

The Future of Integrated Digital Governance in the EU: EBSI and GLASS

William J Buchanan*, Mwarwan Abubakar*, Owen Lo*, Christos Chrysoulas*, Nikolaos Pitropakis*, Pavlos Papadopoulos*, Sarwar Sayeed*, Marc Sel† *Blockpass ID Lab, Edinburgh Napier University

†Royal Holloway, University of London
b.buchanan@napier.ac.uk

Abstract—In the past, citizen identity has been used within siloed data areas, and where government agencies have linked citizens across different services. Often these identifiers were simple alphanumeric strings, and which were assigned by government agencies. These identifiers are then linked in some way to the citizen, and where citizens often have to request access to documents that prove certain aspects of their citizenship. These systems, too, often use paper-based approaches and have little in the way of real digital trust. But, in an information age, we now have the ability to provide unique digital identifiers for each citizen, and then for them to claim access to their citizenship documents. This might be in the form of their academic qualifications, their tax status, or even their driver's licence. While, at one time, these documents were either held by the trusted issuers of the information, or in a paper form, we now have the opportunity for these documents to be linked to a citizen wallet. This would allow citizens the opportunity to request documents once, but use them many times. A core part of this is the unique private key associated with the citizen, and in the usage of digital signing by trusted entities. While many countries have struggled to implement a digital identity scheme, the EU Commission has the ambition to provide every EU citizen with a digital wallet, and thus moved towards improved freedom of movement and integration of the countries within the EU. The scale of this cannot be underestimated, and it could break down the barriers that have been created by legacy systems. In order to harmonise the integration of both citizens and trusted signers, the EU Commission proposes the usage of EBSI (European Blockchain Services Infrastructure) [1]. With EBSI as a foundation, the EU Commission can then look to build layers of governance on top of this, and which is the focus of the GLASS project [2]. This paper outlines how EBSI and GLASS [3] can be integrated, in order to enhance governance and improve the access and usage of citizen-sourced identity documents.

Index Terms—Self-sovereign identity, blockchain, Hyperledger, EBSI

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been an increased demand from citizens, corporations, and governments to access e-government services. This requires the need for trustworthy e-governance solutions that provide citizens and businesses with safe and transparent public services, and without compromising their security or privacy. The failure to satisfy these necessities can have severe economic and social consequences. Along with security and privacy, creating an infrastructure that users can rely on is a key consideration when establishing e-government [4], along with providing a strong linkage between digital identity and socio-economic inclusion [5].

Coursey *et al.* predict that *e-government will fundamentally transform the relationship between governments and citizens* [6]. This transformation could lead to improved democracy, including around citizen participation, increased transparency, improved trust in government, strengthened democracy, and social inclusion [7]. But approaches to e-governance can fail without a citizen focus, increased accountability, citizen empowerment, co-production and good governance [7]. But, Draheim *et al* [7] also outline that there are important political topics which must run alongside any development of e-governance applications including those related to the digital divide, anti-corruption, the loss of privacy, social change, and increasing control from government agencies.

Valdavidia *et al.* [8] outline a number of key recommendations in building a trustworthy approach to e-governance, including:

- **Bridge with the existing world.** This should allow for seamless integration with existing systems, and break-down the barriers to the exchange of digital assets from heterogeneous systems [8].
- **Law and technology.** This requires that legal and technology specialists work together to develop an integrated system.
- **Decentralisation, transparency and accountability.** This moves away from our requirements for centralised services, and aims to increase transparency, privacy and accountability [8].
- **Value proposition.** This requires a strong focus on useful use cases which are important in the lives of citizens.
- **Governance.** This should provide a well-defined foundation for the system based on roles, responsibilities, and decision-making processes and where the governance structures are well-defined, and clearly articulated at every stage of the development [8].

GLASS ¹ [9] provides a user-centric approach in which digital credentials are referenced within digital wallets owned and controlled by individuals. This eliminates the need for a third party to maintain trust. Citizens then have complete control over their identities and associated data. GLASS employs a trusted framework to enable the requester (often defined as the *relying party*) to validate the verifiability of the issuer's verifiable credentials and digital signature.

¹GLASS is funded within the EU Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement 959879

In the EU, these transfers must be compliant with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [?] and the incorporation of a legal framework for electronic Identification and Authentication and trust Services (eIDAS). As a result, the GLASS model is able to carry out procedures that are functional across borders and in a user-friendly manner, in order to support governments, citizens, organisations, and public services. The EBSI infrastructure provides a foundation element of this, and which can be used to provide trusted identity-checking services for citizens and trusted organisations. This infrastructure can provide a distributed infrastructure that can reduce administrative burdens and thus connect public administrations across all the EU state members.

In this paper, we investigate EBSI and GLASS and examine their approaches to handling identity, security and privacy. In addition, we investigate the viable integration of GLASS and EBSI models. Overall, it focuses on a distributed, secure, and scalable e-Government architecture that integrates the GLASS [2], [3] and EBSI (European Blockchain Services Infrastructure) projects [10]. Both of these projects use permissioned blockchains and distributed ledger methods, in order to ensure security and privacy and can address some of the weaknesses of current e-government systems and the interoperability between governance departments. In order to provide improved resilience, GLASS has the option to use IPFS (InterPlanetary File System).

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section II briefly describes the related work while Section III presents fundamental data-sharing use cases. Section IV proceeds with the presentation of IPFS use cases while Section V summarises the European approaches for electronic identities. Soon afterwards Section VI details the European Blockchain Partnership while Section VII provides the necessary background information for the GLASS project. This enables Section VIII to explain the feasibility of bringing together GLASS with EBSI. Last, Section IX draws the conclusions while giving some pointers for future work.

II. RELATED WORK

Lykidis *et al.* [11] define a wide range of ongoing blockchain-based e-Government applications including for authentication, e-Voting, land property services, e-Delivery Services, human resources management, and government contracting. Most of these integrate some form of identity management, but the approaches taken for identity management vary widely. Rathee and Singh [12] thus provide a literature review of blockchain-related identity management. The two main approaches to identity management can be summarised as:

- using one or more appointed trusted authorities providing assurance over the identity-proofing of subjects,
- allowing subjects to create and manage self-asserted identities, referred to as self-sovereign identities (SSI).

