

# Tuning PoW with Hybrid Expenditure

Itay Tsabary  
sitay@technion.ac.il  
Technion, IC3  
Haifa, Israel

Alexander Spiegelman  
sashaspiegelman@fb.com  
Facebook Novi  
Menlo Park, California, USA

Ittay Eyal  
ittay@technion.ac.il  
Technion, IC3  
Haifa, Israel

## ABSTRACT

*Proof of Work (PoW)* is a Sybil-deterrence security mechanism. It introduces an *external cost* to a system by requiring computational effort to perform actions. However, since its inception, a central challenge was to tune this cost. Initial designs for deterring spam email and DoS attacks applied overhead equally to honest participants and attackers. Requiring too little effort did not deter attacks, whereas too much encumbered honest participation. This might be the reason it was never widely adopted.

Nakamoto overcame this trade-off in Bitcoin by distinguishing desired from malicious behavior and introducing *internal rewards* for the former. This solution gained popularity in securing cryptocurrencies and using the virtual internally-minted tokens for rewards. However, in existing blockchain protocols the internal rewards fund (almost) the same value of external expenses. Thus, as the token value soars, so does the PoW expenditure. Bitcoin PoW, for example, already expends as much electricity as Colombia or Switzerland. This amount of resource-guzzling is unsustainable and hinders even wider adoption of these systems.

In this work we present *Hybrid Expenditure Blockchain (HEB)*, a novel PoW mechanism. *HEB* is a generalization of Nakamoto’s protocol that enables tuning the external expenditure by introducing a complementary *internal-expenditure* mechanism. Thus, for the first time, *HEB* decouples external expenditure from the reward value.

We show a practical parameter choice by which *HEB* requires significantly less external consumption compare to Nakamoto’s protocol, its resilience against rational attackers is similar, and it retains the decentralized and permissionless nature of the system. Taking the Bitcoin ecosystem as an example, *HEB* cuts the electricity consumption by half.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

*Permissionless* systems are susceptible to *Sybil attacks* [55] where a single attacker can masquerade as multiple entities. To mitigate such attacks, *Proof of Work (PoW)* [7, 56, 89] security schemes introduce *external costs*, making attacks expensive. To perform operations in a PoW system, users must provide a proof of computation, whose production requires resource expenditure. This makes attacks like email spam [135] and denial of service [9, 10, 91, 143, 153] prohibitively expensive, as they require many operations. However, honest users are also subject to these costs, and the system cannot balance deterring adversarial behavior but not honest one [106].

To circumvent this trade-off, Nakamoto [119] suggested introducing *internal rewards* for honest behavior (Table 1 summarizes this taxonomy). Indeed, nowadays PoW is widely used to secure decentralized and permissionless cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin [119] and Ethereum [29]. These are replicated state-machines [25, 34,

104, 105] that facilitate monetary ecosystems of internally-minted *tokens*, maintained by principals called *miners*. Miners that follow the protocol are rewarded with tokens; tokens are scarce, hence a market forms [26, 27, 47, 111]; so, miners can sell their obtained tokens for fiat currency (e.g., USD, EUR), compensating them for their PoW expenses.

To guarantee their security [50, 71, 128], PoW cryptocurrencies moderate their operation rate by dynamically tuning the required computation difficulty to match miner capabilities [98, 119, 122, 125]. Consequently, the PoW expenditure directly depends on token values [15, 40, 103, 117] – higher token prices imply higher mining rewards, which draw more miners to participate, leading to more expended resources. This results with the external PoW expenditure matching the internal mining rewards, and hence balances the overhead for honest participation with high attack costs.

Indeed, with exponentially-growing token values [21, 43], the amount of resources spent on PoW mining has also been growing accordingly [20, 59]. Bitcoin PoW computations alone are responsible for about 0.3% of the global electricity consumption [49, 52], surpassing medium-sized countries like Colombia and Switzerland [66]. This level of resource guzzling is unsustainable [2, 48, 63, 76, 80, 92, 114, 126, 141, 148, 154], bears a significant ecological impact [1, 13, 58, 77, 85, 87, 112, 118, 145], and prevents adoption [83, 124]. Unfortunately, Nakamoto’s mechanism directly incentivizes external expenditure at the same rate as of the internal rewards, and offers no means of reducing its external effects.

Previous work (§2) explored PoW alternatives for cryptocurrencies, notably focusing on *Proof of Stake (PoS)* [67, 75, 97]. Such systems avoid the external resource expenditure by replacing the computational effort with internal token ownership requirements. However, PoS systems operate, and are secured under, qualitatively-different assumptions. Namely, new participants need to obtain tokens, which occurs only with the permission of current stakeholders.

We note that naive adjustments of the cryptocurrency minting rate do not reduce the external expenses; that a simple reduction

Internal Rewards	Expenses		
	Negligible	External	External & Internal
<i>Exist</i>	PoS Blockchains [67, 75, 78, 97]	PoW Blockchains [29, 119]	<i>HEB</i> (this work)
<i>Absent</i>	Open systems (e.g., email)	Classical PoW [7, 56, 91]	

Table 1: Security scheme rewards-expenses comparison.

of rewards hampers security; and that *forcing* miners to internally-spend breaks the permissionless property of the system. We review these options in the appendix.

In this work we present *Hybrid Expenditure Blockchain (HEB)*, the first PoW protocol with lower external costs than its internal rewards. Despite the reduced external expenditure, *HEB* provides similar security guarantees against rational attackers compared to the more-wasteful Nakamoto protocol. *HEB* is tunable, allowing the system designer to optimize for desired properties.

## HEB Overview

The main challenge is to reduce the external expenses while keeping attack (and also participation) costs high. These objectives seem to contradict, as in previous work [7, 29, 56, 89, 119] the participation costs are only external.

This is the main novelty of *HEB* – it is a generalization of Nakamoto’s protocol that *enables* and *incentivizes* miners to forfeit system tokens as part of the mining process. Miners that do so increase their rewards, resulting with this being the optimal behavior. So, the external mining expenses in *HEB* are lower than existing PoW blockchains, while the total expenses (internal and external) are the same.

Similarly to Bitcoin, *HEB* constructs a tree data structure of elements named *blocks*, where the longest path (called *main chain*) defines the system state. Miners produce PoW to create blocks and broadcast them with a p2p network. However, unlike Bitcoin, *HEB* considers epochs of blocks, and the mining rewards for each epoch are distributed only at its end.

In *HEB* there are two types of blocks miners can create – *regular* or *factored*, which have a *weight* attribute with values 1 and  $F > 1$ , respectively. The epoch rewards are distributed among the miners proportionally to the relative weight of their blocks (in the epoch). Miners can always create regular blocks, but have to forfeit system tokens in epoch  $k$  (e.g., with a designated transaction) to create factored blocks in epoch  $k + 1$ . This mechanism incentivizes miners to divert some of their total participation budget internally to create factored blocks, reducing their external PoW expenditure. The ratio between internal and external expenses is tuned with a parameter  $\rho$ , determining the token expenditure required to create a factored block.

To maintain the total circulating token supply, the internally-expended tokens are distributed proportionally among all system entities (i.e., any token holder) at the epoch conclusion. This redistribution maintains the token value as in a standard PoW cryptocurrency (e.g., Bitcoin), as well as the proportional purchasing power [146] (i.e., relative wealth) of all system entities. The internally-spent tokens are redistributed using a novel redistribution technique, which might be of independent interest (e.g., for regulating transaction fees, cf. [31, 138]).

We emphasize that *HEB* draws ideas from PoS, prominently the utilization of system tokens for security, but the model assumptions, the solution, and the guarantees are distinct. In particular, *HEB* uses the standard PoW assumptions and miners expend (lose) their tokens for mining, whereas in PoS participants derive their power from maintaining ownership.

## HEB Analysis

Reasoning about *HEB* requires a substantial groundwork. We begin by modeling the cryptocurrency ecosystem, starting with the relation of token price and supply, and following with the underlying data structures, participants, and execution (§3). Our model is based on standard economic theories, where a commodity’s price is inverse to its circulating supply; to the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to apply this classic modeling to cryptocurrency mining.

As in previous work [33, 62, 74, 139, 149, 150, 155], we consider a set of rational miners that optimize their revenues and an adversary who is willing to expend resources in order to attack.

We instantiate Nakamoto’s protocol (§4) and use it for a comparison baseline, following with the formal presentation of *HEB* (§5).

To compare and contrast *HEB* with Nakamoto we consider a variety of cryptocurrency metrics (§6). These include common security metrics, namely coalition resistance and tendency to encourage coalitions [60, 62, 139, 149]. We also introduce a new metric – *external expenses*, measuring the resources spent on PoW. Instead of the binary metric permissioned/permissionless (classical-consensus-protocols/Nakamoto-blockchain, respectively), we introduce the continuous metric of *permissiveness*, describing the cost of joining the system.

Finally, we tease apart the common safety-violation security metric into two. We observe that safety-violating chain-reorganization attacks [19, 88, 133, 152] in existing PoW blockchains require high resource investment from the attacker; however, once successful, they completely refund themselves. We therefore consider this type of attacks, as well as a sabotage variant where the attacker is not refunded. We show that in *HEB* the attack cost for the refunded variant is linear in the total expenses (secure as Nakamoto), and that the sabotage variant costs are linear in the external ones.

*HEB* includes several parameters for the system designer to tune. As an example we present a specific choice of parameter values (§7). Choosing the prominent Bitcoin ecosystem as a reference point, we analyze *HEB* and show this parameter choice is practical, achieves strong security guarantees, and leads to the equivalent of reducing the entire electricity consumption of Denmark [41, 49].

In summary, we expand the PoW design space by introducing internal expenses. We present *HEB* – a PoW blockchain protocol with external expenses that are lower than its internal rewards. We prove that *HEB* offers similar security guarantees against rational attackers compared to pure PoW solutions, and show it can significantly reduce the latter’s ecological impact.

## 2 RELATED WORK

In Nakamoto’s blockchain and all subsequent PoW protocols we are aware of, the incentives equal the value of the generated cryptocurrency tokens (and fees). We are not aware of previous work tuning PoW expenditure in cryptocurrencies – the main focus of this work.

We proceed to survey PoS and analysis approaches. We defer to Appendix A a discussion of permissioned [14, 32, 34, 81, 93, 101, 157] and trusted hardware [37, 158] solutions that make

qualitatively-stronger assumptions; protocols that expend different external resources rather than electricity [16, 95, 116, 127, 144], for which *HEB* applies equally well; and protocols [3, 99] with several types of internal tokens that do not achieve incentive compatibility nor reduced external expenses.

*Proof of Stake.* *HEB* and PoS are fundamentally different: the latter limits miner participation to those with stake in the system, i.e., miners who own tokens; the former does not. Moreover, in PoS the Sybil-deterrence [55] is due to the cost of acquiring and holding the system tokens, which the participants maintain throughout the system execution. In contrast, *HEB* relies on PoW, and the participants *spend* the internal currency.

PoS systems like Algorand [97], Ouroboros [75], Tezos [78] and Ethereum2 [67] are designed and analyzed under different assumptions than PoW. Their security is measured with respect to the number of owned tokens rather than expended resources. They assume a new participant wanting to join the system can acquire (or alternatively, lock as a collateral [67, 78, 97]) as many system tokens as she can afford. That is, existing system miners authorize transactions that introduce new system miners, even if these result in a state less favorable from their perspective. Additionally, to combat *long-range attacks* [51, 72] and *nothing-at-stake* [24, 132], these systems assume users voluntarily delete deprecated data [97], or assume users remain online for extended periods [67, 75, 78].

In contrast, *HEB* is PoW-based, and newly-joining miners do not require the cooperation of existing miners to join. It is also resistant to said long-range attacks and the nothing-at-stake problems, and hence does not rely on voluntarily data deletion or user persistence.

A parallel work [70] draws ideas from *HEB*, suggesting to emulate PoW over PoS. The main idea is that the stake used for the consensus degrades over time and usage, mimicking the external expenditures of PoW systems. However, as built atop of PoS, it also requires the aforementioned assumptions.

*Proof of Work Analysis.* We use the standard techniques [33, 62, 74, 84, 108, 121, 139, 149, 159] to analyze *HEB*'s security and incentive compatibility. The evaluation metrics used are a formalization of previous ones presented by said work, and also include definition of new ones regarding the external expenditure and permissiveness level. To the best of our knowledge we are the first to define, evaluate and optimize for such metrics.

Chen et al. [38] define and analyze desired properties of reward allocation schemes in PoW cryptocurrencies. Their work focuses on the reward of a single block, and does not consider environmental impact nor malicious miners. We note that *HEB*'s reward allocation rule is incentive-compatible and Sybil-resistant, satisfying these desired properties.

### 3 CRYPTOCURRENCY MODEL

We present a model for an abstract blockchain system, instantiated with a cryptocurrency protocol. This allows us to consider different instantiations, namely *Nakamoto* and *HEB*. We first define the monetary value of system tokens using an exogenous reference-point fiat currency (§3.1). We follow by presenting the blockchain, the participating entities and how the system derives

its state (§3.2). We then define how a cryptocurrency protocol instantiates that system, defining an internal system currency based on the blockchain (§3.3), and explain how the system makes progress (§3.4).

#### 3.1 Cryptocurrency Economics

The external expenditure of a PoW cryptocurrency system depends on the rewards it grants miners and mining costs. We note that mining rewards are internal while PoW costs are external, hence we first define the relation, or the exchange rate, of the two.

The reward is an amount of the system's internal currency *ic* (e.g., Bitcoin, Ether), and the external cost is an amount of an external currency *ec* (e.g., EUR, USD, RMB). We assume the external currency has a market capital orders of magnitude larger than that of the internal currency [65], and it effectively represents real values.

According to the prominent macroeconomic theories [4, 26, 27, 42, 69, 82, 96, 110, 111] there is a linear relation between *supply* and *price levels* of commodities in equilibrium states. Applying to cryptocurrency tokens, the steady-state real value of a single *ic* token, measured in *ec*, is inverse to the circulating supply of *ic*. This comfortably settles with intuition – *ic* tokens have value due to their scarcity, and if they were twice less scarce then their real value would have been half.

This relation was previously used to analyze a single-shot minting of tokens in Initial Coin Offerings (ICOs) [28, 30, 35, 36], but to the best of our knowledge, this work is the first to apply it to the ongoing token minting process.

Throughout this work, when comparing two cryptocurrencies, we assume their market caps are equal. This implies that if the two cryptocurrencies have the same minting rate then their respective token real values are identical. That is why naively changing a cryptocurrency minting rate does not affect the external expenditure (see Appendix B).

