ο

...

- Each of the above transaction can be put on-chain.
- Is there an alternative?





# The Idea of Lightening

- Frequent two-party interactions can be modeled as off-chain transactions.
- On-chain interaction only to establish payment channels between Alice and Bob.
- The key challenge:
  - Off-chain interactions must remain honest, i.e., prevent Alice or Bob trying to cheat each other.





## Outline of the protocol

- 1. Open a bidirectional channel
  - a. Both parties make deposits to a shard on-chain wallet
- 2. Initiate a transaction by making a contract
  - a. Signed by both parties
- 3. Update the contract when making more transactions
  - a. Keep exchanging the updated contract off-chain
- 4. Push the most updated contract to the blockchain to withdraw
  - a. Thus the bidirectional channel is closed





#### Building Block #1: Transactions







#### Building Block #2: Double Spend



# Building Block #3: Multi-signature (2-of-2)

DSL

SB





### Building Block #4: TimeLock





### Building Block #5: Hash Values & Secrets

From: Someone	2 BTC	From: Alice	2 BTC
Signed:		Alice sign here:	
Someo	ne	Alice	~
To: Alice	2 BTC	To: Bob	2 BTC



# Lightning Network < high level protocol>





# Lightning Network < high level protocol>





# Lightning Network < high level protocol>







# Alice → Bob: \$2.0

- Alice sends \$3.0 to herself,
- \$7.0 to a multisig address:
  - can be unlocked by Bob on his own, but after 1000 blocks have been mined
  - Or, it can be opened by Alice on her own, but only if she includes the S of H(S) from Bob.
- Alice signs her end of this commitment transaction, and gives it to Bob.
- Bob does the same: \$7.0 to himself; and \$3.0 to multisig address with TimeLock & HashLock.



# Alice → Bob: \$2.0 (contd.)

- Both Alice and Bob could sign and broadcast the half-valid transaction.
- If Alice does:
  - Bob gets \$7.0 immediately but Alice must wait for 1000 blocks
- If Bob does:
  - Alice get \$3.0 immediately but Bob must wait

#### → Therefore, neither sign and broadcast their half of the transaction.



# Updating the Payment Channel: Bob → Alice: \$1.0

- Bob:
  - \$4.0 to multisig address (with TimeLock+HashLock)
  - \$6.0 to himself
- Alice:
  - \$4.0 to herself
  - \$6.0 to multisig address (with TimeLock+HashLock)
- Alice & Bob hand each other their *first secrets*





### Can Bob be dishonest?

- What is stopping Bob from broadcasting the first transaction and benefiting with \$7.0 instead of \$6.0?
- Bob is prevented from this because he has revealed the *first* secret to Alice:
  - Broadcasting will require him to wait 1000 blocks
  - Alice will have enough time to beat Bob and claim \$7.0 for herself.





### Lightening Networks

- Closure of payment channel in Lightning Networks
- Extending the lightning networks from two-parties to multiple-parties:
  - Option 1:
    - N parties  $\rightarrow$  N<sup>2</sup> payment channels
  - Option 2:
    - Transitivity of Transactions via intermediaries
    - Alice → Carol: (i) Alice → Bob && (ii) Bob → Carol



# Open Problems and Criticism

#### DSL Open Problems and Criticism







#### UCSB

# Bitcoin mining consumes more electricity a year than Ireland

#### **Guardian**

Network's estimated power use also exceeds that of 19 other European countries, consuming more than five times output of continent's largest windfarm









# Bitcoin mining consumes more electricity a year than Ireland

Network's estimated power use also exceeds that of 19 other

Europe contine

# New study quantifies bitcoin's ludicrous energy consumption

The dition - edition -

Bitcoin could consume 7.7 gigawatts by the end of 2018.



TIMOTHY B. LEE - 5/17/2018, 10:23 AM





# **Open Problems and Criticism**

#### Bitcoin Mining Now Consuming More Electricity Than 159 Countries Including Ireland & Most Network'se Europe





# Questions and Open Discussion



# Blockchain: Panacea for all our data problems?

- Resource cost:
  - Proof-of-work consumes resources at the planetary scale
- Mythical notion of democratization:
  - Handful of miners control the progress of Bitcoin blockchain
- False notion of security:
  - An Individual vulnerable to the security of his/her key

- Extreme distribution:
  - is it really worth it?
- Extreme redundancy:
  - is it really necessary?
- Social consequences:
  - Are we comfortable if this technology is used for dark causes?





#### Contact Us

- Sujaya Maiyaa: sujaya maiyya@ucsb.edu
- Victor Zakhary: victorzakhary@ucsb.edu
- Divyakant Agrawal: <u>divyagrawal@ucsb.edu</u>
- Amr El Abbadi: <u>elabbadi@ucsb.edu</u>