Proof of Space

Murat Osmanoglu









dedicating more disk space means higher chance to create a block

• once the dedicated space is initialized, the cost of mining is marginal



dedicating more disk space means higher chance to create a block

 once the dedicated space is initialized, the cost of mining is marginal a few disk accesses with minimal computation



 to create a block, miners invest disk space instead of computing power
 dedicating more disk space means bigher chance to create a block

- once the dedicated space is initialized, the cost of mining is marginal a few disk accesses with minimal computation
- even if the reward is much smaller than the cost of buying disk space for mining, space still be dedicated towards mining



 to create a block, miners invest disk space instead of computing power
 dedicating more disk space means bigher chance to create a block

- once the dedicated space is initialized, the cost of mining is marginal a few disk accesses with minimal computation
- even if the reward is much smaller than the cost of buying disk space for mining, space still be dedicated towards mining unused disk space is available on many personal computers



- once the dedicated space is initialized, the cost of mining is marginal a few disk accesses with minimal computation
- even if the reward is much smaller than the cost of buying disk space for mining, space still be dedicated towards mining unused disk space is available on many personal computers most mining is currently done by specialized ASICs, and they have no use other than Bitcoin mining. No such devices required for PoSpace



- once the dedicated space is initialized, the cost of mining is marginal a few disk accesses with minimal computation
- even if the reward is much smaller than the cost of buying disk space for mining, space still be dedicated towards mining unused disk space is available on many personal computers most mining is currently done by specialized ASICs, and they have no use other than Bitcoin mining. No such devices required for PoSpace
- a simple idea can be applied to Bitcoin to avoid 'mining pools' : instead of applying the hash function to a nonce directly, it will be applied to the signature of the nonce (similar idea can be adapted to SpaceMint)







Prover

At the initialization, prover stores some data F of size N

<u>Verifier</u>

At the initialization, verifier keeps only small piece of information S about F

Prover

At the initialization, prover stores some data F of size N

Verifier

At the initialization, verifier keeps only small piece of information S about F

At any time later, verifier initialize a proof execution phase

Prover

At the initialization, prover stores some data F of size N

<u>Verifier</u>

At the initialization, verifier keeps only small piece of information S about F

At any time later, verifier initialize a proof execution phase

At the end, verifier outputs reject or accept

Prover

At the initialization, prover stores some data F of size N

<u>Verifier</u>

At the initialization, verifier keeps only small piece of information S about F

At any time later, verifier initialize a proof execution phase

At the end, verifier outputs reject or accept

we demand that verifier is highly efficient in both phases, and prover is highly
efficient in the execution (generating the proof) and in the access to F

Prover

At the initialization, prover stores some data F of size N

<u>Verifier</u>

At the initialization, verifier keeps only small piece of information S about F

At any time later, verifier initialize a proof execution phase

At the end, verifier outputs reject or accept

- we demand that verifier is highly efficient in both phases, and prover is highly
 efficient in the execution (generating the proof) and in the access to F
- be careful; a cheating prover can delete F after initialization



• consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)





- consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)
- every vertex is associated with a value w(v) in {0,1}^L





- consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)
- every vertex is associated with a value w(v) in $\{0,1\}^L$





- consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)
- every vertex is associated with a value w(v) in {0,1}^L





- consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)
- every vertex is associated with a value w(v) in {0,1}^L





- consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)
- every vertex is associated with a value w(v) in {0,1}^L





- consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)
- every vertex is associated with a value w(v) in {0,1}^L



Parameter : G = (V, E) s.t. |V|=N, D is efficiently samplable distribution over vertices



- consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)
- every vertex is associated with a value w(v) in {0,1}^L



Parameter : G = (V, E) s.t. IVI=N, D is efficiently samplable distribution over vertices

- First prover creates S=w(V) and a short proof λ from S, then keeps the graph and gives λ to verifier



- consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)
- every vertex is associated with a value w(v) in {0,1}^L



Parameter : G = (V, E) s.t. IVI=N, D is efficiently samplable distribution over vertices

- First prover creates S=w(V) and a short proof λ from S, then keeps the graph and gives λ to verifier
- Verifier samples a subset C←D, and gives C to P



- consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)
- every vertex is associated with a value w(v) in {0,1}^L



Parameter : G = (V, E) s.t. IVI=N, D is efficiently samplable distribution over vertices

- First prover creates S=w(V) and a short proof λ from S, then keeps the graph and gives λ to verifier
- Verifier samples a subset C←D, and gives C to P
- Prover creates an answer A=w(C) for C



- consider a directed acyclic graph G = (V E)
- every vertex is associated with a value w(v) in {0,1}^L



Parameter : G = (V, E) s.t. |V| = N, D is efficiently samplable distribution over vertices

- First prover creates S=w(V) and a short proof λ from S, then keeps the graph and gives λ to verifier
- Verifier samples a subset C←D, and gives C to P
- Prover creates an answer A=w(C) for C
- Verifier accepts if A is compatible with λ













$$x_a = H(v_a)$$

 $x_{ab} = H(x_a, x_b)$

$$x_{a} = H(v_{a})$$
$$x_{ab} = H(x_{a}, x_{b})$$
$$x_{abcd} = H(x_{ab}, x_{cd})$$

 $x_a = H(v_a)$ $x_{ab} = H(x_a, x_b)$ $x_{abcd} = H(x_{ab}, x_{cd})$ $\lambda = H(x_{1234}, x_{5678})$

Hash Trees for Graph Pebbling

 $x_{a} = H(v_{a})$ $x_{ab} = H(x_{a}, x_{b})$ $x_{abcd} = H(x_{ab}, x_{cd})$ $\lambda = H(x_{1234}, x_{5678})$

- Prover creates hash tree and sends λ to verifier
- Verifier sends a challenge, for instance
 3, to prover

Hash Trees for Graph Pebbling

 $x_{a} = H(v_{a})$ $x_{ab} = H(x_{a}, x_{b})$ $x_{abcd} = H(x_{ab}, x_{cd})$ $\lambda = H(x_{1234}, x_{5678})$

- Prover creates hash tree and sends λ to verifier
- Verifier sends a challenge, for instance
 3, to prover
- Prover sends v_3 together with $\{x_4, x_{12}, x_{5678}\}$ to verifier

Hash Trees for Graph Pebbling

 $x_{a} = H(v_{a})$ $x_{ab} = H(x_{a}, x_{b})$ $x_{abcd} = H(x_{ab}, x_{cd})$ $\lambda = H(x_{1234}, x_{5678})$

- Prover creates hash tree and sends λ to verifier
- Verifier sends a challenge, for instance
 3, to prover
- Prover sends v_3 together with $\{x_4, x_{12}, x_{5678}\}$ to verifier
- Verifier accepts if
Proof of Space (SpaceMint)

Hash Trees for Graph Pebbling



 $x_{a} = H(v_{a})$ $x_{ab} = H(x_{a}, x_{b})$ $x_{abcd} = H(x_{ab}, x_{cd})$ $\lambda = H(x_{1234}, x_{5678})$

- Prover creates hash tree and sends λ to verifier
- Verifier sends a challenge, for instance
 3, to prover
- Prover sends v_3 together with $\{x_4, x_{12}, x_{5678}\}$ to verifier
- Verifier accepts if

 $\lambda = H(H(x_{12}, H(H(v_3), x_4)), x_{5678})$

Proof of Space (SpaceMint)

Hash Trees for Graph Pebbling





Challenges



 Proof of Space requires interactions, it's hard to adapt it to the blockchain settings



- Proof of Space requires interactions, it's hard to adapt it to the blockchain settings
- Generating a PoSpace is computationally cheap. It needs some clever way to decide which of many proof wins



- Proof of Space requires interactions, it's hard to adapt it to the blockchain settings
- Generating a PoSpace is computationally cheap. It needs some clever way to decide which of many proof wins

a miner should learn if he is a winner without any interaction



- Proof of Space requires interactions, it's hard to adapt it to the blockchain settings
- Generating a PoSpace is computationally cheap. It needs some clever way to decide which of many proof wins

 a miner should learn if he is a winner without any interaction
- nothing-at-stake : if mining is computationally cheap, then miners can mine on multiple chains, or try to create many different blocks with a single proof



- Proof of Space requires interactions, it's hard to adapt it to the blockchain settings
- Generating a PoSpace is computationally cheap. It needs some clever way to decide which of many proof wins

 a miner should learn if he is a winner without any interaction
- nothing-at-stake : if mining is computationally cheap, then miners can mine on multiple chains, or try to create many different blocks with a single proof

slows down consensus

gives chance to cheating miners to get a greater reward

enables double-spending attacks by someone controlling less than 50% of the space









- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.







- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.

Gen→(pk,sk),





- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.

Gen \rightarrow (pk,sk), Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (S, λ) where N is the size of the space in terms of bits that the miner contributes to the mining effort





- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.

Gen \rightarrow (pk,sk), Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (S, λ) where N is the size of the space in terms of bits that the miner contributes to the mining effort



 Hash_i : current block index i



- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.

Gen \rightarrow (pk,sk), Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (S, λ) where N is the size of the space in terms of bits that the miner contributes to the mining effort



Hash_i: current block index i miner's signature on Hash_{i-1}



- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.

Gen \rightarrow (pk,sk), Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (S, λ) where N is the size of the space in terms of bits that the miner contributes to the mining effort



Hash_i: current block index i miner's signature on Hash_{i-1} a space proof that contains pk



- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.

Gen \rightarrow (pk,sk), Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (S, λ) where N is the size of the space in terms of bits that the miner contributes to the mining effort



Hash_i: current block index i miner's signature on Hash_{i-1} a space proof that contains pk

Sig_i : current block index i



- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.

Gen \rightarrow (pk,sk), Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (S, λ) where N is the size of the space in terms of bits that the miner contributes to the mining effort



Hash_i: current block index i miner's signature on Hash_{i-1} a space proof that contains pk

Sig_i : current block index i miner's signature on Tran_i



- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.

Gen \rightarrow (pk,sk), Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (S, λ) where N is the size of the space in terms of bits that the miner contributes to the mining effort



Hash_i: current block index i miner's signature on Hash_{i-1} a space proof that contains pk

Sig_i : current block index i miner's signature on Tran_i miner's signature on Sig_{i-1}



- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.

Gen \rightarrow (pk,sk), Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (S, λ) where N is the size of the space in terms of bits that the miner contributes to the mining effort



Hash_i: current block index i miner's signature on Hash_{i-1} a space proof that contains pk

- Sig_i : current block index i miner's signature on Tran_i miner's signature on Sig_{i-1}
- Tran; : current block index i list of transactions



- a miner joins the network by announcing its space commitment (pk, $\lambda)$ via a special transaction.

Gen \rightarrow (pk,sk), Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (S, λ) where N is the size of the space in terms of bits that the miner contributes to the mining effort



Hash_i: current block index i miner's signature on Hash_{i-1} a space proof that contains pk

- Sig_i : current block index i miner's signature on Tran_i miner's signature on Sig_{i-1}
- Tran_i : current block index i list of transactions
- Once an honest miner adds a new block to the chain, the transactions up to this block cannot be changed, even by someone that holds all secret keys of the miners that added all the previous blocks.



• three types of transactions :



- three types of transactions :
 - <u>regular payments</u> : has the form tx = (payment, txID, in, out) where



- three types of transactions :
 - <u>regular payments</u> : has the form tx = (payment, txID, in, out) where

txID is a unique ID (no two tx in the blockchain can have same ID



- three types of transactions :
 - <u>regular payments</u> : has the form tx = (payment, txID, in, out) where

txID is a unique ID (no two tx in the blockchain can have same ID

in is a list of input coins, in = $(in_1,...,in_n)$ where in_j = $(t \times ID_j, k_j, sig_j)$ such that k_j is an index that indicates the sender of $t \times ID_j$



- three types of transactions :
 - <u>regular payments</u> : has the form tx = (payment, txID, in, out) where

txID is a unique ID (no two tx in the blockchain can have same ID

in is a list of input coins, in = $(in_1,...,in_n)$ where in_j = $(t \times ID_j, k_j, sig_j)$ such that k_j is an index that indicates the sender of $t \times ID_j$

out is a list of output coins, out = $(out_1,...,out_m)$ where $out_i=(pk_i,v_i)$ such that