We assume there is an instantaneous and commission-free exchange service of *ec* and *ic*, where the exchange rate matches token real value. Unless explicitly mentioned, we assume this exchange is available to all participating entities.

To simplify presentation we normalize the price level so the exchange rate is one. We often sum *ec* and *ic*, meaning the sum of their values in real terms.

#### 3.2 Blockchain and System Principals

The system comprises a shared *global storage*  $S^G$ , a *scheduler*, and two types of *entities*: system *users*, and principals maintaining the system named *miners*.

*Global storage.* The global storage is an append-only set containing elements called *blocks*. Each block includes a reference to another block and data generated by system entities, with the only exception being a so-called *genesis block* that contains neither. The global storage  $S^G$  initially contains only the genesis block, thus defining a directed tree data structure rooted at the genesis block.

We refer to paths in the data structure starting at the genesis block as *chains*. We denote for any chain *C* its last block by *last*(*C*) and its length by *length*(*C*). We divide a chain *C*

to *epochs* of  $\ell$  blocks. For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , epoch  $k$  includes the block series  $[\ell k + 1, \ell(k + 1)]$  in  $C$ .

A function  $LC(S)$  returns the set of the *longest chains* in a block set  $S$ . A function  $LCP(S)$  returns the *longest common prefix* chain of  $LC(S)$ . We refer to  $LCP(S^G)$  as the *main chain*.

*Miners and the scheduler.* As common [33, 62, 121, 139, 150] we assume that the sets of entities are static during an epoch execution, that is, entities do not join or leave during the course of an epoch. Denote by  $Miners(k)$  and  $Users(k)$  the miners and users of epoch  $k$ , respectively.

Each miner  $i$  has a local storage  $S_i^L$  accessible only to her. Like  $S^G$ ,  $S_i^L$  is an append-only block set. The scheduler invokes miners, allowing them to create blocks in their local storage, and to publish their local blocks by copying them to  $S^G$ . We denote by  $N_i^k(C)$  the number of blocks in epoch  $k$  created by miner  $i$  on chain  $C$ . For presentation simplicity, we assume the main chain at an epoch beginning remains a prefix of the main chain throughout the entire epoch. Note this does not rule out the main chain changing during an epoch, but only that its initial prefix does not.

*State.* Entities derive the *system state* by parsing the global storage  $S^G$  according to the block order of the main chain.

System entities might choose to infer the state based on a chain prefix, excluding potentially-volatile suffixes [71, 128], such as in the case of multiple longest chains. Such considerations are outside the scope of this work.

### 3.3 Instantiating a Cryptocurrency Protocol

The system is instantiated with a cryptocurrency protocol  $\Pi$  that defines a currency internal to the system, *ic*. The protocol  $\Pi$  maps all its internal tokens to system entities through a function  $Bal^\Pi(C)$ , taking as input a chain  $C$ . The  $Bal^\Pi(C)$  function returns a vector where each element  $Bal_i^\Pi(C)$  is the number of tokens mapped to entity  $i$ . When the context is clear, we often omit the protocol name  $\Pi$  and simply write  $Bal(C)$ .

We say the real value of tokens mapped to an entity is her *ic balance*, and note the total number of tokens is the sum of all balances. The protocol mints  $r_k \cdot \ell$  new tokens at the end of each epoch  $k$ , and we often omit the epoch index when it is clear from context. This means the number of tokens is fixed throughout any epoch  $k$ , and increases when epoch  $k + 1$  begins.

Formally, let  $t_j$  be the total number of tokens on chain  $C$  when  $length(C) = j$ . So, for any  $j \in [\ell k, \ell(k + 1) - 1]$  it holds that  $t_j = t_{\ell k}$ , and that  $t_{\ell(k+1)} - t_{\ell k} = r_k \cdot \ell$ . The protocol  $\Pi$  maps the newly-minted tokens to entities using  $Bal(C)$ .

**NOTE.** To avoid temporal inconsistencies, protocols often make newly-minted tokens available only after sufficiently many other blocks are created. For example, Bitcoin makes tokens minted in block  $j$  available only after block  $j + 100$ . We neglect such mechanisms for simplicity, but they demonstrate that delayed availability of minted tokens is both acceptable and practical.

*Miner economics.* Aside from their *ic* balances, miners also own *ec*. We use the terms *internal* and *external balances* to distinguish the different currency holdings, and simply *balance* to describe their aggregate value.

Miners expend all their balance on system maintenance. In practice, a principal can split its balance, using some of it as a miner, and the rest as a user. We model such principals as two separate entities – a miner that spends all its balance on maintenance, and a user that holds the rest.

For any epoch  $k$  we denote by  $B_i^{ec}(k)$  and  $B_i^{ic}(k)$  the initial external and internal balances of each miner  $i \in Miners(k)$ , respectively. We denote by  $B_i(k) \triangleq B_i^{ec}(k) + B_i^{ic}(k)$  the initial balance of miner  $i$ .

We denote the accumulated internal and external miner balances by  $B_{Miners}^{ic}(k) \triangleq \sum_{j \in Miners} B_j^{ic}(k)$  and  $B_{Miners}^{ec}(k) \triangleq \sum_{j \in Miners} B_j^{ec}(k)$ , respectively. We also denote the total balances of all miners by  $B_{Miners}(k)$  and of all users by  $B_{Users}^{ic}(k)$ . We denote the external and internal relative balances of miner  $i$  by  $b_i^{ec}(k) \triangleq \frac{B_i^{ec}(k)}{B_{Miners}^{ec}(k)}$  and  $b_i^{ic}(k) \triangleq \frac{B_i^{ic}(k)}{B_{Miners}^{ic}(k)}$ , respectively, and her relative balance by  $b_i(k) \triangleq \frac{B_i(k)}{B_{Miners}(k)}$ .

We assume the value of expended resources by the miners on system maintenance in a single epoch  $k$  is much smaller than the system market cap. That is, the balance of all miners is negligible compared to that of all users, i.e.,  $B_{Miners}(k) \ll B_{Users}^{ic}(k)$ . This holds both in Bitcoin and in Ethereum where  $\frac{B_{Miners}(k)}{B_{Users}^{ic}(k)}$  is approximately  $3.4 \cdot 10^{-7}$  [44] and  $8.95 \cdot 10^{-9}$  [45], respectively.

### 3.4 Execution

Initially, the global storage  $S^G$  contains only the genesis block, and each miner  $i$  has an empty local storage  $S_i^L = \emptyset$ . The state variables (like the global and local storage) change over time, but we omit indexing as it is clear from the context.

The system progresses is orchestrated by the scheduler (Alg. 1).

Epoch  $k$  begins when  $length(LCP(S^G)) = \ell k$ . First, *nature* sets all miner balances (lines 1–2), modeling miners joining and leaving at epoch transitions.

The scheduler then lets miners set their internal and external balances using the exchange service, achieving their preferred balance of the two. We use the term *allocate* to describe this action, and say miner  $i$  allocates her balance  $B_i(k)$  with the invocation of the  $Allocate_i(S^G, B_i(k))$  function, returning a tuple of her internal and external balances  $\langle B_i^{ic}(k), B_i^{ec}(k) \rangle$ . So, for each miner  $i$  the scheduler invokes  $Allocate_i(S^G, B_i(k))$  (lines 3–4).

Note that modeling changes in the miner set and balance allocations at epoch transitions is for presentation simplicity; these occur throughout the system execution.

The rest of the epoch execution progresses in steps, until the main chain  $LCP(S^G)$  is extended by  $\ell$  blocks (lines 5–14). Each step begins with the scheduler selecting a single miner at random, proportionally to her relative *external expenditure*, that is  $\forall i \in Miners : \Pr(\text{scheduler selects } i) = b_i^{ec}(k)$  (line 6). Similarly to previous work [6, 62, 121, 139], these steps represent a standard PoW mechanism and its logical state changes, and entities have synchronous access to the global storage.

The scheduler invokes the selected miner  $i$ 's function  $Generate_i^\Pi(S^G, S_i^L)$ , returning a newly generated block, and

**Alg. 1: Scheduler in epoch  $k$** 


---

```

/* Initial storage state */
input:  $S^G$  such that  $\text{length}(LCP(S^G)) = \ell k$ 

/* Setting miner balances */
1 for  $i \in \text{Miners}(k)$  do
2    $B_i(k) \leftarrow v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , chosen by nature such that  $B_{\text{Miners}}(k) \ll B_{\text{Users}}^{ic}(k)$ 
/* Miner balance allocation */
3 for  $i \in \text{Miners}(k)$  do
4    $\langle B_i^{ic}(k), B_i^{ec}(k) \rangle \leftarrow \text{Allocate}_i(S^G, B_i(k))$ 

/* Main chain extension */
5 while  $\text{length}(LCP(S^G)) < \ell(k+1)$  do
  // Block generation
6    $i \leftarrow$  miner index chosen at random,  $\forall j \in \text{Miners}(k) : \Pr(i=j) = b_j^{ec}(k)$ 
7    $S_i^L \leftarrow S_i^L \cup \{\text{Generate}_i^\Pi(S^G, S_i^L)\}$ 
  // Block publication
8    $\text{blocks\_to\_publish} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
9   do
10     $S^G \leftarrow S^G \cup \text{blocks\_to\_publish}$ 
11     $\text{blocks\_to\_publish} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
12    for  $i \in \text{Miners}(k)$  do
13       $\text{blocks\_to\_publish} \leftarrow \text{blocks\_to\_publish} \cup \text{Publish}_i(S^G, S_i^L)$ 
14  while  $\text{blocks\_to\_publish} \neq \emptyset$ 

```

---

**Alg. 2:  $\sigma_{i, \text{prescribed}}^{\text{Nakamoto}}$** 


---

```

1 Function  $\text{Allocate}(S^G, B_i)$ :
2   return  $\langle \rho B_i, (1-\rho) B_i \rangle$ 
3 Function  $\text{Generate}(S^G, S_i^L)$ :
4    $C \leftarrow$  uniformly from  $LC(S^G)$ 
5    $\text{pointer} \leftarrow \text{last}(C)$ 
6   return  $\text{NewBlock}(\text{pointer})$ 
7 Function  $\text{Publish}(S^G, S_i^L)$ :
8   return All unpublished blocks

```

---

**Alg. 3:  $\sigma_{i, \text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$** 


---

```

1 Function  $\text{Allocate}(S^G, B_i)$ :
2   return  $\langle \rho B_i, (1-\rho) B_i \rangle$ 
3 Function  $\text{Generate}(S^G, S_i^L)$ :
4    $C \leftarrow$  uniformly from  $LC(S^G)$ 
5    $\text{pointer} \leftarrow \text{last}(C)$ 
6   if  $\rho = 0$  or  $N_i(C) < \left\lfloor \frac{B_i^{ic}}{\rho \cdot r} \right\rfloor$ 
7      $\text{type} \leftarrow \text{factored}$ 
8   else
9      $\text{type} \leftarrow \text{regular}$ 
10  return  $\text{NewBlock}(\text{pointer}, \text{type})$ 
11 Function  $\text{Publish}(S^G, S_i^L)$ :
12  return All unpublished blocks

```

---

adds it to miner  $i$ 's local storage  $S_i^L$  (line 7). The protocol  $\Pi$  states block validity rules in  $\text{Bal}^\Pi(C)$ , and invalid blocks do not affect the system state. Creating an invalid block or not creating one at all is sub-optimal and we only consider miners who avoid doing so.

Next, the scheduler lets each miner  $i$  publish her blocks by invoking  $\text{Publish}_i(S^G, S_i^L)$ , returning a subset of her previously-private local blocks. The scheduler adds the returned blocks to the global storage, and repeats this process until all miners do not wish to publish any more blocks (lines 8–14). The publication loop is used to capture strategic-block-release behaviors [62, 121, 139].

The cryptocurrency protocol  $\Pi$  includes implementations of  $\text{Allocate}_i(S^G, B_i(k))$ ,  $\text{Generate}_i^\Pi(S^G, S_i^L)$ , and  $\text{Publish}_i(S^G, S_i^L)$  that each miner  $i$  should follow. We refer to the tuple of three implementations as the *prescribed strategy* and denote it by  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ . The protocol  $\Pi$  is therefore a tuple of the balance function  $\text{Bal}^\Pi$  and a prescribed strategy  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ . Note that  $\Pi$  cannot force miners to follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ .

**4 NAKAMOTO PROTOCOL**

As an example and to serve as a baseline, we instantiate an epoch-based *Nakamoto* protocol (used with  $\ell = 1$  in Bitcoin [119], Bitcoin Cash [18], Litecoin [109], etc.) in our model.

The balance function of *Nakamoto* awards each miner  $i$  with  $r$  tokens per block she created in the epoch, and a total of  $\ell \cdot r$  new tokens are minted. Hence, the balance of each miner  $i$  at epoch conclusion is  $\text{Bal}_i^{\text{Nakamoto}}(LCP(S^G)) = N_i(LCP(S^G)) \cdot r$ .

The prescribed strategy  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{Nakamoto}}$  (Alg. 2) states that each miner  $i$  allocates her balance  $B_i^{ec} = B_i$  and  $B_i^{ic} = 0$ , extends the longest chain, and publishes her blocks immediately. In case of multiple longest chains,  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{Nakamoto}}$  picks uniformly-at-random<sup>1</sup>.

**5 HEB PROTOCOL**

We are now ready to present *HEB*. Briefly, it incentivizes miners to expend their balances internally by enabling miners who do so to create higher-rewarding blocks. Two parameters,  $\rho \in [0, 1)$  and  $F \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$ , control the reward distribution mechanism. We detail the different block types, the reward distribution mechanism, and the prescribed strategy.

*Block types.* Each block has a type, determined at its creation – either *regular* or *factored*. During the epoch miner  $i$  can create regular blocks whenever the scheduler invokes  $\text{Generate}_i()$ . In contrast, creating a factored block on  $C$  requires an expenditure of  $\rho \cdot r$  in  $ic$  by miner  $i$  at the previous epoch; recall we model such expenditure as if it occurs at the start of current epoch.

Consequently, if  $\rho > 0$  then miner  $i$  can create at most  $\left\lfloor \frac{B_i^{ic}}{\rho \cdot r} \right\rfloor$  factored blocks in an epoch on chain  $C$ . *HEB* assigns a *weight* to each block according to its type, and factored and regular blocks have weights of  $F$  and 1, respectively.