A. Country-wide adoption

In blockchain-based applications, SSI is commonly used. Traditional applications favour the appointed trusted authority

approach, such as those adopted within PKI (Public Key Infrastructure). A range of projects, too, have resulted in country-wide infrastructures, such as a collaboration from the State Information Center, China Mobile, China UnionPay, and other businesses in creating the Blockchain Service Network (BSN) [13]. Singanamalla *et al.* [14] define Telechain integrates a range of telecommunication providers in India in order to comply with regulations. Estonia, too, is well known for its advancement of the X-Road [15], and which includes the Guardtime blockchain solution (KSI blockchain [16]). This focuses on integrating Estonian state registries [17]. As part of their advancement of a digital economy, Belarus developed the cryptohub HTP (High Technologies Park) [18] in order to define key cryptographic operators, cryptocurrency exchanges, and so on. Akpan *et al.* [19] analysed with the link between e-governance and governance in 15 West African countries, and found there was a significant positive correlation between World Governance Indicators (WGI) and E-government Development Index (EDGI), and that the best advancement comes when there is strong integration with established institutions and into existing structures of governance.

Within the EU, blockchain methods are increasingly being considered for enhanced e-governance, but challenges still exist in aligning identity linkages that use PKI (Public Key Infrastructure) and Qualified Digital Certificates issued by Qualified Trust Service Providers. Turkanovic *et al.* [20] propose an architecture using the CEF (Connecting Europe Facility) [21] building blocks of EBSI, eSignature, and an eID compliant with eIDAS.

B. Self-sovereign identity

The method of creating and controlling one's own identity is known as SSI (Self-sovereign Identity). With this, we typically use a key pair, and where transactions are digitally signed using a private key, and then this is proven with a public key. The private key can then be stored in a citizen wallet, and which cannot be accessed by any other entity.

Two major global initiatives which aim to harmonize the usage of verifiable credentials and wallets are The Open Identity Exchange (OIX) and Trust over IP Foundation (ToIP) [22]. With ToIP we see a focus on decentralized digital identity projects, and where it issues global compatibility guidelines for Hyperledger Aries and Indy, and verifiable credentials [23]. The basic infrastructure involves the user (the holder), the issuer of a verifiable credential, and the relying party. The user is in full control of gathering the verifiable credential and then passing it on to the relying party. Overall, we use a trust framework to give allow the relying party to check the trustworthiness of the verifiable credentials that are passed. This should include a digital signature of the issuer, and a check against the trusted public key of the issuer.

C. Appointed trusted authorities

Traditional digital applications often use one or more appointed trusted authorities providing assurance over the identity-proofing of subjects. In the case of natural persons,

this takes the form of a centralised or decentralised identity register. In the case of legal persons, typically these are defined as business registers. For this, Anand and Brass [24] provides an overview of eID systems and their governance models.

D. Sharing credentials

Liang *et al.* [25] used Hyperledger Fabric to share consent information. With this, a user could share healthcare information with insurance companies, in order to get an insurance quote. On a data sharing event, an event record is created as a tuple of recordhash, owner, receiver, time, location, expiry-date, and signature, and then submitted to the blockchain network in order to convert health records into a transaction. Every action on the health record is then recorded and is thus accountable. The research project uses the Hyperledger Fabric membership service component and the channel scheme and uses:

- **Membership service provider (CA).** The CA focuses on membership enrollment. Each participating node is then issued with enrollment certificates and transaction certificates for the network and creates access control lists during channel establishment.
- **Chaincode.** This is the code responsible for the deployment, invocation and querying of transactions, and isolates each of the participating parties in the network.

The License accountability and Compliance (LUCE) data sharing platform is built on the Ethereum platform [26]. It allows citizens to rectify and erase data in relation to General Data Protection Regulation's (GDPR) rights. LUCE tracks data in terms of licensing terms and has three core roles: Data Providers; Data Requesters; and Supervisory Authorities With LUCE, we have states of:

- Sharing document: publish.
- Accessing dataset: query, request, accessing terms, accepting licensing terms, and download token.
- Monitoring compliance: access token, access data, reports compliance, access token, replication and checking compliance.
- GDPR compliance: rights to access; rights to erase and right to rectification; and supervisory authority.

Jaiman *et al.* [27] created a blockchain-based data-sharing consent model for health data, and where smart contracts represent a citizen's consent over their health data. It uses two ontologies defined within the Ethereum blockchain:

- Data Use Ontology (DUO). This defines citizen consent.
- Automatable Discovery and Access Matrix (ADA-M). This defines the formatting of queries from data requesters.

E. Right to be forgotten

Often our data storages are centralised in the approach. One method that can be used to create distributed file storage is IPFS (InterPlanetary File System). This involves hashing the content of files to a CID (Content Identifier). It then supports the splitting up of files onto multiple nodes. This increases the resilience and availability of the stored files. Unfortunately, it

is often difficult to delete content from IPFS, and where there can often be little in the way of encryption used to store files. Politou *et al.* [28] define the Right to be Forgotten (RtbF) as a requirement of GDPR, and thus for data to be erased. Unfortunately, enforcing this across the entire IPFS network is not actually feasible. They thus implemented an anonymous protocol for delegated content erasure requests within IPFS, and where erasure is only allowed by the original content provider or their delegates.

F. Dual-chain approaches

Wang *et al.* [29] define data-sharing methods on a dual blockchain approach and where one chain stores the original data (the data blockchain) and another one stores the transactions related to the data (the trading blockchain). This method allows for the transactions performed on the data to be traced. Within this method, the data is broken into n data blocks. Within a transaction, a data owner then signs a random hash on a previous transaction, and provides the data block number, permission level, and the public key of the next data user. The access level defines three main levels:

- Level 1. Ability to use data, along with granting full rights to usage and distribution.
- Level 2. Ability to use data, and grant data usage rights.
- Level 3. Ability to use data.