- three types of transactions :
 - <u>regular payments</u> : has the form tx = (payment, txID, in, out) where

txID is a unique ID (no two tx in the blockchain can have same ID

in is a list of input coins, in = $(in_1, ..., in_n)$ where in_j = $(t \times ID_j, k_j, sig_j)$ such that k_j is an index that indicates the sender of $t \times ID_j$

out is a list of output coins, out = $(out_1,...,out_m)$ where $out_i=(pk_i,v_i)$ such that

- <u>space commitments</u>: has the form $tx = (commit, txID, (pk, \lambda))$ where Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (pk, λ)



- three types of transactions :
 - <u>regular payments</u> : has the form tx = (payment, txID, in, out) where

txID is a unique ID (no two tx in the blockchain can have same ID

in is a list of input coins, in = $(in_1,...,in_n)$ where in_j = $(t \times ID_j, k_j, sig_j)$ such that k_j is an index that indicates the sender of $t \times ID_j$

out is a list of output coins, out = $(out_1,...,out_m)$ where $out_i=(pk_i,v_i)$ such that

- <u>space commitments</u>: has the form $tx = (commit, txID, (pk, \lambda))$ where Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (pk, λ)
- <u>penalties</u> : has the form tx = (penalty, txID, pk, prf)



- three types of transactions :
 - <u>regular payments</u> : has the form tx = (payment, txID, in, out) where

txID is a unique ID (no two tx in the blockchain can have same ID

in is a list of input coins, in = $(in_1,...,in_n)$ where in_j = $(t \times ID_j, k_j, sig_j)$ such that k_j is an index that indicates the sender of $t \times ID_j$

out is a list of output coins, out = $(out_1,...,out_m)$ where $out_i=(pk_i,v_i)$ such that

- <u>space commitments</u>: has the form $tx = (commit, txID, (pk, \lambda))$ where Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (pk, λ)
- <u>penalties</u>: has the form tx = (penalty, txID, pk, prf)

pk is the public key of the transaction creator



- three types of transactions :
 - <u>regular payments</u> : has the form tx = (payment, txID, in, out) where

txID is a unique ID (no two tx in the blockchain can have same ID

in is a list of input coins, in = $(in_1,...,in_n)$ where in_j = $(t \times ID_j, k_j, sig_j)$ such that k_j is an index that indicates the sender of $t \times ID_j$

out is a list of output coins, out = $(out_1,...,out_m)$ where $out_i=(pk_i,v_i)$ such that

- <u>space commitments</u>: has the form $tx = (commit, txID, (pk, \lambda))$ where Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (pk, λ)
- <u>penalties</u> : has the form tx = (penalty, txID, pk, prf)

pk is the public key of the transaction creator

prf is the proof indicating that two blocks of same index signed by the same signer



- three types of transactions :
 - <u>regular payments</u> : has the form tx = (payment, txID, in, out) where

txID is a unique ID (no two tx in the blockchain can have same ID

in is a list of input coins, in = $(in_1,...,in_n)$ where in_j = $(t \times ID_j, k_j, sig_j)$ such that k_j is an index that indicates the sender of $t \times ID_j$

out is a list of output coins, out = $(out_1,...,out_m)$ where $out_i=(pk_i,v_i)$ such that

- <u>space commitments</u> : has the form $tx = (commit, txID, (pk, \lambda))$ where Init(pk,N) \rightarrow (pk, λ)
- <u>penalties</u>: has the form tx = (penalty, txID, pk, prf)

pk is the public key of the transaction creator

prf is the proof indicating that two blocks of same index signed by the same signer

• For regular payments; all signatures must be valid, any subsequent transaction must be used only one time in the blockchain(double-spendin), and the sum of the input values should be at least the sum of the output for the acceptance of tx



• Mining :



- Mining :
 - extract the hash value of the last block in the best chain so far, and a challenge c which is used to derive two long random strings C_u , C_v



- Mining :
 - extract the hash value of the last block in the best chain so far, and a challenge c which is used to derive two long random strings C_u , C_v
 - compute challenges $Chal(n,u,C_u) = (c_1,...,c_u)$



- Mining :
 - extract the hash value of the last block in the best chain so far, and a challenge c which is used to derive two long random strings C_u , C_v
 - compute challenges $Chal(n,u,C_u) = (c_1,...,c_u)$
 - compute the proof of space $a = (a_1, ..., a_u)$