*Reward distribution.* *HEB* distributes the  $\ell r$  minted tokens among the miners in proportional to their contributed block weights. Denote by  $W_i(C)$  the total weight of blocks created in the epoch by miner  $i$  on chain  $C$ . So, miner  $i$  gets  $\frac{W_i(C)}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} W_j(C)} \ell r$  tokens for her created blocks.

*HEB* distributes the internal expenses  $B_{\text{Miners}}^{ic}$  among all system entities (i.e., including users) proportionally to their  $ic$  balances at the epoch beginning. So, miner  $i$  receives  $\frac{B_i^{ic}}{B_{\text{Miners}}^{ic} + B_{\text{Users}}^{ic}} B_{\text{Miners}}^{ic}$  tokens from the redistribution.

In summary, the balance of miner  $i$  with the epoch conclusion is  $\text{Bal}_i^{\text{HEB}}(LCP(S^G)) = \frac{W_i(LCP(S^G))}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} W_j(LCP(S^G))} \ell r +$

$$\frac{B_i^{ic}}{B_{\text{Miners}}^{ic} + B_{\text{Users}}^{ic}} B_{\text{Miners}}^{ic}$$

<sup>1</sup>Bitcoin defines a different tie-breaking rule – pick the first longest chain the miner became aware of. Therefore its security guarantees vary, depending on the underlying network assumptions. As in previous work [61, 100, 139], we avoid such assumptions by considering the uniformly-at-random variation.

NOTE. *Token redistribution is linear in the relative token balance in order to maintain the relative purchasing power [146] of each entity. This is in line with previous work [38, 119], and the natural approach in a permissionless and decentralized setting: super-linear allocation incentivizes centralization; sub-linear results with the rich splitting as several entities; both are undesired [38].*

**Prescribed strategy.** The prescribed strategy  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$  (Alg. 3) states that miners allocate their balance with ratio  $\rho$ , and create factored blocks up to their internal balance limitation. Formally, miner  $i$  allocates  $B_i^{\text{fc}} = \rho B_i$  and  $B_i^{\text{ec}} = (1 - \rho) B_i$ . If  $\rho = 0$  then the miner creates all blocks as factored, and if  $\rho > 0$  then only the first  $\left\lfloor \frac{B_i^{\text{fc}}}{\rho \cdot r} \right\rfloor$  ones. As in *Nakamoto*, miner  $i$  points her created blocks to a uniformly-at-random selected chain from  $LC(S^G)$ , and publishes them immediately.

NOTE. *Setting  $\rho = 0$  enables miners to create all blocks as factored, and setting  $F = 1$  removes motivation to create any factored blocks at all. In both cases there is only one practical block type, reducing HEB to Nakamoto.*

Appendix C brings practical implementation aspects of HEB – shortening epochs, utilizing a pure PoW ramp-up period to create a sufficiently-large currency circulation, and addressing discretization issues.

## 6 EVALUATION

We now evaluate *HEB*, showing how parameter choices affect its properties. For that, we formalize the cryptocurrency system as a game played among system entities, striving to maximize their rewards (§6.1). We use *Nakamoto* as a baseline, highlighting parameter choices that result with significantly lower PoW expenditure while limiting undesirable side-effects.

To realize such a comparison we first need to define its criteria. Hence, throughout the rest of this section we present cryptocurrency evaluation metrics, each followed by its evaluations of *Nakamoto* and *HEB*.

We consider previous security metrics [33, 38, 62, 71, 74, 108, 117, 121, 128, 136, 139] regarding the *incentive compatibility* of a system (§6.2 and §6.3); refine the common safety-violation security metric [23, 90, 94, 113, 137], measuring attack costs (§6.4); generalize the binary permissioned/permissionless notion [14, 119] to a continuous metric (§6.5); and conclude with a new natural metric for external expenses (§6.6).

### 6.1 Block Creation as a Game

The model gives rise to a game, played for the duration of a single epoch  $k$ . The players are the miners, each with her epoch balance as an input.

We define the utility of miner  $i$  for an epoch  $k$  as her expected cryptocurrency holdings at the conclusion of the epoch, i.e.,  $U_i(k) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{Bal}_i \left( LCP(S^G) \right) \right]$  when  $\text{length} \left( LCP(S^G) \right) = \ell(k+1)$ .

As commonly done in the analysis of cryptocurrency protocols [33, 62, 86, 139, 150], we assume that during an epoch the system is quasi-static, where all miners participate and the total

profit is constant. In operational systems miners participate for a positive profit [102, 117, 156], but discussing the required return-on-investment ratio for such behavior is out the scope of this work, and we arbitrarily assume it to be 0 [64, 79, 149]. Accordingly, the sum of all miner utilities equals the overall miner balances, that is,

$$B_{\text{Miners}}(k) = \sum_{i \in \text{Miners}(k)} U_i(k). \quad (1)$$

We normalize the number of newly-minted tokens in epoch  $k$  per block to be one, meaning  $r_k = 1$ , and a total of  $\ell$  tokens are created in the epoch.

The mining strategy space comprises choosing the balance allocation ratio, what blocks to generate, and when to publish them, i.e., implementations of  $\text{Allocate}(S^G, B(k))$ ,  $\text{Generate}^\Pi(S^G, S^L)$  and  $\text{Publish}(S^G, S^L)$ .

**Example: Nakamoto.** We demonstrate the compatibility of our definitions and modeling with previous results [120] regarding *Nakamoto*.

We consider a scenario where all miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{Nakamoto}}$ . So, all miner balances are in *ec* and consequently  $b_i = b_i^{\text{ec}}$ . Additionally, all miners extend the longest chain, so there is only a single one ( $|LC(S^G)| = 1$ ), which we denote by  $C$ , and it follows that  $C = LCP(S^G)$ .

We note the scheduler picks at each step a miner proportionally to her relative external balance (Alg. 1, line 6). We can consider each pick as a Bernoulli trial where miner  $i$  is picked with success probability of  $b_i$ . So, the number of blocks a miner  $i$  creates in an epoch is binomially distributed  $N_i(C) \sim \text{Bin}(\ell, b_i)$ .

Therefore,  $\mathbb{E}[N_i(C)] = b_i^{\text{ec}} \ell$ , and the utility of miner  $i$  is  $U_i^{\text{Nakamoto}} = b_i^{\text{ec}} \ell$ , matching previous analysis [119]. Summing for all miners and applying the balance-income equation (Eq. 1) yields  $B_{\text{Miners}} = B_{\text{Miners}}^{\text{ec}} = \ell$ , and the expected cost to create each block is 1, matching its reward.

### 6.2 Size bias

Cryptocurrency security relies on having multiple, independent miners, none of which has control over the system [38, 71, 128, 130, 136]. For that, these systems strive to distribute their rewards in a way that is *size-indifferent* [38], meaning that miners get relative reward matching their relative balances, and hence have no incentive to coalesce. The metric *Size bias* measures how well a protocol satisfies this desideratum when all miners follow the prescribed strategy. Unlike the other metrics, it is evaluated for a specific balance distribution (i.e., a specific allocation).

Formally, assume a balance distribution and that each miner  $i$  with relative balance  $b_i$  follows  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ . The utility of such miner is  $U_i^\Pi$ , and her relative utility is  $\frac{U_i^\Pi}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} U_j^\Pi}$ . We define *Size bias* to be the maximal difference of each miner's relative balance and relative utility, that is,  $\text{Size bias} \triangleq \max_{i \in \text{Miners}} \left| b_i - \frac{U_i^\Pi}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} U_j^\Pi} \right|$ .

Systems strive for *Size bias* to be minimal, as higher values indicating more disproportionate shares. Preferably, *Size bias* = 0, indicating all miners get reward proportionally to their balance.

In practice, there is an inherent advantage for having a larger relative balance. For example, a larger miner is competing against a smaller portion of the network, reducing the chance of its blocks being forked of the main chain [73, 107, 115, 123, 142]. Additionally, economy-of-scale optimizations allow miners with higher balances to operate more efficiently [6]. These considerations are outside the scope of this work, and current literature does not provide a specific number for comparison. So, although *Size bias* = 0 is a theoretical desideratum, systems like Bitcoin successfully operate even with non-zero values.

**Nakamoto.** Recall that in *Nakamoto* the utility of each miner  $i$  is  $U_i^{\text{Nakamoto}} = b_i^{\text{ec}}$ , meaning  $\frac{U_i^{\text{Nakamoto}}}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} U_j^{\text{Nakamoto}}} = b_i$  and in our model *Size bias* = 0. This matches previous analysis [119].

**HEB.** We now analyze *HEB's Size bias*. We begin with a preliminary analysis of the prescribed strategy (§6.2.1), deriving the expected miner utilities.

We follow with formalizing and proving two lemmas (§6.2.2): the first showing a required and sufficient condition to achieve *Size bias* = 0; the second showing this condition is met for sufficiently-large epoch lengths (i.e., larger  $\ell$ ).

We conclude with concrete number instantiations (§6.2.3), showing that *Size bias* improves (decreases) with longer epochs (larger  $\ell$ ) and a smaller factor (smaller  $F$ ) value, while being independent of  $\rho$ . We also show more balanced distributions have lower *Size bias*, but note these are not under the control of the system designer. Considering practical parameter choices, we show that even for an extreme balance distribution, *HEB* achieves *Size bias* < 0.3%. In a similar, yet balanced scenario, *Size bias* = 0.

**6.2.1 Prescribed Strategy Analysis.** We show that if all miners follow the prescribed strategy then

$$B_{\text{Miners}} = \ell \quad (2)$$

and utility of each miner  $i$  is

$$U_i^{\text{HEB}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} \mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]} \ell. \quad (3)$$

This analysis requires the following steps. First we show the redistributed internal currency a miner receives is negligible, allowing us to focus on the minting reward. For that we analyze the number of blocks a miner creates. Then, we derive her conditional total block weight, that is, her total block weight conditioned on the number of blocks she creates. We proceed to derive her expected total block weight, and conclude with finding her utility. Note that as all miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$  there is a single longest chain  $C$ .

**Negligible internal distribution rewards.** According to  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$  each miner  $i$  allocates her balance such that  $B_i^{\text{ic}} = \rho B_i$ . Summing the reward all miners receive and substituting total rewards with total balance (Eq. 1) yields  $B_{\text{Miners}} = \ell + \frac{(\rho B_{\text{Miners}})^2}{\rho B_{\text{Miners}} + B_{\text{Users}}^{\text{ic}}}$ , and as such  $B_{\text{Miners}} \left(1 - \frac{\rho^2 B_{\text{Miners}}}{\rho B_{\text{Miners}} + B_{\text{Users}}^{\text{ic}}}\right) = \ell$ . Recall that  $\rho < 1$  and  $B_{\text{Miners}} \ll B_{\text{Users}}^{\text{ic}}$ , therefore  $\rho^2 B_{\text{Miners}} \ll B_{\text{Users}}^{\text{ic}}$  (cf. §3.1) and  $\frac{\rho^2 B_{\text{Miners}}}{\rho B_{\text{Miners}} + B_{\text{Users}}^{\text{ic}}}$  is negligible. We get that  $B_{\text{Miners}} = \ell$  (Eq. 2).

**Number of blocks.** Each miner  $i$  allocates her balance such that  $B_i^{\text{ec}} = (1 - \rho) B_i$  and therefore the *ec* ratio of miner  $i$  equals her balance ratio:  $b_i^{\text{ec}} = \frac{B_i^{\text{ec}}}{B_{\text{Miners}}^{\text{ec}}} = \frac{(1-\rho)B_i}{(1-\rho)B_{\text{Miners}}} = b_i$ .

Recall that the scheduler selects miner  $i$  to generate a block by her relative external expenses  $b_i^{\text{ec}}$ . Epochs are of length  $\ell$  and the number of blocks miner  $i$  creates in an epoch,  $N_i(C)$ , is binomially distributed  $N_i(C) \sim \text{Bin}(\ell, b_i)$ . Therefore, the probability that miner  $i$  creates exactly  $m$  blocks in an epoch is  $\Pr(N_i(C) = m) = \binom{\ell}{m} \cdot (b_i)^m \cdot (1 - b_i)^{\ell - m}$ , and her expected number of blocks is  $\mathbb{E}[N_i(C)] = \ell b_i$ .

By  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$  each miner  $i$  allocates her balance such that  $B_i^{\text{ic}} = \rho B_i$ . The required internal balance per factored block is  $\rho$ , so miner  $i$  can create at most  $\lfloor B_i \rfloor$  factored blocks.

Recall  $B_i = b_i \cdot B_{\text{Miners}}$  and  $B_{\text{Miners}} = \ell$ , and we get the maximal number of factored blocks miner  $i$  can create in an epoch is  $\lfloor \ell b_i \rfloor$ .

For simplicity we assume that all miners have balances such that  $\ell b_i \in \mathbb{N}$ . We note this implies the minimal relative balance of a miner to participate in the system. However, because  $\ell$  is large, this limitation only applies to miners with very low, arguably insignificant, relative balances. E.g., if  $\ell = 1000$  then this limitation prevents miners with lower than 0.001 relative balance to participate, whom are irrelevant for any practical concern [6].

We now find the miner  $i$ 's total block weight, conditioned on the number of blocks she created.

**Conditional block weight.** Assume miner  $i$  created  $m$  blocks, and recall she can create at most  $\ell b_i$  factored ones.

If  $0 \leq m \leq \ell$  then miner  $i$  creates all her blocks as factored, each contributing block weight of  $F$ , resulting with an accumulated block weight of  $mF$ .

However, if  $\ell b_i < m \leq \ell$  then miner  $i$  creates only  $\ell b_i$  factored blocks, while the rest,  $m - \ell b_i$  are regular ones. Consequently, her accumulated block weight is  $\ell b_i F + m - \ell b_i$ .

In summary, miner  $i$ 's block weight assuming she created  $N_i(C) = m$  blocks is

$$W_i(C|m) = \begin{cases} mF, & 0 \leq m \leq \ell b_i \\ \ell b_i F + m - \ell b_i, & \ell b_i < m \leq \ell \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

**Expected block weight.** It follows the expected block weight of miner  $i$  is  $\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)] = \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} \Pr(N_i(C) = m) W_i(C|N_i(C) = m)^2$ .

**Expected income.** The utility based on the *Bal* implementation is  $U_i^{\text{HEB}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} \mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]} \ell + \frac{\rho^2 B_i B_{\text{Miners}}}{\rho B_{\text{Miners}} + B_{\text{Users}}^{\text{ic}}}$ . Note that for similar considerations  $\frac{\rho^2 B_i B_{\text{Miners}}}{\rho B_{\text{Miners}} + B_{\text{Users}}^{\text{ic}}}$  is negligible, resulting with

$$U_i^{\text{HEB}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} \mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]} \ell,$$

which is exactly Eq. 3.