G. File sharing

Khatal *et al.* [30] define FileShare and which defines a secure decentralized application framework for sharing files. It uses a centralized application (DApp) built on Ethereum to register users and provide provenance. A smart contract then governs, manages, and provides traceability of encrypted files for the latest version.

III. DATA SHARING USE CASES

In order to fully develop distributed e-governance applications, it is important to investigate other application areas for their usage of data sharing and citizen integration.

A. Healthcare sharing

Electronic Health Records (EHR) often contain highly sensitive healthcare data which are periodically distributed among healthcare providers, pharmacies and patients for clinical diagnosis and treatment [31]. Furthermore, critical medical information must be regularly updated and shared, and where proper consent is provided by the patient. Along with this, we need strong availability, fast access, and the appropriate encryption on these records [31]–[33].

Siyal *et al.* [34] define a number of opportunities in relation to blockchains within health care, including those related to transparency, reduced transaction time, improved security, cost efficiencies and irreversible transactions. Along these, they see the key challenges being interoperability, scalability, storage, social acceptance, and the requirement for standardization.

Omran *et al.* [35] define a sharded blockchain-based to share diagnostic tests around pandemics, and which focuses

on privacy-enhanced methods for health care data sharing. This included the usage of ring signatures, which have unique random identifiers and are unlinkable (but trusted). The authors propose that their method could be used to share health care data for research. The work outlined that 2,407,462 records can be shared within 11 minutes, compared to 63 days without sharding.

1) *MedChain*: Information sharing within health care provides strong use cases around citizen permissions and in supporting interoperability. Shen *et al.* [36] implemented MedChain for sharing health care data within a blockchain infrastructure. The general architecture of the system uses a super-peer approach at the top level of the architecture.

2) *Tangle-based*: Zheng *et al.* [37] define a health data-sharing system using the IOTA Tangle. It uses a Masked Authenticated Messaging and where IOTA users create a channel - identified by an address - and to where they publish messages. Users then subscribe to this channel and receive messages whenever the channel owner publishes them. Recently, IOTA has also defined a number of use cases for the integration of the IOTA Tangle and EBSI. These include digital management of educational credentials, trusted digital audit trails and document traceability, SME financing, data sharing among authorities, intellectual property rights management, and digital product passport [38].

B. Distributed Data Sharing Platforms

1) *Distributed Health Care*: Theodouli *et al.* [39] defined a layered approach to a blockchain-based architecture: Layer 1: Web/Cloud Platforms; Layer 2: Cloud Middleware; and Layer 3: Blockchain Network. The system is built on a foundation of smart contracts using a Registry Contract (RC) and which stores the registry of users (medical research centers and patients). Each user has a unique smart contract address - defined as the Patient Data Contract (PDC). Each ID is unique for every patient and does not reveal their identity. The PDC has hashed patient healthcare data and a URL for the link to the patient's healthcare data. A Permissions Contract (PC) is then used to map the PDC address and the requesting entity (medical research centre), and then links to the patient approval for access.

There are currently several approaches regarding EHR management and how blockchain technology can be utilized to improve it [40], [41]. Yüksel *et al.* [42] discuss the distinction of EHR storage between distributed and cloud design, and propose that a centralized model could be established by applying the relevant decentralized settings and techniques of the Cloud architectures. Overall, their cloud architecture refers to the structured storage and allocation of massive volumes of medical records among remote third-party service providers. Within the Cloud, healthcare organizations and individuals are able to access the data by utilizing relevant security measures based on identity management, access control, policy integration and compliance management, thus accomplishing common requirements such as scalability, availability and cost-effectiveness [43].

The MedRec software [44] is a permissionless blockchain implementation, built on the Ethereum blockchain network,

and which demonstrates an auditable and decentralized EHR management. It introduces both questionable transaction scalability and linkability likelihood between a transaction and an individual thus could compromise data and user anonymity. MedRec has inspired other authors to build upon and try to mitigate its issues [45].

The MediBchain system [46] establishes a permissioned peer-to-peer approach and is designed on the Ethereum network. It uses a cloud-based server infrastructure to achieve acceptable scalability. However, even if data is held by the participating parties, the data remains in encrypted form, but linkability remains an issue. Another concern is the transaction cost, which is not measurable. One solution built on the Ethereum network focuses on the pharmaceutical supply chain: *Modum.io* [47]. In this work, Bocek *et al.* [47] developed an architecture where the IoT devices collect temperature data; and mobile devices get this data and connect to an HTTP server. The HTTP server acts as a blockchain node and stores the data in PostgreSQL databases, using smart contracts. Their real-world scenario looks promising and can be adapted in an EHR use case, although it is not decentralized in each stage. Where the HTTP server is hijacked by attackers and where the collected data is vulnerable and exposed. Subsequently, its usage in an EHR scheme is not advisable, considering the sensitive nature of EHR data.

2) *Permissioned approaches*: Stamatellis *et al.* [48], utilized Hyperledger Fabric to incorporate a private data collection key feature. In their work, the authors created a privacy-preserving healthcare scenario in which various participating entities can store and share data securely. The Idemix suite is used to generate the participants' credentials to enhance their privacy and anonymity further. Idemix is a Zero-Knowledge Proof (ZKP) cryptographic protocol that ensures the anonymity and unlinkability of the credentials [48]. Ichikawa *et al.* [49] presented solutions that utilize Hyperledger Fabric in order to store healthcare records collected from mobile devices. Although the authors built their model on the older v0.5 version of Hyperledger Fabric - and which does not have the private data collection feature, the v1.4 version (the version that PREHEALTH [48] is built upon) has it. Moreover, their model does not support the Idemix suite to create the necessary privacy guarantees. Overall their system is able to store data in an immutable ledger, but without any privacy protection for end-users. It should be noted that to incorporate the private data collection feature - an update of their system - is not possible without a complete re-design of their architecture. Likewise, Liang *et al.* [25] utilized Hyperledger Fabric to simulate a real-world scenario with different participating entities. On their system, the represented entities include users, wearable devices, healthcare providers, insurance companies, blockchain networks and cloud databases. However, later versions of Hyperledger Fabric introduced new challenges that their work needs to address, in case of an architecture re-design and revision into a newer version that incorporates the private data collection feature. MedShare [50] has many concepts similar to their work, however, the backbone blockchain framework is not explicitly selected. Moreover, the authors focus more on discussing the

fundamental building blocks of blockchain technology, such as data blocks and smart contracts, than on a proposed solution.