- Mining :
 - extract the hash value of the last block in the best chain so far, and a challenge c which is used to derive two long random strings C_u , C_v
 - compute challenges $Chal(n,u,C_u) = (c_1,...,c_u)$
 - compute the proof of space $a = (a_1, ..., a_u)$
 - compute the quality $Q(pk,\lambda,c,a)$ of the proof



- Mining :
 - extract the hash value of the last block in the best chain so far, and a challenge c which is used to derive two long random strings C_u , C_v
 - compute challenges $Chal(n,u,C_u) = (c_1,...,c_u)$
 - compute the proof of space $a = (a_1, ..., a_u)$
 - compute the quality $Q(pk,\lambda,c,a)$ of the proof
 - if the quality is high enough (there is a realistic chance to be the best proof in that period), compute the proof of correct commitment $b = (b_1, ..., b_v)$, create a block, send the block to the network


Construction

- Mining :
 - extract the hash value of the last block in the best chain so far, and a challenge c which is used to derive two long random strings C_u , C_v

How do we create this challenge ?

- (i-1)th block can be used to derive that challenge, but it can slow down the consensus.
- there may be many chains; rational miners can create different challenges for different chains, and try to create
- proofs for different chains since it is easy to do it

Derive the challenge from the hash of block i - Δ

- the probability of multiple chains surviving for more than Δ blocks decreases exponentially

he best b = (b1,



Construction

- Mir For a set of valid proofs $\pi_1 = (pk_1, \lambda_1, c_1, a_1), \dots, \pi_m = (pk_m, \lambda_m, c_m, a_m), Q(\pi_i)$ should be defined in a way that the probability that π_i has
 - the best quality among $\pi_1, ..., \pi_m$ corresponds to ith miner's fraction of the total space in the network, which is

 $N_i / (N_1 + ... + N_m)$

- where N_i is the space committed to λ_i
- compute the proof of space $a = (a_1, \dots, a_u)$
- compute the quality $Q(pk,\lambda,c,a)$ of the proof
- if the quality is high enough (there is a realistic chance to be the best proof in that period), compute the proof of correct commitment b = (b₁, ...,b_v), create a block, send the block to the network

and a





• Grinding:



- Grinding:
 - In PoSpace, it's computationally easy to generate proofs. So, miners can work on many different blocks (just try different transactions) till finding a good one that will allow them to generate good proofs for future



- Grinding:
 - In PoSpace, it's computationally easy to generate proofs. So, miners can work on many different blocks (just try different transactions) till finding a good one that will allow them to generate good proofs for future
 - the challenge is derived from proof chain that does not contain transactions. Thus, a prover can create at most one valid proof per challenge



- Grinding:
 - In PoSpace, it's computationally easy to generate proofs. So, miners can work on many different blocks (just try different transactions) till finding a good one that will allow them to generate good proofs for future
 - the challenge is derived from proof chain that does not contain transactions. Thus, a prover can create at most one valid proof per challenge
- Mining on mutiple chains:



- Grinding:
 - In PoSpace, it's computationally easy to generate proofs. So, miners can work on many different blocks (just try different transactions) till finding a good one that will allow them to generate good proofs for future
 - the challenge is derived from proof chain that does not contain transactions. Thus, a prover can create at most one valid proof per challenge
- Mining on mutiple chains:
 - In PoSpace, it's computationally easy to generate proofs. So, miners can work on all known chains in parallel to increase their profits, even to try double-spending and selfish-mining.



- Grinding:
 - In PoSpace, it's computationally easy to generate proofs. So, miners can work on many different blocks (just try different transactions) till finding a good one that will allow them to generate good proofs for future
 - the challenge is derived from proof chain that does not contain transactions. Thus, a prover can create at most one valid proof per challenge
- Mining on mutiple chains:
 - In PoSpace, it's computationally easy to generate proofs. So, miners can work on all known chains in parallel to increase their profits, even to try double-spending and selfish-mining.
 - the challenge is derived the hash of block i Δ , and for any challenge there is a single proof. Besides, the protocol imposes a penalty via the penalty transactions (half of the reward for bad block is given to the creator of the penalty transaction, and other half is diminished)