<sup>2</sup>We note that the Chernoff [39] and factorial moment [131] bounds apply for  $N_i(C)$ , provide an exponentially decreasing (with respect to  $\ell$ ) bound on its distribution tail. For a specific  $\ell$  value we can use the cumulative distribution and survival functions to find the error probability. For example, for a miner  $i$  with relative balance  $b_i = 0.3$  and  $\ell = 1000$ , the probabilities for a negative and positive relative errors of 10% are 0.02 and 0.018, respectively.

**6.2.2 Theoretical Analysis.** We prove necessary and sufficient conditions to achieve  $\text{Size bias} = 0$ , and show they hold for sufficiently long epochs, i.e., large  $\ell$  values.

First, we note that in *HEB* the relative utility of any miner  $i$  is  $\frac{U_i^{\text{HEB}}}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} U_j^{\text{HEB}}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} \mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]}$  (summing Eq. 3 for all miners), and hence we can consider  $\text{Size bias} = \max_{i \in \text{Miners}} \left| b_i - \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} \mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]} \right|$ .

We now present and prove two lemmas. The first shows that all miners have the same expected block weight normalized by their relative balance iff  $\text{Size bias} = 0$ ; the second that for a large  $\ell$  value all miners have the same normalized expected block weight.

**LEMMA 6.1.** *In HEB, if all miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$ , then  $\forall i, j \in \text{Miners} : \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]}{b_j}$  iff  $\text{Size bias} = 0$ .*

**PROOF.** First, assume  $\forall i, j \in \text{Miners} : \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]}{b_j}$ . It follows  $\forall i \in \text{Miners} : \mathbb{E}[W_i(C)] = \frac{b_i}{b_1} \mathbb{E}[W_1(C)]$ . Therefore  $\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} \mathbb{E}[W_j(C)] = \frac{1}{b_1} \mathbb{E}[W_1(C)]$ , and consequently  $\frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} \mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]} = b_i$ . It immediately follows that  $\text{Size bias} = 0$ .

Now assume  $\text{Size bias} = 0$ , meaning  $\frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{\sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} \mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]} = b_i$  or  $\frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i} = \sum_{j \in \text{Miners}} \mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]$ . The last equation holds for any miner  $i$ , thus pose a set of linear equations, with the solution being that  $\forall i, j \in \text{Miners} : \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_j(C)]}{b_j}$ .  $\square$

**LEMMA 6.2.** *In HEB, if all miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$ , then  $\forall i \in \text{Miners} : \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i} = \ell F$ .*

**PROOF.** By the law of large numbers we get that  $N_i(C)$  converges to its expected value,  $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} N_i(C) = \ell b_i$ . Consequently, the expected block weight of each miner  $i$  (Eq. 4) is  $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[W_i(C)] = \ell b_i F$ , and therefore  $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i} = \ell F$ .  $\square$


It directly follows from the two previous lemmas that with a sufficiently large  $\ell$  value *HEB* achieves  $\text{Size bias} = 0$ , as stated in the following corollary:

**COROLLARY 6.3.** *In HEB, if all miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$ , then  $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \text{Size bias} = 0$ .*

**6.2.3 Parameter Instantiation.** We now evaluate the  $\text{Size bias}$  for different  $\ell$ ,  $F$  and  $b$  values. As all miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$  then  $\text{Size bias}$  is unaffected by  $\rho$ .

We proceed as follows. We numerically calculate  $\frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i}$  for various  $F$ ,  $\ell$  and  $b_i$  values. We present our results in Fig. 1, normalized by  $\frac{1}{\ell F}$  for comparison purposes. Although we present results for specific configurations, we assert that different parameter values yield the same qualitative results.

Fig. 1a shows for a fixed  $F = 20$  the value of  $\frac{1}{\ell F} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i}$  as a function of  $\ell$ . As expected (Lemma 6.2),  $\frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i}$  approaches 1



**Figure 1:**  $\frac{1}{\ell F} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i}$  for  $\rho$  and  $\ell$  values.

Balance distribution					Size bias
$b_1$	$b_2$	$b_3$	$b_4$	$b_5$	
0.20	0.80	-	-	-	<b>0.0029</b>
0.10	0.15	0.20	0.20	0.35	<b>0.0025</b>
0.20	0.40	0.40	-	-	<b>0.0015</b>
0.20	0.20	0.30	0.30	-	<b>0.0007</b>
0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	<b>0.0000</b>

**Table 2:**  $\text{Size bias}$  when  $\ell = 1000$  and  $F = 20$ . Hyphens represent miners not present in the configuration.

as  $\ell$  grows, leading towards  $\text{Size bias} = 0$ . However, for any fixed  $\ell$  value, miners of different  $b_i$  have different  $\frac{1}{\ell F} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i}$ , resulting with  $\text{Size bias} > 0$ , matching Lemma 6.1.

We also illustrate the effect of  $F$  on  $\frac{1}{\ell F} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i}$ . Fig. 1b shows  $\frac{1}{\ell F} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i}$  for  $\ell = 1000$  as function of  $F$ . At the region of lower  $F$  values, increasing  $F$  also increases the difference of  $\frac{1}{\ell F} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i}$  for different  $b_i$ . However, as  $F$  becomes larger, then  $\frac{1}{\ell F} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_i(C)]}{b_i}$  tends towards a constant and the difference for different  $b_i$  remains fixed. This is expected, as for larger  $F$  values the term  $\ell b_i F + m - \ell b_i$  in Eq. 4 is dominated by  $\ell b_i F$ , and the expected weight becomes linear in  $F$ .

We dedicate the rest of this section to analyze how different balance distributions affect miners' utilities and  $\text{Size bias}$ . We consider various settings of at most 5 miners with epoch length of  $\ell = 1000$  blocks and  $F = 20$ .

For each setting we numerically calculate  $\text{Size bias}$  and present it, along with its respective balance distribution, in Table 2. We choose these specific settings to demonstrate  $\text{Size bias}$  both balanced and extreme distributions.

Table 2 shows that more extreme balance distributions results in higher  $\text{Size bias}$ . For instance, consider the setting with only two miners where  $b_1 = 0.2$  and  $b_2 = 0.8$ . This setting leads to the highest value of  $\text{Size bias} = 0.0029$ . Note that this is an unrealistic setting, presented only as an example for a highly-uneven distribution. Even in this extreme scenario miner 1 has a degradation of less than 0.3% in her relative utility. More balanced settings lead to lower  $\text{Size bias}$  values.

In summary, even a highly-unbalanced distribution results in minor deviations from proportional rewards. Increasing  $\ell$  and decreasing  $F$  enables the system designer to reduce these deviations.

### 6.3 Nash threshold

Recall protocol  $\Pi$  provides a prescribed strategy  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$  that miners individually choose whether to follow. The protocol properties rely on miners following this strategy [33, 62, 74, 117, 121, 139, 149, 150, 159], hence it should incentivize miners to do so.

The question is whether the prescribed strategy is a Nash-equilibrium [8, 68, 151], meaning no miner can benefit from individually deviating to a different strategy. Like in previous work [62, 119, 121, 130, 139], the *Nash threshold* metric is the maximal relative miner balance that achieves this: If all miners have relative balances smaller than the threshold, then the prescribed strategy is a Nash-equilibrium.

Formally, denote by  $\sigma_{i,\text{best}}^\Pi$  the best-response strategy of miner  $i$  with relative balance  $b_i$  when all other miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ . *Nash threshold* is the maximal value  $b_i$  such that  $\sigma_{i,\text{best}}^\Pi = \sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ . It follows that  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$  is a Nash-equilibrium if all miner relative balances are not greater than *Nash threshold*.

**Nakamoto.** Sapirshtein et al. [139] showed that for *Nakamoto* with the uniform tie-breaking fork selection rule (see §4) the metric value is *Nash threshold* = 0.232.

**HEB.** An optimal miner strategy must consider how to allocate the balance, which previous blocks to point to, what block type to create, and when to publish created blocks.

**PoW-only analysis.** Before the general analysis we start by considering a specific, natural, *PoW-only* strategy  $\sigma_{\text{PoW-only}}^{\text{HEB}}$  (Alg. 5), which simply ignores the internal expenditure aspect of *HEB*.

The idea of  $\sigma_{\text{PoW-only}}^{\text{HEB}}$  is to maximize the block creation rate by expending all resources externally. The miner tries to create all the epoch blocks herself, and thus obtain all the epoch rewards. Specifically, miner  $i$  allocates her balance s.t.  $\langle 0, B_i \rangle$ , creates regular blocks pointing to the last block in her local storage  $S_i^L$ , and publishes these blocks only after she has created  $\ell$  of them.

$\sigma_{\text{PoW-only}}^{\text{HEB}}$  does not allocate resources for factored blocks, as if successful, all published blocks on the main chain are by the miner, thus her relative block weight is 1, granting her all the epoch reward.

This strategy is of interest as it abuses the internal expenditure mechanism; it is also simple enough to lend itself to a closed-form analysis. Specifically, for  $\sigma_{\text{PoW-only}}^{\text{HEB}}$  to be expected to succeed, miner  $i$  has to create blocks at a rate higher than all other miners combined.

Let  $B_{-i}$  be the aggregate balance of all miners except miner  $i$ . It follows the requirement is  $B_i^{\text{ec}} > B_{-i}^{\text{ec}}$ , and we seek the minimal  $b_i$  satisfying this condition.

All miners except miner  $i$  follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$ , so  $B_{-i}^{\text{ec}} = (1 - \rho) B_{-i}$ . We get the aforementioned inequality is equivalent to  $B_i > (1 - \rho) B_{-i}$ . Now, recall that  $B_i + B_{-i} = \ell$  and  $\ell b_i = B_i$ , and we get  $b_i > (1 - \rho) (1 - b_i)$  or  $b_i > \frac{1-\rho}{2-\rho}$ .




Figure 2: Required  $b_i$  for  $\sigma_{i,\text{PoW-only}}^{\text{HEB}}$  to outperform  $\sigma_{i,\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$




Figure 3: Minimal required  $F$  for Nash threshold.

The value of  $\frac{1-\rho}{2-\rho}$  is an upper bound of *Nash threshold*; for larger  $b_i$  values, the strategy  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$  is not the best-response, i.e., not a Nash-equilibrium.

We present this bound in Fig. 2. If  $b_i > \frac{1-\rho}{2-\rho}$ , i.e., above the plot,  $\sigma_{i,\text{PoW-only}}^{\text{HEB}}$  outperforms  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$  showing that  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$  is not a Nash-equilibrium.

As expected, higher  $\rho$  values lower the bound, as miner  $i$  is competing against less external balance. This result matches *Nakamoto*, as if  $\rho = 0$  then  $\frac{1-\rho}{2-\rho} = 0.5$ , yielding the established 50% bound [5, 103, 119, 139].

**General analysis.** Following previous work [74, 84, 139, 160], we use *Markov Decision Process (MDP)* to search for the optimal strategy in *HEB*. The MDP includes the internal expenditure and block weights, and produces miner  $i$ 's best-response strategy  $\sigma_{i,\text{best}}^{\text{HEB}}$  based on system parameters.

We note the state and action spaces grow exponentially with the epoch length, limiting available analysis to relatively small epoch values. Therefore, similarly to previous work [74, 84, 139, 160], we also limit the state space by excluding strategies requiring longer, and thus less probable, sequences of events.

Our focus is finding the required parameter values for which the best response  $\sigma_{i,\text{best}}^{\text{HEB}}$  is the prescribed  $\sigma_{i,\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$  strategy. Recall that  $\sigma_{i,\text{best}}^{\text{HEB}}$  is the optimal implementation of  $\text{Allocate}_i()$ ,  $\text{Generate}_i()$  and  $\text{Publish}_i()$  given  $B_i$  and the system parameters  $\ell, F, \rho$ , hence we take the following approach.

We fix  $\ell = 10$  to limit the state space, and for various values of  $\rho$  and  $b_i$  we use binary-search to find the minimal  $F \in [1, 10^8]$  value such that  $\sigma_{i,\text{best}}^{\text{HEB}} = \sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$ . First, we consider  $\text{Allocate}_i()$  implementations that let miner  $i$  create a natural number of blocks (allocating balance to enable the creation of a fraction of a block is strictly dominated, enabling discretization of possible implementations). For each such implementation we use the MDP to obtain the optimal implementation of  $\text{Generate}_i()$  and  $\text{Publish}_i()$ . We let the miner play the resultant strategies for 5000 games each, and take the most rewarding to be  $\sigma_{i,\text{best}}^{\text{HEB}}$ .

Alg. 4: $\sigma_{i,petty}^{HEB}$	Alg. 5: $\sigma_{i,PoW-only}^{HEB}$
<pre> 1 <b>Function</b> Allocate(<math>S^G, B_i</math>): 2   <b>return</b> <math>(1 - \rho) B_i</math> 3 <b>Function</b> Generate(<math>S^G, S_i^L</math>): 4   <math>C \leftarrow</math> uniformly from the minimal-weight       chains in <math>LC(S^G)</math> 5   <math>pointer \leftarrow last(C)</math> 6   <b>if</b> <math>N_i(C) &lt; \left\lfloor \frac{B_i^c}{\rho r} \right\rfloor</math> <b>then</b> 7     <math>type \leftarrow factored</math> 8   <b>else</b> 9     <math>type \leftarrow regular</math> 10  <b>return</b> NewBlock(pointer, type) 11 <b>Function</b> Publish(<math>S^G, S_i^L</math>): 12  <b>return</b> All previously unpublished blocks </pre>	<pre> 1 <b>Function</b> Allocate(<math>S^G, B_i</math>): 2   <b>return</b> <math>\langle 0, B_i \rangle</math> 3 <b>Function</b> Generate(<math>S^G, S_i^L</math>): 4   <math>pointer \leftarrow last(S_i^L)</math> 5   <b>return</b> NewBlock(pointer, regular) 6 <b>Function</b> Publish(<math>S^G, S_i^L</math>): 7   <b>if</b> <math>N_i(S_i^L) &lt; \ell</math> <b>then</b> 8     <b>return</b> 9   <b>else</b> 10    <b>return</b> All previously unpublished <math>\ell</math> blocks </pre>

We present the results in Fig. 3, showing that increasing  $F$  values and lowering  $\rho$  increases *Nash threshold*. Specifically, for  $b_i = 0.2$  the required  $F$  values grow exponentially with  $\rho$  up to  $\rho = 0.5$ , and from there even the maximal  $F$  value does not accommodate the desired behavior. We note a similar behavior for  $b_i = 0.1$ , growing exponentially with  $\rho$  up to  $\rho = 0.7$ , being the maximal  $\rho$  that leads to  $\sigma_{i,prescribed}^{HEB}$  being a Nash-equilibrium.