A decentralized privacy-preserving blockchain solution built on a permissionless blockchain network, and which combines cloud storage and medical data acquired from IoT devices, is examined in [51] in the context of developing a novel hybrid EHR management method. The key advantages of the proposed solution include the utilization of lightweight symmetric and asymmetric key encryption (also known as public key encryption) in order to achieve effective anonymity and client authorization; however, performance efficiency and GDPR compliance have not been examined.

3) *Other implementations:* Sharma, Chen and Sheth [52] examine kHealth, a practical privacy-preserving cloud-based system that handles health data acquired from the Internet of Things (IoT) devices. Their system aims to build personalized health predictive models by applying efficient, but computationally expensive privacy guarantees, as it employs various homomorphic encryption and differential privacy techniques. Meanwhile, it should be noted that scalability optimizations often undermine privacy-protection mechanisms.

Dubovitskaya *et al.* [53] introduced a scalable and privacy-preserving e-Health cloud system where medical data is encrypted through public-key cryptography over both local and cloud-stored databases, and efficiently distributed by access control policies specified by the patient. A limitation of this implementation is the possible misconduct of trusted cloud server providers; these could violate anonymity by deducing private information from the user's IP address. They could, also, associate a pseudonym with a patient by launching an inference attack.

Casino *et al.* [54] addressed how blockchain technology could enhance several applications within the healthcare industry, such as the management of EHR, drug counterfeiting, and user-oriented medical research.

Ming and Zhang [55] proposed an efficient Privacy-Preserving Access Control (PPAC) scheme for EHR cloud-based systems and which utilizes the cuckoo filter and a novel Attribute-Based Signcryption (ABSC) mechanism, in order to achieve anonymity and computational efficiency. They provided extensive privacy guarantees and comparative performance evaluation results. However, compliance with GDPR has not been investigated.

Roehrs *et al.* [56] distributed Personal Health Record (PHR) information into data blocks. From a logical point of view, the data storage seems centralized, but, in fact, it is decentralized among the participating devices. The authors noted that their proposed protocol *openPHR* is feasible, extensible, and elastic, and can be adopted in practice by many organizations. Their architecture is presented in detail, but the practicality of their work is being questioned. Additionally, the authors mentioned that security and privacy are still lacking in their approach. It should be noted that a PHR is controlled by the patient in contrast to an EHR which is controlled by a healthcare institution. However, both EHR and PHR are electronically stored and distributed and thus may be evaluated in terms

of performance and scalability metrics, privacy-preserving features, and GDPR compliance.

IV. IPFS USE CASES

IPFS (InterPlanetary File System) implements a distributed infrastructure using P2P (Peer-to-peer) methods, and where there is no centralised server. As with Torrent networks, it is defined as being censorship-resistant [57]. Benet [58] outlines that IPFS can be likened to the Web where we use content-address hyperlinks, but where a single BitTorrent swarm exchange objects within one Git repository.

IPFS breaks files up into blocks and uses a Merkle DAG (Direct Acyclic Graph) and a distributed hashtable. Within a traditional blockchain infrastructure, we sequentially store transactions, and where this can take some time to create a consensus through the building of blocks. With a DAG, each of the transactions becomes a block, and it thus speeds up the consensus mechanisms. Sergio Demian Lerner [59] outlined that in a DAG there were no fixed blocks, and that each transaction brings with it, its own proof of work. Within this, he defined the usage of a fast cache for the most recent transactions, and where older transactions cannot be used as a reference.

A. Architecture

Chen *et al.* [60] define four core layers for storage (Layer 4), routing (Layer 3), virtual chain (Layer 2), and blockchain (Layer 1). Within the blockchain layer, it is possible to build a new blockchain or use Bitcoin's blockchain. A significant and prominently distributed database technology that elaborates the blockchain technology is Blockstack [61]. Blockstack operates by default using the Gaia distributed database [62] that is able to store its data decentralized in the users' web browsers instead of a centralized web server, thus enhancing privacy. Blockstack recently released Stacks 2.1 which is built on top of the Bitcoin blockchain, in order to utilise smart contracts and decentralised applications [63].

For the virtual chain layer, the transactions are processed and verified, and then sent to the blockchain layer to be stored. Each transaction must have been signed by the private key of a sender, and these are verified by their public key. Typically transactions are for a node to bind its IP address and its associated account (such as defined by its public key), and also one to declare the files that it is associated with. Files can either be **long-term immutable** or **occasionally mutable**, and are broken into blocks to be bartered in the BitSwap protocol. Each of the blocks is then identified with a **content identifier (CID)**. With the **Bitswap protocol** nodes distribute *want-lists* to their peers, and which contains the list of CIDs for blocks that they want to receive. Each node remembers which blocks its peers want. Whenever a node receives a block it checks its list to see if one of its connected peers wants the received block. The BitSwap protocol involves a node having two lists: the blocks they want; and the blocks they have. Nodes thus barter between themselves. Within a BitTorrent exchange, the data is exchanged in a single torrent.

The routing layer extracts the information from Layer 2 and maps the routing address of an account to the associated files or blocks under their account. The storage layer (Layer 4) is where the data itself is stored (for mutable storage and immutable storage). In [60], the authors make improvements to IPFS by adding a zig-zag file storage structure in order to provide a triple replication scheme (for frequently used data) and for an erasure codes storage scheme (for infrequently used data). The authors define that the method can differentiate between hot data and cold data. Within hot data storage, we store data near the computation and where there is fast access to the data, whereas cold data can be stored within cloud storage.