We also note that lower  $b_i$  requires lower  $F$  values, and specifically, there are no  $F$  and  $\rho$  values for which the configuration of  $b_i = 0.3$  achieves a Nash-equilibrium. This is expected as the profitability threshold for selfish-mining variants is  $b_i = 0.232$  [139], and indeed the resultant best-response strategies resemble selfish-mining in *Nakamoto*.

We conclude that *Nash threshold* relies on  $\ell$ ,  $F$  and  $\rho$ ; by setting  $F = 20$ , we can obtain *Nash threshold* = 0.2 even for  $\rho = 0.5$ , close to *Nakamoto's* *Nash threshold* = 0.232 value [139].

**MDP Technical Details.** Like previous work [74, 84, 139, 159, 160], our MDP finds the best-response strategy of miner  $i$  for given system parameters. We detail the modeling of the other system miners as a single one, denoted miner  $\neg i$ , who follows a prescribed strategy.

As such, we limit the analysis to strategies considering at most two chains at any given time [33, 62, 121, 139]. The first is the *public* chain, followed by miner  $\neg i$ , while the other is known only to miner  $i$  (i.e., maintained in her local storage  $S_i^L$ ), named the *secret* chain.

We describe miner  $\neg i$ , the action space, the state space, and the reward function.

*Miner  $\neg i$ .* As in previous work [33, 62, 139], miner  $\neg i$  is a cohort comprising infinitely-many, non-colluding infinitely-small balance miners. She follows a *petty-compliant* [33] strategy  $\sigma_{petty}^{HEB}$  that is a variant of  $\sigma_{prescribed}^{HEB}$  (Alg. 4): it tie-breaks conflicting longest chains uniformly-at-random from the multiple longest chains with the minimum accumulated weight.

The intuition for  $\sigma_{petty}^{HEB}$  is as follows. Given a specific block, its relative weight is higher on a chain with less accumulated weight. As miners get reward based on their relative weight, they have an explicit incentive to pick the chain that has a lower accumulated weight. That is, this strategy is more logical from a miner's perspective as it is expected to increase her utility.

So, assuming a petty-compliant cohort strengthens our result, producing a more conservative threshold, as such behavior is more amendable to manipulation [33].

In practice it is less likely that a miner will prefer to extend a chain excluding a previous block she created, as that lowers her block weight and utility. So, larger honest miners are more reluctant to discard their blocks and follow other chains; modeling the cohort to comprise infinitely-many negligibly-small balance miners removes this consideration [33], resulting with a stronger adversary, i.e., producing a more conservative bound. We illustrate that with the following example.

**EXAMPLE.** Assume the last block  $last(C)$  on the main chain  $C$  is a factored block created by miner  $\neg i$ . According to  $\sigma_{prescribed}^{HEB}$  the next block should point to  $last(C)$  and extend  $C$ . Assume the scheduler lets miner  $i$  create the next block, and she creates a regular block that points to the same block as  $last(C)$ , publishing it immediately. Denote the original and the new chain by  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , respectively.

Chains  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are the longest chains, i.e.,  $LC(S^G) = \{C_1, C_2\}$ . Now, assume that miner  $i$  points her next created block to  $last(C_2)$ . As  $W(C_1) - W(C_2) = F - 1 > 0$  and miner  $\neg i$  follows  $\sigma_{petty}^{HEB}$ , if miner  $\neg i$  is picked to create the next block she will deterministically choose to point it to  $last(C_2)$ .

Therefore, regardless of which miner gets to create the next block,  $last(C_1)$  will not be pointed by following blocks, effectively removing it from any future longest chain. That means miner  $i$  had managed to replace a factored block miner  $\neg i$  with her own regular block on the main chain, increasing her block weight while decreasing that of miner  $\neg i$ , both effectively increasing her utility.

If miner  $\neg i$  had followed  $\sigma_{prescribed}^{HEB}$  then she would have pointed her next block to  $last(C_2)$  only with probability 0.5, as both  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are of the same length. That means that block  $last(C_1)$  might still end on the main chain (depending on miner  $i$ 's strategy and future block creations), resulting with lower expected block weight for miner  $i$ .

**Action space.** We represent miner  $i$ 's action as a two-element tuple  $\{chain\_manipulation, block\_type\}$ . Element *chain\_manipulation* describes how miner  $i$  interacts with the secret and public chains, and may contain one of the three values — *publish*, *adopt* and *wait*. The value of *publish* indicates the miner publishes the blocks of the secret chain, a value of *adopt* indicates the miner abandons the secret chain and adopts the public chain, and *wait* indicates the miner does neither the former nor the latter. Element *block\_type* takes a binary value, describing whether the next block the miner creates is factored.

**State space.** We represent states as a three-element tuple  $\{secret\_chain, public\_chain, fork\}$  [74, 84, 139, 160]. Elements *secret\_chain* and *public\_chain* represent the contents of the secret and public chains, respectively. Element *fork* has a binary value indicating whether miner  $\neg i$  is partitioned with regards to which of the two chains to extend. Note that *fork* is true only if miner  $i$  had previously published her chain.

Previous work [74, 139, 160] analyzes an infinite game and introduces a *truncation parameter*  $T$ , capping the length of the secret and public chains. The used state space includes counters of the blocks in the secret and public chains, resulting in a state space complexity of  $O(T^2)$ .

This state space does not fit *HEB* – we must maintain the order of block types on each chain, resulting in a state space complexity of  $O(2^\ell)$ . As an example, consider the case where miner  $i$  has first created a factored block and then a regular block on the secret chain, followed by miner  $\neg i$  creating a factored block on the public chain. In this case, miner  $i$  publishing the first factored block results in a fork, resembling *Lead-Stubborn Mining* [121]. Now, consider the similar case where miner  $i$  has first created a regular block and then a factored block on the secret chain, followed by miner  $\neg i$  creating a factored block on the public chain. In this case, miner  $i$  publishing the first regular block results with miner  $\neg i$  deterministically adopting it and forfeiting her recently-created factored block. To distinguish these two cases, our state space includes the order of created block types.

**Reward function.** Rewarding states are those where either the secret or the public chain are of  $\ell$  blocks, that is,  $\text{length}(\text{secret\_chain}) = \ell$  or  $\text{length}(\text{public\_chain}) = \ell$ . Note that this restricts miner  $i$  to strategies bounded by the creation of  $\ell$  blocks; strategies that exceed this limitation are feasible with negligible probability [74]. These states indicate the epoch conclusion and hence the reward distribution of *HEB*.

**NOTE.** Previous work [74, 139, 160] analyzed infinitely-repeating games, hence their MDPs had no final states. They iteratively optimize for the best-response strategy, stopping only when meeting a predefined precision criteria. This results with an approximation of the best-response strategy.

The *HEB* MDP has final states (where the longest chain is of length  $\ell$ ), and there are no state reoccurrences. Essentially, the *HEB* MDP is a dynamically-programmed search on all possible strategies. As such, its result is not an approximation but the actual best-response strategy.

## 6.4 Free safety-violation threshold and Safety-violation threshold

We consider safety-violation attacks [12, 19, 23, 46, 88, 90, 94, 113, 133, 137] as scenarios where an attacker causes the system to make an invalid transition. This can be achieved by creating and publishing an alternative chain, surpassing in length the main one. The blocks of the original chain are then discarded, and the system state is reinstated according to the blocks on the alternative, new chain.

To mount this attack in *Nakamoto* the attacker expends her resources on creating blocks to form the alternative chain; recall that each block costs its worth in reward to create (Eq. 1). Therefore, if the attack is successful, the attacker is fully compensated for her expenditures by the rewards from her created blocks. As such, there is a threshold of required resources to mount this attack, but once met, the attack is *free*.

The metric *Free safety-violation threshold* measures the minimal required balance for a miner to deploy such a refunded safety-violation attack on the system, assuming all other miners follow the prescribed strategy  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ . As shown in previous work [23], the attacker may rent vast computational resources for a short period of time or a moderate amount for longer periods. We therefore measure the expected cost to create a single block, disregarding the attack duration and amplitude.

The *Safety-violation threshold* metric removes the refund requirement, and simply represents the cost to create a block.

Formally, assume all miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ . Then, *Free safety-violation threshold* is the minimal cost to create a block, guaranteeing full compensation should it be on the main chain, and *Safety-violation threshold* is this cost without any further compensation guarantees.

**Nakamoto.** In *Nakamoto* the cost to create each block is 1, hence *Free safety-violation threshold* = 1. All blocks produce the same reward, hence a miner cannot reduce the cost for a safety-violation attack by choosing to create less-rewarding blocks. Therefore, *Safety-violation threshold* = 1.

**HEB.** In equilibria the total external expenses are  $1 - \rho$  of the total balances, that is  $B_{\text{Miners}}^{\text{ec}} = (1 - \rho) B_{\text{Miners}}$ . As  $B_{\text{Miners}} = \ell$  it follows that the required external expenses to create a single block is  $1 - \rho$ .

As other miners create factored blocks, a miner also has to create a factored block to be fully compensated for her expenses, requiring additional spending of  $\rho$ . Hence, the cost to create a single block is 1, so *Free safety-violation threshold* = 1. That is, *HEB* is as resilient to refunded attacks as *Nakamoto*.

Alternatively, a miner can disregard compensation and choose to create regular blocks, baring no additional internal expenses, and so *Safety-violation threshold* =  $1 - \rho$ , which is less secure than *Nakamoto*. However, the lack of direct compensation makes these attacks very expensive, hence they are only available to a well-funded adversary with an exogenous utility, e.g., interested in destabilizing or short-selling a cryptocurrency.

Indeed, previous attack instances [19, 88, 133, 152] were on relatively-small systems and were of the former, refunded type. We are not aware of such sabotage attacks happening in practice; this is possibly because the required expenditure surpasses the potential profit [12, 46].

## 6.5 Permissiveness

Cryptocurrency protocols implement their own reward distribution mechanisms [38], and may choose to condition rewards on a miner having the internal system currency  $ic$ . For example, in PoS systems [57, 75, 97] owning  $ic$  is a requisite, and miners without  $ic$  cannot participate and get rewards. In contrast, in PoW systems [29, 119] owning  $ic$  does not affect reward eligibility.

Acquisition of  $ic$  involves an update of the new currency ownership in the system state. This requires the cooperation of the present system miners: They decide which state updates occur when placing user data in their created blocks. So, if token ownership is a mining requirement, then a new miner wishing to participate requires the cooperation of existing miners.

Previous work considered either permissioned systems that require token ownership [67, 75, 78, 97] (some also require explicitly locking owned tokens as a collateral), or permissionless systems [29, 61, 119] that do not.

We generalize this binary differentiation to a continuous metric, *Permissiveness*, measuring the revenue of a newly-joining miner without cooperation from the incumbents. The metric is the ratio between the revenues of a miner where she failed or managed to obtain  $ic$ .




Figure 4: HEB Permissiveness.

Formally, consider a miner  $i$  with balance  $B_i$ , and assume that all other miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ . Denote by  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed-no-ic}}^\Pi$  a strategy identical to  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$  with the exception that the  $\text{Allocate}_i(S^G, B_i(k))$  implementation returns  $\langle 0, B_i \rangle$ . Note this captures the inability of miner  $i$  to obtain  $ic$ . Denote by  $U_{i,\text{prescribed-no-ic}}^\Pi$  and by  $U_{i,\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$  the utility of miner  $i$  if she follows  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed-no-ic}}^\Pi$  and  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ , respectively. We then define  $\text{Permissiveness} \triangleq \frac{U_{i,\text{prescribed-no-ic}}^\Pi}{U_{i,\text{prescribed}}^\Pi}$ .

If  $\text{Permissiveness} = 1$  then a miner's utility is not affected by her inability to obtain  $ic$ , meaning the protocol is permissionless. In contrast,  $\text{Permissiveness} = 0$  indicates that a miner who cannot obtain  $ic$  is completely prevented from participation.

**Nakamoto.** As a pure PoW blockchain protocol, *Nakamoto* does not require  $ic$  balance, and both strategies do not allocate any balance internally, and as such  $\text{Permissiveness} = 1$ .

**HEB.** Deriving  $U_{i,\text{prescribed-no-ic}}^\Pi$  and  $U_{i,\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$  leads to  $\text{Permissiveness} = \frac{1}{b_i + F(1-b_i)}$  (Appendix D).

Fig. 4 presents  $\text{Permissiveness}$  for different values of  $b_i$  as a function of  $F$ . It shows that higher factor values  $F$  lead to lower  $\text{Permissiveness}$  values, making the system more permissioned. It also shows that miners with higher relative balances are slightly less susceptible to these effects.

As expected, higher values of  $F$  increase the reward of creating factored blocks, and failing to do so results in lower income. Additionally, a higher relative balance enables creating more blocks, decreasing the overall block weight of the other miners, making the miner's revenue less susceptible.

Although failure to obtain  $ic$  results with a lower reward, it still enables the new miner to create blocks herself, removing the requirement for cooperation from the incumbents in the subsequent epochs. The reduced reward in the first epoch is a one-time cost that is negligible for a long-running miner.

This is a significant and qualitative improvement over permissioned systems, where a miner that cannot obtain tokens [75] or lock them as a collateral [67, 78, 97] is blocked from all future participation.

## 6.6 External expenses

*External expenses* evaluates the external expenditure of the protocol, and lower values indicate a lower environmental impact. Formally, assume all miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^\Pi$ . *External expenses* is the total of miner external expenses, measured in  $ec$ , normalized by the epoch length, i.e.,  $\text{External expenses} \triangleq \frac{B_{\text{Miners}}^{ec}}{\ell}$ .

**Nakamoto.** The total miner expenses are  $B_{\text{Miners}}^{ec} = \ell$ , so  $\text{External expenses} = 1$ .

**HEB.** When all miners follow  $\sigma_{\text{prescribed}}^{\text{HEB}}$  then  $B_{\text{Miners}}^{ec} = (1 - \rho) B_{\text{Miners}}$  and  $\text{External expenses} = 1 - \rho$ . This is the main advantage of HEB over *Nakamoto*.

## 7 PRACTICAL PARAMETERS

As we have seen, *HEB* presents several knobs for the system designer. Longer epoch length  $\ell$  improves *Size bias*, however, also means that reward distribution takes longer. Higher factored block weight  $F$  improves *Nash threshold* at the expense of *Permissiveness*. Higher internal expenditure rate  $\rho$  reduces the external expenditures, but makes the system less robust against rational miners, and reduces the required costs for sabotage attacks.

The choice of parameter values should be according to the desired system properties. Each system has different goals, and we emphasize that determining optimal parameter values is not a goal of this work. Nevertheless, in this section we consider a specific parameter choice. We compare this instantiation to Bitcoin, and use the latter's miner balance distribution [22] as a representative example.

We choose the external cost parameter to be  $\rho = 0.5$ , the epoch length to be  $\ell = 1000$ , and the factor to be  $F = 20$ .

First and foremost, this setting results with only half of the external resource consumption ( $\text{External expenses} = 0.5$ ), which is equivalent to reducing the entire power consumption of Denmark [41, 49]. This choice incentivizes rational miners with up to 0.2 relative balance to follow the prescribed strategy (*Nash threshold* = 0.2) down from Bitcoin's 0.232 [139]. Note that the largest miner in Bitcoin has a relative balance of 0.16 [22], so rational miners would follow the prescribed, honest mining behavior.

With Bitcoin's expected block creation interval of 10 minutes, having epochs of  $\ell = 1000$  means mining rewards are distributed on a weekly basis. This is longer than the seventeen hours [119, 147] miners wait today, but arguably still an acceptable time frame.

The threshold for a refunded safety-violation (*Free safety-violation threshold* = 1), is as in Bitcoin, but the non-refunded variation is twice as cheap (*Safety-violation threshold* = 0.5). We note that we are not aware of attacks of either type on prominent cryptocurrency systems, and that the non-refunded type is unlikely due to the lack of endogenous compensation (cf. §6.4).

In regards to permissiveness, a miner with a relative balance  $b_i = 0.1$  that fails to obtain any  $ic$  due to incumbents is expected to get 5% of what she would have if she had  $ic$  ( $\text{Permissiveness} = 0.05$ ). Recall this is at most a negligible one-time cost (cf. §6.5).

Finally, for the current Bitcoin miner balance distribution [22] the maximal relative advantage from size differences is 0.1% (*Size bias* = 0.001). We consider modifications to further decrease this value in Appendix C.

## 8 CONCLUSION

We propose a new PoW paradigm that utilizes internal expenditure as a balancing mechanism. We present *HEB* – a generalization of

Nakamoto's protocol that allows its designer to tune external resource expenditure. We link the values of internal and external currencies, and formalize evaluation metrics including a blockchain's resilience to sabotage and revenue-seeking attacks and permissiveness on a continuous scale. We explore the trade-offs in parameter choice. We propose practical parameters based on Bitcoin's ecosystem that cut down by half the PoW expenditure (equivalent to reducing the power consumption of an entire country) while maintaining similar security guarantees against practical attacks.

Natural questions that arise from the discovery of *HEB* are what should be the security target for cryptocurrency protocols, how to set the parameters dynamically, and how to govern them [78, 134]. Beyond these, *HEB* extends the design space of decentralized systems, and is a step forward in realizing secure PoW systems with a sustainable environmental impact.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Alan L. Johnson. 2019. The Negative Environmental Impact of Bitcoin. <https://sci-techmaven.io/superposition/society/the-negative-environmental-impact-of-bitcoin>
- [2] Alex Hern. 2019. Bitcoin's energy usage is huge – we can't afford to ignore it. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/jan/17/bitcoin-electricity-usage-huge>
- [3] M. Ali, Aaron Blankstein, M. Freedman, Ludovic Galabru, D. Gupta, Jude Nelson, Jesse Soslow, and Patrick Stanley. [n.d.]. PoX: Proof of Transfer Mining with Bitcoin. <https://uploads-ssl.webflow.com/5e7b1a27d160ce49af1c24e1/5f1596b12bcc0800f3dcadcd196c.pdf>
- [4] Maurice Allais. 1966. A restatement of the quantity theory of money. *The American economic review* (1966).
- [5] andes. 2011. Bitcoin's kryptonite: The 51% attack. <https://bitointalk.org/index.php?topic=12435>
- [6] Nick Arnosti and S Matthew Weinberg. 2018. Bitcoin: A natural oligopoly. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.08572* (2018).
- [7] James Aspnes, Collin Jackson, and Arvind Krishnamurthy. 2005. Exposing computationally-challenged Byzantine impostors. *Department of Computer Science, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Tech. Rep* (2005).
- [8] Robert J Aumann. 1987. Correlated equilibrium as an expression of Bayesian rationality. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* (1987).
- [9] Tuomas Aura, Pekka Nikander, and Jussipekka Leiwo. 2000. DOS-resistant authentication with client puzzles. In *International workshop on security protocols*. Springer.
- [10] Adam Back. 2002. *Hashcash – A Denial of Service Counter-Measure*. <http://www.cipherspace.org/hashcash/hashcash.pdf>
- [11] Marshall Ball, Alon Rosen, Manuel Sabin, and Prashant Nalini Vasudevan. 2017. Proofs of Useful Work. *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2017).
- [12] Shehar Bano, Alberto Sonnino, Mustafa Al-Bassam, Sarah Azouvi, Patrick McCorry, Sarah Meiklejohn, and George Danezis. 2019. SoK: Consensus in the age of blockchains. In *Proceedings of ACM AFT*.
- [13] Gregory Barber. 2019. *Bitcoin's Climate Impact Is Global. The Cures Are Local*. <https://www.wired.com/story/bitcoins-climate-impact-global-cures-local/>
- [14] Mathieu Baudet, Avery Ching, Andrey Chursin, George Danezis, François Garillot, Zekun Li, Dahlia Malkhi, Oded Naor, Dmitri Perelman, and Alberto Sonnino. 2018. State machine replication in the Libra Blockchain.
- [15] Jörg Becker, Dominic Breuker, Tobias Heide, Justus Holler, Hans Peter Rauer, and Rainer Böhm. 2012. Can We Afford Integrity by Proof-of-Work? Scenarios Inspired by the Bitcoin Currency. In *Workshop on the Economics of Information Security*. Berlin, Deutschland.
- [16] Iddo Bentov, Pavel Hubáček, Tal Moran, and Asaf Nadler. 2017. Tortoise and Hares Consensus: the Meshcash Framework for Incentive-Compatible, Scalable Cryptocurrencies. *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2017).
- [17] Iddo Bentov, Charles Lee, Alex Mizrahi, and Meni Rosenfeld. 2014. Proof of Activity: Extending Bitcoin's Proof of Work via Proof of Stake. *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2014).
- [18] Bitcoin Cash community. [n.d.]. Bitcoin Cash Site. <https://www.bitcoincash.org/>
- [19] Bitcoin.com. 2020. \$5.6 Million Double Spent: ETC Team Finally Acknowledges the 51% Attack on Network. <https://news.bitcoin.com/5-6-million-stolen-as-etc-team-finally-acknowledge-the-51-attack-on-network/>
- [20] blockchain.info. 2019. Bitcoin Difficulty Chart. <https://www.blockchain.com/charts/difficulty?timespan=all>
- [21] blockchain.info. 2020. Bitcoin Market Price. <https://www.blockchain.com/charts/market-price>
- [22] blockchain.info. 2020. Hashrate Distribution. <https://www.blockchain.com/charts/pools>
- [23] Joseph Bonneau. 2016. Why buy when you can rent?. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*.
- [24] Joseph Bonneau, Andrew Miller, Jeremy Clark, Arvind Narayanan, Joshua A. Kroll, and Edward W. Felten. 2015. Research perspectives on Bitcoin and second-generation cryptocurrencies. In *Symposium on Security and Privacy*.
- [25] Anita Borg, Jim Baumbach, and Sam Glazer. 1983. A message system supporting fault tolerance. *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review* 17, 5 (1983), 90–99.
- [26] Timothy C Brock. 1968. Implications of commodity theory for value change. In *Psychological foundations of attitudes*. Elsevier, 243–275.
- [27] Timothy C Brock and Laura A Brannon. 1992. Liberalization of commodity theory. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 13, 1 (1992), 135–144.
- [28] Chris Burniske and Jack Tatar. 2017. *Cryptoassets: The Innovative Investor's Guide to Bitcoin and Beyond*. McGraw Hill Professional.
- [29] Vitalik Buterin. 2013. A Next Generation Smart Contract & Decentralized Application Platform. <https://www.ethereum.org/pdfs/EthereumWhitePaper.pdf>
- [30] Vitalik Buterin. 2017. On Medium-of-Exchange Token Valuations. <https://vitalik.ca/general/2017/10/17/moe.html>
- [31] Vitalik Buterin, Eric Conner, Rick Dudley, Matthew Slipper, Ian Norden, and Abdelhamid Bakhta. 2020. EIP 1559 : Fee market change for ETH 1.0 chain. <https://github.com/ethereum/EIPs/blob/master/EIPS/eip-1559.md>
- [32] Christian Cachin. 2016. Architecture of the hyperledger blockchain fabric. In *Workshop on distributed cryptocurrencies and consensus ledgers*.
- [33] Miles Carlsten, Harry Kalodner, S. Matthew Weinberg, and Arvind Narayanan. 2016. On the Sustainability of Bitcoin Without the Block Reward. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM CCS*.
- [34] Michael Castro and Barbara Liskov, et al. 1999. Practical Byzantine fault tolerance. In *Practical Byzantine fault tolerance*.
- [35] Christian Catalini and Joshua S Gans. 2016. *Some simple economics of the blockchain*. Technical Report. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- [36] Christian Catalini and Joshua S Gans. 2018. *Initial coin offerings and the value of crypto tokens*. Technical Report. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- [37] Lin Chen, Lei Xu, Nolan Shah, Zhimin Gao, Yang Lu, and Weidong Shi. 2017. On Security Analysis of Proof-of-Elapsed-Time (PoET). In *International Symposium on Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems*. Springer.
- [38] Xi Chen, Christos Papadimitriou, and Tim Roughgarden. 2019. An Axiomatic Approach to Block Rewards. In *Proceedings of ACM AFT*.
- [39] Herman Chernoff et al. 1952. A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* (1952).
- [40] Pavel Ciaian, Miroslava Rajcaniova, and d'Artis Kancs. 2016. The economics of BitCoin price formation. *Applied Economics* (2016).
- [41] citypopulation.de. [n.d.]. Electricity Consumption. <https://www.citypopulation.de/en/world/bymap/ElectricityConsumption.html>
- [42] Simon Clarke et al. 1988. *Keynesianism, Monetarism and the Crisis of the State*. Elgar Aldershot.
- [43] coindesk. 2020. Ethereum Price Chart. <https://www.coindesk.com/price/ethereum>
- [44] coinmarketcap.com. [n.d.]. Bitcoins in Circulation. <https://coinmarketcap.com/currencies/bitcoin/>
- [45] coinmarketcap.com. [n.d.]. Ethereum in Circulation. <https://coinmarketcap.com/currencies/ethereum/>
- [46] Mauro Conti, E Sandeep Kumar, Chhagan Lal, and Sushmita Ruj. 2018. A survey on security and privacy issues of bitcoin. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* (2018).
- [47] cryptoslate.com. 2020. *Proof of Work Cryptocurrency Market Capitalizations*. <https://cryptoslate.com/cryptos/proof-of-work/>
- [48] Alex de Vries. 2019. Renewable energy will not solve bitcoin's sustainability problem. *Joule* 3, 4 (2019), 893–898.
- [49] Alex de Vries. 2020. Bitcoin's energy consumption is underestimated: A market dynamics approach. *Energy Research & Social Science* (2020).
- [50] Christian Decker and Roger Wattenhofer. 2013. Information Propagation in the Bitcoin Network. In *IEEE P2P*. Trento, Italy.
- [51] Evangelos Deirmentzoglou, Georgios Papakyriakopoulos, and Constantinos Patsakis. 2019. A survey on long-range attacks for proof of stake protocols. *IEEE Access* (2019).
- [52] digiconomist.net. 2019. Bitcoin Energy Consumption Index. <https://digiconomist.net/bitcoin-energy-consumption>
- [53] Dogecoin Project. 2014. Dogecoin. <https://dogecoin.org>
- [54] Maya Dotan and Saar Tochner. 2020. Proofs of Useless Work–Positive and Negative Results for Wasteless Mining Systems. *arXiv* (2020).
- [55] Jean-Marc Fouque. 2002. The sybil attack. In *International workshop on peer-to-peer systems*. Springer.
- [56] Cynthia Dwork and Moni Naor. 1992. Pricing via processing or combatting junk mail. In *Annual International Cryptology Conference*.