B. IoT integration

Muralidharan et al [64] implemented an IoT network using IPFS and where nodes and data are addressed using unique cryptographic hashes. Overall routing is implemented using Distributed Hash Tables (DHTs), and which can be used to find and publish data for peers. These DHTs can store data within the network, and can thus reduce the latency in accessing data. A Merkle DAG along with Git versioning keeps the infrastructure up-to-date. For security, IPFS uses secure file sharing and encrypted communication.

Nizamuddin et al [65] implemented an IPFS infrastructure using Ethereum. They have documented their Solidity smart contracts on GitHub [66] and tested them under Remix - and an Ethereum IDE (Integrated Development Environment) which allows for the development of smart contracts [67]. It defines Developers (D) and Approvers (A). These are identified by Ethereum addresses, and where the creator of a document creates one smart contract for each document. Developers are then responsible in uploading the document (off-chain) to the IPFS file system. The system requires a two-thirds majority of new developers/approvers to be approved by existing approvers.

C. Performance

Henningsten et al [57] measured the performance of IPFS and used a Kademlia-based distributed hash table (DHT). They had an average of 44,474 nodes of which 52.19% resided behind a NAT. They found that the infrastructure was robust and was resistant against Sybil attacks. Unfortunately, they identified weaknesses related to performance and the privacy of queries.

Naz *et al* [68] implements a data-sharing model with a number of entities:

- **Owner.** This relates to the entity that is sharing the data, such as a government entity.
- **Customer.** This relates to an entity which can download files from an IPFS server using reconstructed hashes.
- **Workers.** These help customers to decrypt the content, authenticate new customers through signatures, and query smart contracts customer data requests.
- **Arbitrator.** This entity resolves disputes between buyers and sellers for the requested content.

With Naz's model [68], an owner creates metadata for a file they wish to share, such as its filename, its file type, its file size, and its description. This information, and a complete copy of the file data, are then added to the IPFS. Once loaded onto the IPFS, the owner receives the hashes of the data back and then contacts trusted worker nodes. These worker nodes have their key pairs stored within smart contracts and are responsible for decrypting content. The file hashes are split into k shares using the Shamir Secret Share (SSS) method and encrypted using n random keys. These shares are then stored - along with security information - on a blockchain. It is important to encrypt these hashes as an adversary could rebuild the file based on the hashes. Only valid customers who have paid for access can then rebuild the files. A share for S can then be created with S_1, \dots, S_n shares, and where there are n shares with a threshold of k . Overall, k shares are required to rebuild the secret. These shares are stored and encrypted in a smart contract and can only be decrypted and rebuilt by verified workers (who are found by their public key by the owner).

Ali et al [69] used a side-chain method to keep network privacy where a validator node runs the side chain. Within the network, each IoT device has public and private keys, and which they use to encrypt data for the validator. The validator then adds data onto a side chain. A smart contract then provides communication between the device and the validator. It also stores the public key and hash of the IPFS storing data on a device, and the public key and access rights of requesters from the consortium. Kumar et al [70] outlined a way to implement IPFS networks in order to reduce the transaction size of blocks in the blockchain, and a content-addressed-based access of transactions. With this, miners store transactions on the IPFS distributed system storage. They then get back the IPFS hash of the transaction and store it in a block on the blockchain.

D. Applications

Sun *et al* [71] used a ciphertext policy attribute-based encryption (CP-ABE) and IPFS to securely store and sharing of electronic medical records. CP-ABE controls the access to encrypted files, and IPFS then stores these in a distributed form. The system is made up of: Blockchain, IPFS, medical system, and data user (DU). In this case, CP-ABE is used to generate an encryption key based on a policy which is made up from a number of attributes. A workflow is [71]:

- Initially a public-private key pair is created for Bob (the patient) based on his attributes. Bob then goes to a hospital and doctor Alice diagnoses a condition.
- Alice encrypts the diagnosis (R) with Bob's public key (CT) and signs the diagnosis ($CT' = (CT, sig_R)$). She then uploads to IPFS and generates an index for keywords. IPFS returns a hash address (HASHID) for the file (h).
- On receipt of the hash address, Alice encrypts h with a random number and hashes the medical records and their index with SHA-256. The hash value (h_R) and the encrypted hash (h') are then stored on the blockchain by

broadcasting the transaction. h_R is the hash value of the record, and h' is the encrypted hash address.

- A transaction ID (TRANSID) is then returned from the blockchain.

To recall the record:

- Bob sends an access request with keywords to the hospital. If he has the rights of access, a search token is returned ($ST_w = (ID, h, \gamma)$).
- Bob verifies the hash address h which contains in the search token ST_w , and downloads the encrypted medical record (CT') using the IPFS for hash address of h .
- Bob decrypts the ciphertext with his private key and obtains the file.

The advantages of this scheme is that Bob needs to be authorized to gain access to private data, and needs to be authorized. The weaknesses of the system include its inability to revoke attributes for access and expired users [71].

Taborda *et al.* [72] created a Web platform to store information on hotels for an image repository. This uses IPFS and blockchain in order to improve security and access control. Hao *et al.* [73] define a data storage system which uses IPFS to store video, images, and real-time monitoring data reported from sensors in agricultural products tracking.

Nizamuddin [74] defines an IPFS/smart contract solution to prove the originality and authenticity of published work and digital content. They use Ethereum smart contracts in order to govern, manage, and provide traceability and visibility of the history of digital content from its original version to the current version. In the work, they create a use case of an online book publication.

Vishwavidyapeetham *et al.* [75] apply IPFS to making notes within research projects. Their system uses a traditional encryption method to create secure documents for record keeping and Ethereum smart contracts to track the encrypted files.

Patsakis [76] define Resource Identifier Generation Algorithms and which extend Domain Generation Algorithms (DGA) - and which are often used by cybercriminals for botnet management and communication. Their system extends beyond DNS to use IPFS. overall, it hosts malicious content and explores ways that a botmaster deploys and controls bots. Karapapas *et al.* [77] define that decentralized systems provide opportunities for cybercriminals to perform illegal activities. Overall, Nizamuddin *et al.* [65] use IPFS and define a number of drivers for a business model using cryptocurrencies. With its integrated version control systems, their infrastructure enables tamper-proof version control. Dwivedi [78] defines the usage of smart contracts and an IPFS infrastructure to improve data sharing - using data contracts - and device authentication within a fog computing/IIoT (Industrial IoT) infrastructure.

V. EUROPEAN E-ID

Different countries have different approaches to identity and consequently also to electronic identity. On a global scale, some well-known implementations are the ICAO electronic passport system [79] which is used by most countries worldwide, and the Indian Aadhaar system [80]. Depending

on the political and cultural situation in a particular country, the degree of trust in such a system varies. Some countries do not have a national identity scheme. In the UK, a previous national ID scheme was cancelled [81] on the back of a single blog post [82].

A. EU electronic identity

1) *eIDAS*: Within the European Commission, DG Connect (the Directorate General for Communications Networks, Content & Technology) took the initiative for the electronic **I**dentification, **A**uthentication and **S**ervices (eIDAS) regulation, covering electronic identification, authentication and trust services. The main legal document relates to electronic identification and trust services in the eIDAS Regulation [83]. The implementation of eIDAS is technically supported by ETSI (European Telecommunications Standards Institute) and CEN, including the development of standards. Along with this there are Implementing Decisions and Implementing Regulations for electronic identification [84]–[87], as well as for trust services [88]–[91]. Additional regulation addresses, amongst others things, reference the provision of e-Signature products, Points-of-Single Contact and Trusted Lists. The European Commission thus publishes an entry point to the Trusted Lists in the form of a List of Trusted Lists.

Delos *et al.* [92] describe how every member state is free to organise its trust ecosystem within the European Union. The FutureTrust project [93] researched the foundations of trust and trustworthiness and provided Open Source software components and trustworthy services. Regarding identity, member states act in a sovereign way. Each member state organises the identity of its citizens at its discretion. Most member states provide some form of an electronic authentication mechanism. These mechanisms include userid/password schemes, smart cards and mobile apps.

A member state may notify one or more identity management systems of the EU Commission, which (after acceptance by the other Member States) leads to mutual recognition across the member states. For this purpose, a set of minimum identity attributes has been defined [84] for natural and legal persons. Regarding trust services, a member state may set up a supervisory body in order to monitor Trust Service Providers (TSPs), including Qualified Trust Service Providers (QTSPs). While the supervisory body is a public sector body, most TSPs and QTSPs are private enterprises. The supervisory body will call upon the services of a Conformity Assessment Body (CAB) to evaluate TSPs and QTSPs. Such CABs are typically private enterprises, accredited by a National Accreditation Body (NAB).

The relations between these entities can be summarised as follows. Prospective QTSPs must be audited (*conformity assessed*) by a CAB. There are no prescribed standards for this purpose. However, the following applies:

- A CAB needs to be accredited by a NAB.
- A CAB must make its conformity assessment scheme public.

- The European cooperation for Accreditation² (EA) adopted Resolution EA 2014 (34) 22 [95] to use an eIDAS accreditation scheme based on ISO/IEC 17065 [96] supplemented by ETSI EN 319 403 [97] as one possible way for CABs to assess conformity with the relevant requirements of the eIDAS Regulation [83].

Terminology and basic definitions for electronic signatures are specified in eIDAS Article 3 [98]. Three levels of increasing reliability and protection against potential misuse are defined for Trust services, particularly electronic signatures: basic; advanced; and qualified. The EU Commission offers an anchor point from where evaluation and validation of identity and trust services can be initiated. This anchor point is legal, functional, and technical. It is based on the combination of a set of legal acts and the online publication of signed metadata. For trust services, the List of Trusted Lists (LOTL), both in a human and machine-readable format, is publicly available. From this meta-data anchor point, parties such as supervisory bodies can be identified, and each such supervisory body can publish the trusted list for its territory. Within these trusted lists, trust service providers are identified. Qualified TSPs are subject to mandatory supervision and conformity assessment, including bi-annual audits and the use of qualified hardware and software.

Regarding trust services, eIDAS Chapter III defines general provisions, the organisation of supervision, and mutual assistance amongst supervisor bodies. It defines specific requirements for TSPs and QTSPs, such as the bi-annual audit and the security breach notification requirement. Dedicated sections of eIDAS Chapter III define requirements for electronic signatures and seals, as well as electronic time stamps, electronic registered delivery services, and website authentication.

2) *The envisaged European identity wallet*: In 2021, an updated proposal [99] was recommended [100] to eIDAS and which requires all EU member states to provide a European Digital Identity Wallet (EDIW) as prior sections of this work had described. Furthermore, the updates to eIDAS introduce four new Trust Services including [99], [101]:

- Electronic Ledgers.
- Qualified Electronic Archiving service.
- Management of remote electronic signature and seal creation devices.
- Qualified electronic attestation of attributes verified against authentic sources.

This opened up a realm of possibility and supports distributed ledger technologies, verifiable credentials and self-sovereign identity for electronic signature use cases.

While many countries are moving towards digital ID schemes, it is the EU that perhaps has the answer to getting citizens on board. With the European Digital ID (EUDI) approach, there is the ambition that every EU citizen has the option to request a governmental e-ID in the form of an electronic wallet. The pilot phase for digital wallets will begin in 2023, and where every EU member country will

offer a Digital ID Wallet by 2024. The core part of this will be compliance with GDPR and the integration of a legal framework of the eIDAS regulation. Its vision is to break down existing siloed digital systems.

Thales [102] conducted a survey to understand how citizens perceive an EU-derived wallet — which could store a citizen's ID, driving licence, and other relevant documents that could be used to prove someone's identity. It showed that around 27% of those surveyed currently use some form of national ID scheme to prove their identity. A significant finding is that privacy and security are significant concerns for citizens, with 65% of those in the survey saying that security was the most important feature of the wallet and then followed by convenience and privacy as the most significant concerns. Another finding was that there were significant differences in the attitudes to the wallet in different countries, and where in France and Italy, the level of likely adoption was surveyed at 85% and 75%, respectively. Age, too, plays a factor, and where younger people are more accepting of the adoption of digital wallets. The survey uncovers differences in national attitudes.