- [57] EOS. 2019. *EOS.IO Technical White Paper v2*. <https://github.com/EOSIO/Documentation/blob/master/TechnicalWhitePaper.md>
- [58] Ethan Lou. 2019. Bitcoin as big oil: the next big environmental fight? <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/jan/17/bitcoin-big-oil-environment>
- [59] etherscan.info. 2019. *Ethereum Difficulty Chart*. <https://etherscan.io/chart/difficulty>
- [60] Ittay Eyal. 2015. The Miner's Dilemma. In *IEEE SP*.
- [61] Ittay Eyal, Adem Efe Gencer, Emin Gün Sirer, and Robbert Van Renesse. 2016. Bitcoin-NG: A Scalable Blockchain Protocol. In *NSDI*.
- [62] Ittay Eyal and Emin Gün Sirer. 2014. Majority is not Enough: Bitcoin Mining is Vulnerable. In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security*.
- [63] Peter Fairley. 2017. Blockchain world-Feeding the blockchain beast if bitcoin ever does go mainstream, the electricity needed to sustain it will be enormous. *IEEE Spectrum* 54, 10 (2017), 36–59.
- [64] Amos Fiat, Anna Karlin, Elias Koutsoupias, and Christos Papadimitriou. 2019. Energy equilibria in proof-of-work mining. In *Proceedings of ACM EC*.
- [65] fiatmarketcap.com. 2019. *Top Fiat Currencies by Market Capitalization*. <https://fiatmarketcap.com/>
- [66] Cambridge Centre for Alternative Finance. 2019. *Cambridge Bitcoin Electricity Consumption Index*. <https://www.cbeci.org/cbeci/comparisons>
- [67] Ethereum Foundation. 2019. *Ethereum* 2. <https://docs.ethhub.io/ethereum-roadmap/ethereum-2.0/proof-of-stake/>
- [68] James W Friedman. 1971. A non-cooperative equilibrium for supergames. *The Review of Economic Studies* (1971).
- [69] Milton Friedman. 1989. Quantity theory of money. In *Money*. Springer.
- [70] Chaya Ganesh, Claudio Orlandi, Daniel Tschudi, and Aviv Zohar. 2020. Virtual ASICs: Generalized Proof-of-Stake Mining in Cryptocurrencies. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, Report 2020/791. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2020/791>.
- [71] Juan A. Garay, Aggelos Kiayias, and Nikos Leonardos. 2015. The Bitcoin Backbone Protocol: Analysis and Applications. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2015 - 34th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*.
- [72] Peter Gaži, Aggelos Kiayias, and Alexander Russell. 2018. Stake-bleeding attacks on proof-of-stake blockchains. In *2018 Crypto Valley Conference on Blockchain Technology (CVCBT)*.
- [73] Adem Efe Gencer, Soumya Basu, Ittay Eyal, Robbert Van Renesse, and Emin Gün Sirer. 2018. Decentralization in bitcoin and ethereum networks. In *FC*.
- [74] Arthur Gervais, Ghassan O Karame, Karl Wüst, Vasileios Glykantzis, Hubert Ritzdorf, and Srdjan Capkun. 2016. On the security and performance of proof of work blockchains. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM CCS*. ACM.
- [75] Yossi Gilad, Rotem Hemo, Silvio Micali, Georgios Vlachos, and Nikolai Zeldovich. 2017. Algorand: Scaling byzantine agreements for cryptocurrencies. In *SOSP*.
- [76] Pasquale Giungato, Roberto Rana, Angela Tarabella, and Caterina Tricase. 2017. Current Trends in Sustainability of Bitcoins and Related Blockchain Technology. *Sustainability* 9, 12 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9122214>
- [77] Andrew L Goodkind, Benjamin A Jones, and Robert P Berrens. 2020. Cryptodamages: Monetary value estimates of the air pollution and human health impacts of cryptocurrency mining. *Energy Research & Social Science* (2020).
- [78] LM Goodman. 2014. *Tezos - a self-amending crypto-ledger White paper*. [https://tezos.com/static/white\\_paper-2dc8c02267a8fb86bd67a108199441bf.pdf](https://tezos.com/static/white_paper-2dc8c02267a8fb86bd67a108199441bf.pdf)
- [79] Guy Goren and Alexander Spiegelman. 2019. Mind the Mining. In *ACM EC*.
- [80] Pierce Greenberg and Dylan Bugden. 2019. Energy consumption boomtowns in the United States: Community responses to a cryptocurrency boom. *Energy Research & Social Science* 50 (2019), 162–167.
- [81] Guy Golan Gueta, Ittai Abraham, Shelly Grossman, Dahlia Malkhi, Benny Pinkas, Michael Reiter, Dragos-Adrian Seredinschi, Orr Tamir, and Alin Tomescu. 2019. SBFT: a scalable and decentralized trust infrastructure. In *DSN*.
- [82] Peter A Hall et al. 1989. *The political power of economic ideas: Keynesianism across nations*. Princeton University Press.
- [83] Toby Hill. 2020. *BlackRock goes green? Investment giant joins Climate Action 100+ amid controversy*. <https://www.greenbiz.com/article/blackrock-goes-green-investment-giant-joins-climate-action-100-amid-controversy>
- [84] Charlie Hou, Mingxun Zhou, Yan Ji, Phil Daian, Florian Tramer, Giulia Fanti, and Ari Juels. 2019. SquirRL: Automating Attack Discovery on Blockchain Incentive Mechanisms with Deep Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv* (2019).
- [85] Nicolas Houy. 2019. Rational mining limits Bitcoin emissions. *Nature Climate Change* 9, 9 (2019), 655–655.
- [86] G Huberman, J Leshno, and CC Moallemi. 2017. Monopoly Without a Monopolist: An Economic Analysis of the Bitcoin Payment System. SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 3025604. *Social Science Research Network*, Rochester, NY, URL <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract> (2017).
- [87] Tam Hunt. 2018. *Can We Prevent a Global Energy Crisis From Bitcoin Mining?* <https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/can-we-prevent-a-global-energy-crisis-from-bitcoin-mining>
- [88] Digital Currency Initiative. 2020. 51% attacks. <https://dci.mit.edu/51-attacks>
- [89] Markus Jakobsson and Ari Juels. 1999. Proofs of work and bread pudding protocols. In *Secure Information Networks*.
- [90] Aljosha Judmayer, Nicholas Stifter, Alexei Zamyatin, Itay Tsabary, Ittay Eyal, Peter Gaži, Sarah Meiklejohn, and Edgar Weippl. 2019. Pay-To-Win: Incentive Attacks on Proof-of-Work Cryptocurrencies.
- [91] Ari Juels. 1999. Client puzzles: A cryptographic countermeasure against connection depletion attacks. In *NDSS*.
- [92] George Kamiya. 2019. *Bitcoin energy use - mined the gap*. <https://www.iea.org/commentaries/bitcoin-energy-use-mined-the-gap>
- [93] Rüdiger Kapitza, Johannes Behl, Christian Cachin, Tobias Distler, Simon Kuhnle, Seyed Vahid Mohammadi, Wolfgang Schröder-Preikschat, and Klaus Stengel. 2012. CheapBFT: resource-efficient byzantine fault tolerance. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM european conference on Computer Systems*. ACM.
- [94] Ghassan O. Karame, Elli Androulaki, and Srdjan Capkun. 2012. Double-spending Fast Payments in Bitcoin. In *Proceedings of ACM CCS*.
- [95] Kostis Karantias, Aggelos Kiayias, and Dionysis Zindros. 2019. Proof-of-Burn. *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2019). <https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/1096>
- [96] John Maynard Keynes. 1918. *The general theory of employment, interest, and money*. Springer.
- [97] Aggelos Kiayias, Alexander Russell, Bernardo David, and Roman Oliynykov. 2017. Ouroboros: A provably secure proof-of-stake blockchain protocol. In *Annual International Cryptology Conference*.
- [98] Lucianna Kiffer, Rajmohan Rajaraman, and Abhi Shelat. 2018. A better method to analyze blockchain consistency. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM CCS*.
- [99] S King and S Nadal. 2012. *Peercoin-secure & sustainable cryptocoin*. Available: <https://www.peercoin.net/whitepapers/peercoin-paper.pdf>
- [100] Eleftherios Kokoris Kogias, Philipp Jovanovic, Nicolas Gailly, Ismail Khoffi, Linus Gasser, and Bryan Ford. 2016. Enhancing bitcoin security and performance with strong consistency via collective signing. In *USENIX*.
- [101] Ramakrishna Kotla, Lorenzo Alvisi, Mike Dahlin, Allen Clement, and Edmund Wong. 2007. Zyzzyva: speculative byzantine fault tolerance. In *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review*.
- [102] Ladislav Kristoufek. 2020. Bitcoin and its mining on the equilibrium path. *Energy Economics* (2020).
- [103] Joshua A Kroll, Ian C Davey, and Edward W Felten. 2013. The Economics of Bitcoin Mining or, Bitcoin in the Presence of Adversaries. In *Workshop on the Economics of Information Security*.
- [104] Leslie Lamport. 1978. The implementation of reliable distributed multiprocess systems. *Computer Networks* (1978) 2, 2 (1978), 95–114.
- [105] Leslie Lamport. 1984. Using time instead of timeout for fault-tolerant distributed systems. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)* 6, 2 (1984), 254–280.
- [106] Ben Laurie and Richard Clayton. 2004. Proof-of-work proves not to work; version 0.2. In *Workshop on Economics and Information Security*.
- [107] Yoad Lewenberg, Yoram Bachrach, Yonatan Sompolsky, Aviv Zohar, and Jeffrey S Rosenschein. 2015. Bitcoin Mining Pools: A Cooperative Game Theoretic Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- [108] Kevin Liao and Jonathan Katz. 2017. Incentivizing blockchain forks via whale transactions. In *FC*.
- [109] Litecoin Project. 2014. *Litecoin, open source P2P digital currency*. <https://litecoin.org>
- [110] Robert E Lucas. 1980. Two illustrations of the quantity theory of money. *The American Economic Review* (1980).
- [111] Michael Lynn. 1991. Scarcity effects on value: A quantitative review of the commodity theory literature. *Psychology & Marketing* 8, 1 (1991), 43–57.
- [112] Maximilian Feige. 2019. Bitcoin doesn't incentivize green energy. <https://www.theblockcrypto.com/2019/01/30/bitcoin-doesnt-incentivize-green-energy/>
- [113] Patrick McCorry, Alexander Hicks, and Sarah Meiklejohn. 2018. Smart contracts for bribing miners. In *FC*.
- [114] Eckel Mike, Chania Izida, and Gogoryan Anaid. 2020. *Bitcoin Blackouts: Russian Cryptocurrency 'Miners' Minting Millions While Sucking Abkhazia's Electricity Grid Dry*. <https://www.rferl.org/a/bitcoin-blackouts-russian-cryptocurrency-miners-minting-millions-suck/>
- [115] Andrew Miller, Elaine Shi, Ari Juels, Bryan Parno, and Jonathan Katz. 2015. Nonoutsourceable scratch-off puzzles to discourage bitcoin mining coalitions. In *ACM CCS*.
- [116] Andrew Miller, Elaine Shi, Ari Juels, Bryan Parno, and Jonathan Katz. 2014. Permacoin: Repurposing Bitcoin Work for Data Preservation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. IEEE, San Jose, CA, USA. <http://research.microsoft.com/apps/pubs/default.aspx?id=217984>
- [117] Michael Mirkin, Yan Ji, Jonathan Pang, Arian Klages-Mundt, Ittay Eyal, and Ari Juels. 2020. BDoS: Blockchain Denial-of-Service. In *ACM CCS*.
- [118] Camilo Mora, Randi L Rollins, Katie Taladay, Michael B Kantar, Mason K Chock, Mio Shimada, and Erik C Franklin. 2018. Bitcoin emissions alone could push global warming above 2 C. *Nature Climate Change* 8, 11 (2018), 931–933.
- [119] Satoshi Nakamoto. 2008. *Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System*. <http://www.bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf>

- [120] Arvind Narayanan, Joseph Bonneau, Edward Felten, Andrew Miller, and Steven Goldfeder. 2016. *Bitcoin and cryptocurrency technologies: a comprehensive introduction*. Princeton University Press.
- [121] Kartik Nayak, Srijan Kumar, Andrew Miller, and Elaine Shi. 2016. Stubborn mining: Generalizing selfish mining and combining with an eclipse attack. In *IEEE European SP*.
- [122] Kevin Alarcón Negy, Peter R Rizun, and Emin Gün Sirer. 2020. Selfish mining re-examined. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*. Springer, 61–78.
- [123] Till Neudecker and Hannes Hartenstein. 2019. Short paper: An empirical analysis of blockchain forks in bitcoin. In *FC*.
- [124] BBC news. 2021. *Tesla will no longer accept Bitcoin over climate concerns, says Musk*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-57096305>
- [125] Shunya Noda, Kyohei Okumura, and Yoshinori Hashimoto. 2020. An economic analysis of difficulty adjustment algorithms in proof-of-work blockchain systems. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM conference on Economics and Computation (EC'20)*, July.
- [126] Thuy Ong. 2018. *Plattsburgh has become the first city in the US to ban cryptocurrency mining*. <https://www.theverge.com/2018/3/16/17128678/plattsburgh-new-york-ban-cryptocurrency-mining>
- [127] P4Titan. 2014. Slimcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Crypto-Currency with Proof-of-Burn. <https://github.com/slimcoin-project/slimcoin-project.github.io/raw/master/whitepaperSLM.pdf>
- [128] Rafael Pass, Lior Seeman, and Abhi Shelat. 2017. Analysis of the blockchain protocol in asynchronous networks. In *Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*. Springer.
- [129] Rafael Pass and Abhi Shelat. 2015. Micropayments for decentralized currencies. In *ACM CCS*.
- [130] Rafael Pass and Elaine Shi. 2017. Fruitchains: A fair blockchain. In *ACM PODC*.
- [131] Thomas K Philips and Randolph Nelson. 1995. The moment bound is tighter than Chernoff's bound for positive tail probabilities. *The American Statistician* (1995).
- [132] Andrew Poelstra et al. 2014. Distributed consensus from proof of stake is impossible. *Self-published Paper* (2014).
- [133] Jamie Redman. 2020. Bitcoin Gold 51% Attacked - Network Loses \$70,000 in Double Spends. <https://news.bitcoin.com/bitcoin-gold-51-attacked-network-loses-70000-in-double-spends/>
- [134] Wessel Reijers, Fiachra O'Brolcháin, and Paul Haynes. 2016. Governance in blockchain technologies & social contract theories. *Ledger* (2016).
- [135] Jonathan Rosenberg, Cullen Jennings, and J Peterson. 2008. *The session initiation protocol (SIP) and spam*. Technical Report. RFC 5039, January.
- [136] Meni Rosenfeld. 2011. Analysis of Bitcoin Pooled Mining Reward Systems. *arXiv* (2011).
- [137] Meni Rosenfeld. 2014. Analysis of hashrate-based double spending. *arXiv* (2014).
- [138] Tim Roughgarden. 2020. Transaction Fee Mechanism Design for the Ethereum Blockchain: An Economic Analysis of EIP-1559. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.00854* (2020).
- [139] Ayelet Sapirshstein, Yonatan Sompolsky, and Aviv Zohar. 2016. Optimal Selfish Mining Strategies in Bitcoin. In *FC*.
- [140] Eli Ben Sasson, Alessandro Chiesa, Christina Garman, Matthew Green, Ian Miers, Eran Tromer, and Madars Virza. 2014. Zerocash: Decentralized anonymous payments from bitcoin. In *IEEE SP*.
- [141] Congressional Research Service. 2019. *Bitcoin, Blockchain, and the Energy Sector*. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R45863>
- [142] Yahya Shahsavari, Kaiwen Zhang, and Chamseddine Talhi. 2019. A theoretical model for fork analysis in the bitcoin network. In *IEEE ICBC*.
- [143] Douglas Stebila, Lakshmi Kuppusamy, Jothi Ranganamy, Colin Boyd, and Juan Gonzalez Nieto. 2011. Stronger difficulty notions for client puzzles and denial-of-service-resistant protocols. In *Cryptographers' Track at the RSA Conference*. Springer.
- [144] Iain Stewart. 2012. Proof of burn. *bitcoin.it* (2012).
- [145] Christian Stoll, Lena Klaaßen, and Ulrich Galtersdörfer. 2019. The carbon footprint of bitcoin. *Joule* 3, 7 (2019), 1647–1661.
- [146] CORE Team et al. 2017. The Economy (<https://Core-Econ.Org/the-Economy/?Lang=En>).
- [147] The Bitcoin community. [n.d.]. Block chain. [https://en.bitcoin.it/wiki/Block\\_chain](https://en.bitcoin.it/wiki/Block_chain)
- [148] Jon Truby. 2018. Decarbonizing Bitcoin: Law and policy choices for reducing the energy consumption of Blockchain technologies and digital currencies. *Energy research & social science* 44 (2018), 399–410.
- [149] Itay Tsabary and Ittay Eyal. 2018. The Gap Game. In *ACM CCS*.
- [150] Itay Tsabary, Matan Yechieli, and Ittay Eyal. 2020. MAD-HTLC: Because HTLC is Crazy-Cheap to Attack. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.12031* (2020).
- [151] Eric Van Damme. 2002. Strategic equilibrium. *Handbook of game theory with economic applications* (2002).
- [152] Zack Voell. [n.d.]. Ethereum Classic Hit by Third 51% Attack in a Month. <https://www.coindesk.com/ethereum-classic-blockchain-subject-to-yet-another-51-attack>
- [153] XiaoFeng Wang and Michael K Reiter. 2003. Defending against denial-of-service attacks with puzzle auctions. In *IEEE SP*.
- [154] Gabriel Wildau. 2018. *China moves to shutter bitcoin mines*. <https://www.cnbc.com/2018/01/10/china-moves-to-shutter-bitcoin-mines.html>
- [155] Fredrik Winzer, Benjamin Herd, and Sebastian Faust. 2019. Temporary censorship attacks in the presence of rational miners. In *2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&PW)*. IEEE.
- [156] Aviv Yaish and Aviv Zohar. 2020. Pricing ASICs for Cryptocurrency Mining. *arXiv* (2020).
- [157] Maofan Yin, Dahlia Malkhi, Michael K Reiter, Guy Golan Gueta, and Ittai Abraham. 2019. HotStuff: BFT consensus with linearity and responsiveness. In *ACM PODC*.
- [158] Fan Zhang, Ittay Eyal, Robert Escriva, Ari Juels, and Robbert Van Renesse. 2017. REM: Resource-Efficient Mining for Blockchains. In *USENIX*.
- [159] Ren Zhang and Bart Preneel. 2019. Lay down the common metrics: Evaluating proof-of-work consensus protocols' security. In *IEEE SP*.
- [160] Roi Bar Zur, Ittay Eyal, and Aviv Tamar. 2020. Efficient MDP analysis for selfish-mining in blockchains. In *ACM AFT*.

## A POW ALTERNATIVES

*Permissioned systems.* These systems assume a set of entities that run a Byzantine fault tolerant [14, 34, 81, 93, 101, 157] algorithm to determine system state, and are also in charge of making membership changes. Unlike *HEB*, these systems are *permissioned*, as a new participant requires the authorization of existing participants to join. Such solutions are common in the enterprise market [14, 32], but are not directly suitable for permissionless cryptocurrency systems.

*Proof of activity.* Bentov et al. [17] propose a system utilizing POW to elect a committee of participants among the system stakeholders, who then run a variation of a classical permissioned distributed consensus protocol. Similarly to Algorand [75], they also make assumptions regarding the availability of stake holders to ensure system progress. *HEB* does not require assumptions of that sort since its blocks can be generated without tokens.

*Proof of useful work.* This approach suggests performing useful work for PoW, that is, work that has external value outside the security of the cryptocurrency system [11, 54, 159]. However, these protocols also operate under different assumptions. Ball et al. [11] relies on users providing problem instances altruistically, while Zhang et al. [158] rely on trusted hardware, i.e., a manufacturer like Intel.

In this work we focus on reduction of wastefulness rather than its re-purposing, without relying on a centralized authority nor assuming altruistic behavior.

*Proof of burn.* A different suggestion for PoW replacement is *proof-of-burn* [95, 127, 144], in which miners prove the depletion of another cryptocurrency, typically PoW-based, to create blocks. This scheme replaces burning electricity with burning another currency. This increases the scarcity of the burnt tokens, and hence that currency's value, maintaining high minting costs and negative environmental impact. In contrast, *HEB* reduces the expended external resources without deferring the waste.

*Proof of space.* Permacoin [116] and MeshCash [16] both use storage instead of computations as basis for their puzzles. However, this approach still results with physical resource expenditure. *HEB* reduces any external expenditure, and can be applied to such systems as well.

*PPCoin*. PPCoin [99] suggests a PoW system that transitions into PoS – the stake is measured by considering the time each token is held, creating a so-called *coin-age*. It requires similar assumptions to other PoS systems, and lacks evaluation of its security and incentive compatibility. Specifically, it does not consider the reward (expressed either as coin or coin-age) nor the expenses (external expenses and coin-age) for creating PoW blocks, so the effect of using coin-age in the ecosystem is not well defined. *HEB* uses the native system token for block generation, and has a full security and incentive-compatibility analysis.

*Proof of transfer*. The Stacks blockchain [3] uses *proof of transfer* – it requires transferring a base token (e.g., Bitcoin) to create blocks. It does not contain a security proof nor incentive-compatibility analysis, preventing an accurate comparison. Specifically, it does not take into account that a user can transfer her base tokens to herself, hence generating multiple transfer-proofs with only a minor investment. *HEB* does not rely on a base token, the re-distributed tokens are not transferred to a destination of choice but shared proportionally among all system entities, and the protocol has a full security and incentive-compatibility analysis.

## B NAIVE PROTOCOLS

We present three naive protocols and discuss their shortcomings. These are simpler solutions compared to *HEB*, however, help clarify some of its design choices.

The first protocol, named *NakamotoHalf*, is exactly as *Nakamoto* excepts it mints new tokens at half rate (§B.1). That is,  $\frac{r}{2}$  new tokens per block compared to  $r$  of *Nakamoto*. We show this protocol is as wasteful as *Nakamoto*, i.e., they both result with *External expenses* = 1.

We then consider a different protocol, named *PartialReward* (*PR*), that similarly to *Nakamoto* also mints  $r$  tokens per block (§B.2). However, for a parameter  $\rho \in [0, 1)$ , it rewards only  $(1 - \rho)r$  of these to the block-generating miner, and distributes the other  $\rho r$  among all system miners and users proportionally to their current token holdings. We show that *PR* is less wasteful than *Nakamoto* (*External expenses* =  $1 - \rho$  compared to 1) at the expense of less resiliency to free safety-violation attacks (*Free safety-violation threshold* =  $1 - \rho$  compared to 1).

We conclude with the *MandatoryInternalExpenditure* (*MIE*) protocol, which is like *HEB*, but *requires* (rather than enabling) miners to internally-spend to create blocks (§B.3). Although providing lower *Free safety-violation threshold*, this protocol undesirably provides *Permissiveness* = 0 on top of having an inherent liveness issue.

### B.1 *NakamotoHalf*

As mentioned, *NakamotoHalf* is just like *Nakamoto* but mints tokens at a half rate. The prescribed mining strategy is identical (Alg. 2).

Recall that the real value of a single token in *ec* is inverse to the number of circulating tokens (cf. §3.1). As such, when minting at half rate, the price of a single token in *NakamotoHalf* is exactly twice of a token in *Nakamoto*. So, despite a miner getting only  $\frac{r}{2}$  tokens with each block, her reward in *ec* matches that of

---

### Alg. 6: $\sigma_{i,prescribed}^{MIE}$

---

```

1 Function Allocate( $S^G, B_i$ ):
2   return  $\langle \rho B_i, (1 - \rho) B_i \rangle$ 

3 Function Generate( $S^G, S_i^L$ ):
4    $C \leftarrow$  uniformly at random from  $LC(S^G)$ 
5    $pointer \leftarrow last(C)$ 
6   return NewBlock(pointer)

7 Function Publish( $S^G, S_i^L$ ):
8   return All previously unpublished blocks

```

---

miners in *Nakamoto*. As such, *NakamotoHalf* is just as wasteful as *Nakamoto*, both providing *External expenses* = 1.

### B.2 *PartialReward*

As previously stated, *PR* mints  $r$  tokens per block as *Nakamoto*, but distributes these minted tokens differently. It gives  $(1 - \rho)r$  to the miner who created the block, and the remaining  $\rho r$  are shared between the miners and users proportionally to their token holdings. The prescribed mining strategy is as in *Nakamoto* (Alg. 2).

As both protocols mint at the same rate, their respective tokens have the same *ec* value (cf. §3.1). However, *PR* miners get less reward ( $(1 - \rho)r$  compared to  $r$ ), hence incentivized to spend less electricity in equilibrium (Eq. 1). As such, it provides *External expenses* =  $1 - \rho$ , achieving less wastefulness.

However, as reward for creating a block is now lower also are the costs to create one, and as such, the system is less resilient to free safety-violation attacks. Specifically, it only provides *Free safety-violation threshold* =  $1 - \rho$  compared to the original *Free safety-violation threshold* = 1.

That is, *PR* reduces wastefulness at the expense of making the system less resilient against rational attackers.

### B.3 *MandatoryInternalExpenditure*

The motivation for *MIE* is to incorporate internal expenses as part of the block creation process. It is just like *HEB*, but requires internal expenditure to create blocks. That is, there is a single type of blocks, and a miner  $i$  can create at most  $\left\lfloor \frac{B_i^{ic}}{\rho \cdot r} \right\rfloor$  blocks in an epoch on chain  $C$ .

The prescribed strategy  $\sigma_{i,prescribed}^{MIE}$  (Alg. 6) indicates that miner  $i$  should allocate her balance s.t.  $\langle \rho B_i, (1 - \rho) B_i \rangle$ , point her created blocks to  $last(LC(S^G))$ , and publish them immediately. In case of conflicting longest chains,  $\sigma_{i,prescribed}^{MIE}$  states that the miner points her next block to either of them picked uniformly-at-random.

However, *MIE* has two significant shortcomings. First, miners must obtain *ic* prior to creating blocks, failing to do so prevents participation. Therefore, *Permissiveness* = 0, i.e., it is a permissioned protocol.

Moreover, in equilibrium, miners are expected to commit *ic* sufficient to enable the creation of exactly the number of blocks they expect. Now, assume a miner becomes absent, either maliciously or unintentionally. Other miners cannot create new blocks exceeding their quota, and the system halts.

These problems arise as *MIE* conditions block creation on early *ic* expenditure, justifying *HEB*'s design of *incentivizing*, but *not forcing* miners to internally spend.

## C PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

*Epoch duration and Size bias.* Longer epochs are required to reduce *Size bias*— they assure that with high probability each miner gets to create her expected number of blocks, and thus not under-utilize her internally-spent tokens. However, such longer epochs impose longer payout intervals, and are less appealing to miners.

Payout intervals exist even in existing PoW systems (e.g., 100 blocks maturity period in Bitcoin), but, to allow for shorter epochs while not degrading expected utilization, we suggest letting surplus internal expenses carry out to the following consecutive epoch. Specifically, instead of redistributing all committed internal expenses after every epoch, the system redistributes only the used tokens, while the others are carried out to the next epoch. That reduces under-utilization, making shorter epochs feasible.

*Circulating supply.* Recall that *HEB* works under the assumption that  $B_{Miners}(k) \ll B_{Users}^{ic}(k)$ , thus requiring a sufficiently large circulating supply. To achieve this, we suggest bootstrapping with a *ramp up* period, in which *HEB* performs as *Nakamoto*, allowing enough internal currency to accumulate.

*Internal expenditure mechanism.* The cryptocurrency transaction mechanism can be utilized to let users internally expend their tokens. A specific implementation could be to let the miners transact their tokens to a null address [127, 144].

*Currency redistribution.* Recall *HEB* redistributes the internally-spent currency among all the cryptocurrency holders, proportionally to their relative holdings. There are two issues at hand – first, how to divide the tokens proportionally (who gets what), and then, how to perform the actual redistribution (associate entities with their tokens).

Blockchain systems record user amounts, whether they are account [29] or UTXO [53, 109, 119, 140] based. As such, system users know all relative token holdings and therefore how to proportionally divide the required amount. We note proportional distribution could require fragmenting the atomic unit of the currency (e.g., 1 Satoshi in Bitcoin). One can circumvent such scenarios by using pseudo-random tie breaking, rewarding only one user with the atomic unit [129]. We illustrate through an example: say there are 10 users with the same token holdings, due to share 15 tokens, that is, each is due 1.5 tokens. As such, 5 users selected at random will receive 2 tokens, while the other receive only 1.

The actual token allocation can be performed implicitly, that is, without including explicit transactions in the blockchain.

## D HEB Permissiveness ANALYSIS

We note the miner balance distribution affects miner utilities, and thus affects *Permissiveness* as well.

We consider a system with two miners  $i$  and  $\neg i$ , with balances  $B_i, B_{\neg i}$ , respectively. Miner  $\neg i$  has access to *ic* and follows  $\sigma_{prescribed}^{HEB}$

If miner  $i$  can obtain *ic* then she follows  $\sigma_{prescribed}^{HEB}$  resulting with  $U_{i,prescribed}^{HEB} = \ell b_i$  (see §6.2.1).

Otherwise, she follows  $\sigma_{prescribed-no-ic}^{HEB}$ , thus allocating her balance  $B_i^{ic} = 0, B_i^{ec} = B_i$ . Consequently,  $b_i^{ec} = \frac{B_i}{B_i + (1-\rho)B_{\neg i}}$  and  $b_{\neg i}^{ec} = \frac{(1-\rho)B_{\neg i}}{B_i + (1-\rho)B_{\neg i}}$ .

Miner  $i$  creates only regular blocks, with an expected number of  $\frac{B_i}{B_i + (1-\rho)B_{\neg i}}$ , therefore her expected block weight is  $\mathbb{E}[W_i] = \ell \frac{B_i}{B_i + (1-\rho)B_{\neg i}}$ . In contrast, miner  $\neg i$  creates only factored blocks with an expected block weight of  $\mathbb{E}[W_{\neg i}] = \ell F \frac{(1-\rho)B_{\neg i}}{B_i + (1-\rho)B_{\neg i}}$ . Consequently,  $U_{i,prescribed-no-ic}^{HEB} = \frac{B_i}{B_i + F B_{\neg i}} \ell$ , and as such *Permissiveness* =  $\frac{1}{b_i + F(1-b_i)}$ .