VI. EUROPEAN BLOCKCHAIN PARTNERSHIP

In 2018, 27 EU Member states, Norway and Liechtenstein signed up to the European Blockchain Partnership (EBP) [103]. This led to the creation of the European Blockchain Services Infrastructure (EBSI). In 2022, Ukraine became the third non-EU member to join EBP [104]. Within EBP, there are currently four main use cases: Self-Sovereign Identity, Diploma award [105], Document Traceability and Trust Data Sharing. For the European Self-Sovereign Identity Framework (ESSIF), we have a trusted method of identifying citizens and thus allow them to create their own digital identity. There is thus no need for trusted third-party trust providers for identity checking. ESSIF also aligns with GDPR and eIDAS, and where EBSI is a public permissioned blockchain and where digital credentials are stored in wallets that citizens own and control [106]. This means that citizens have full control of their identities and their associated data. The blockchain, itself, does not store any personal information. Baldacci *et al.* [107] define that the core principles of EBSI are:

- **Public and permissioned.** The identity of all participating nodes must be governed.
- **Decentralized.** Each member should run its own node or set of nodes.
- **Scalable.** Support of high-throughput and a high number of nodes.
- **Open specifications.** EU Public License and free from patent and IP protection.
- **Sustainable.** Energy-efficient consensus mechanism.
- **Interoperable.** should foster interoperability via alignment with the work of standardization bodies such as ISO, CEN or ETSI.

In 2020, a number of proponents (DIZME, Findy, Lissi and MeineSichereID) outlined their collaboration within the Trust over IP Foundation [108] and with a goal to focus on achieving a European SSI Network. A key focus of their statement is related to the integration of EBSI with ToIP stack and ESSIF,

²The EA is the body recognised under Regulation 765/2008 [94] to manage a peer evaluation system across European NABs

and thus move towards a common single market for data across both private and public services.

Overall, the European Commission (EC) has developed a number of blockchain strategies [109], including the regulation of crypto-assets [110] and in the development of market infrastructures based on distributed ledger technology [111]. These involve the integration of joint visions through the EBP and have since invested in EBSI [1]. Along with this, the EU Commission has defined the ESSIF (European Self Sovereign Identity Framework) [112] as a framework for enhancing interoperability between national SSI schemes [113].

A. EBSI

1) *The EBSI project*: Turkanovic *et al.* [20] define the usage of EBSI and which aims to integrate with public services across the EU. It involves EU member states running both Hyperledger Besu [114] and Fabric clients. EBSI's ledger protocol is described as being *pluggable* and thus it is assumed that either Besu or Fabric can be used [1]. With a consensus, each member state has an equal vote on the verification process, and where each state runs at least one consensus node. Figure 1 outlines the SSI model used by EBSI.

Figure 2 outlines the architecture for EBSI, and where we have a customer (such as Alice, who is the signer for a public service based on the blockchain) can sign for an academic quantification, and then create a verifiable signature, and link to a cross-border service for an eIDAS compliant signature [116]. This then links to the EBSI blockchain infrastructure. With EBSI, each member state has at least one running the ledger, and where the reading of the information contained is public. The writing process can only be done by trusted entities.

Hyperledger Besu integrates with the Ethereum blockchain platform which uses 42-character hexadecimal addresses to identify accounts (derived based on a 128-character public key and 64-character hexadecimal private key) [117]. With this, there is an owner of the blockchain network and who has the right to define the addresses that have permission to read and/or write from the blockchain. With Hyperledger Fabric, nodes are identified with an X.509 certificate, and a Fabric root CA (Certificate Authority) is then defined as a *Root of Trust* for all the permissions.

A key focus for a citizen-focused data ecosystem is the usage of digital wallets and verifiable credentials. In Canada, we see the usage of the Verifiable Organizations Network (VON), and which can issue digital licenses, permits, and registrations to legal entities [118]. These credentials then integrate with Hyperledger Aries. In Germany, too, Aries is used to issue eID cards, along with travel documents. For a global scope, the Trust over IP Foundation focuses on improving the compatibility of infrastructures in using Hyperledger Aries and Indy for verifiable credentials.

2) *EBSI Use Cases*: There are four current use cases for EBSI: identity checking, the awarding of a Diploma, social security checking and document traceability. At the core of EBSI is ESSIF (European Self-Sovereign Identity Framework), and which supports the onboarding and creation

of a citizen wallet (Figure 3). This should allow for interaction with other public and private organisational infrastructures. One core feature is that ESSIF is compliant with GDPR, and supports e-IDAS. These are important for legal enforceability and citizen privacy - and thus move toward a European citizen-derived identity.

The awarding of a Diploma involves an abstraction of the key roles involved in an academic award, such as the Accreditation Body; the Educational Organisation; the Student; and Trusted Accreditation Registry Administrator. A common identity check that is used when moving between countries is a social security check. This EBSI use case integrates the creation and checking of a PDA1 document³, and for it to be signed by a trusted entity, and then verified in another EU member state. Within document tracing, EBSI focuses on defining ways that allow for trusted audit trails and compliance checks for documents. This involves both off-chain storage of the documents, with on-chain verification.

To support document traceability, EBSI adds a storage layer to its infrastructure layer [107], and where documents are not kept off-chain, and where the document is hosted by a trusted organisation (and subject to terms and conditions defined by EBSI). As of EBSI v2.0 only distributed storage has been implemented as an off-chain solution. This approach involves using nodes on the EBSI network as data stores via Cassandra DB [120]. Although only one data store has been implemented it should be noted that EBSI's API can support other storage types in the form of flat files, relational databases, key/value stores, and big data stores [121].

3) *Trusted health care data sharing with EBSI*: Bittins *et al.* [122] outline how EBSI could be used for the sharing of healthcare data across the EU, and thus provide both provenance and the integration of SSI. With this, we have a trust relationship between XCA (Cross-Community Access). EBSI — though an eIDAS bridge — then defines the permissions and the required verifiable credentials for access to the medical data. It uses XDS (Cross-Domain Sharing) and the SAML (Security Assertion Markup Language) to integrate with existing legacy systems, in order to authenticate and authorize, and also to support patient-informed consent.

B. EBSI Compliance and Security Measures

A core strength of EBSI is its integration with a range of regulations and legislation, including the NIS Directive [123]; The NIS Implementing Regulation; The eIDAS Regulation; and the GDPR Regulation. As EBSI delivers an infrastructure, the legislation listed above may be applied directly to this infrastructure, or it may be applicable when EBSI is used in combination with one or more applications. The latter is particularly the case for the eIDAS Regulation because EBSI – at least for version 2.0 and prior versions – does not offer identity or trust services as defined by the Regulation. Nevertheless, applications that do offer identity or trust services may make use of EBSI.

³A PDA1 document is used to prove one's social security status and is issued by the country of origin.




Fig. 1: SSI model for EBSI [115]




Fig. 2: System landscape diagram of the architecture reference model [20]

Furthermore, EBSI must comply with the Commission’s internal standards and policies. As a consequence, the use of appropriate security is mandated [119]. Within the context of the security framework described above, a selection of key security measures is listed in Table I.

VII. THE GLASS PROJECT

The overall structure of GLASS uses a distributed domain approach (Figure 4) and is created using Hyperledger Fabric. In the example we three distinct sovereign nations that have joined a single channel to expedite the governance infrastructure, and where sovereign nation has two departments that are accountable for endorsing, validating,

and committing citizens data. Each trusted department is then responsible in signing identity documents with their associated private key, and proven with their public key on the EBSI ledger.

A. Decentralised Distributed Ledger and Chaincode

Blockchain is a decentralised, trustless, tamper-proof, distributed ledger over peer-to-peer networks [124], [125]. The blockchain and smart contract technology provide a mechanism for developing efficient access control methods to support secure identification, authentication, and user authorization. In addition, the immutable audit trail of blockchain makes it immutable against integrity issues. On




Fig. 3: EBSI ESSIF use case [119]

TABLE I: A selection of EBSI V2 Security Measures

Security Measure ID	Security Measure Description
EBSI_V2_SMID_001	End user identification/authentication based on EU Login and EBSI wallet (covering users)
EBSI_V2_SMID_002	DevOps users identification/authentication based on remote SSH login
EBSI_V2_SMID_003	Application components identification/authentication based on JSON Web Token (JWT) and component key pairs (covering components and enterprises)
EBSI_V2_SMID_004	EBSI API acts as an access mechanism for blockchain and distributed storage services
EBSI_V2_SMID_005	Registry of trusted dapps in a smart contract
EBSI_V2_SMID_006	Registry of trusted issuers (governments and universities) in a smart contract
EBSI_V2_SMID_007	Registry of trusted accreditation organisations in a smart contract
EBSI_V2_SMID_007	Registry of trusted registration authorities in a smart contract
EBSI_V2_SMID_009	Registry of trusted schemes in a smart contract
EBSI_V2_SMID_010	Protection of all smart contracts by an ABAC[7] security policy and a multi-sig smart contract
EBSI_V2_SMID_011	All EBSI front-end components have a TLS[8] certificate
EBSI_V2_SMID_012	All EBSI front-end components are protected by a proxy server
EBSI_V2_SMID_013	All EBSI components are protected by a firewall
EBSI_V2_SMID_014	All EBSI components run on a hardened Operating System
EBSI_V2_SMID_015	For those EBSI components that are cloud-based, the cloud provider's security




Fig. 4: An overview of a distributed data-sharing platform based on permissioned blockchain.

the other hand, the smart contract feature facilitates user authentication and authorisation under programmable policies in a fully distributed environment [126].

In a permissioned blockchain (such as Hyperledger Fabric) the smart contract interconnects with the ledger, and shapes the core segments of the blockchain system [127]. With Hyperledger Fabric, the chaincode is a piece of code that runs on peers within an organisation. It enables the creation and querying of transactions on the shared ledger, and updates the current state of the ledger. This chaincode can be utilised to generate business contracts, asset definitions or oversee decentralised applications.

B. Interplanetary File System

IPFS [58], [128] is a content sharing protocol that enables nodes to store and transfer digital content in a distributed manner. IPFS uses a peer-to-peer protocol that adopts a content-based addressing approach to resource sharing. It follows a similar approach as BitTorrent, where its distributed nature defines how files can be shared across the network. IPFS can be used to generate a permanent and distributed Web-based system (either public or private).

The IPFS process involves generating a cryptographic hash that can be used as the address, as opposed to a URL approach on our existing Web-based accesses. IPFS thus does not follow

a centralised approach, rather the peers on the network are able to distribute the data. Moreover, when a peer downloads the content, it becomes a distributor of that content. Digital content such as those related to directory folders, images, and data stores can be represented by IPFS. IPFS breaks down the resources and stores them in a distributed manner. Each block of data is content-addressed using a CID.

C. Content Identifier

A content identifier, or CID, is a label used to point to resources in IPFS [129]. It does not indicate where the content is stored (unlike URLs), but it forms a kind of address based on the content itself. CIDs have a fixed length, regardless of the size of their underlying content. They are basically the SHA-256 cryptographic hash of the contents; hence, any minor changes to the data will produce a different CID. An example of a CID for the string-based content of 'hello world' would be: QmT78zSuBmuS4z925WZfrqQ1qHaJ56DQaTfyMUF7F8ff5o

1) *Distributed Hash Table*: A Distributed Hash Table (DHT) is a decentralised key-value lookup table [58]. It functions as a distributed database that can store and retrieve information based on the keys that the nodes hold [130]. The main feature of DHT is that it maps a CID to the location of content in IPFS. Moreover, nodes are permitted to connect

or leave the network and organise themselves to balance and store data without having any central entity involved in the network. The DHT algorithm that has been fulfilled by IPFS is referred to as Kademlia [131].

2) *Distributed Infrastructure of Trust*: A core part of the adoption of the GLASS architecture is in the trust infrastructure based on country-wide domains. Figure 5 outlines this structure in terms of the mapping of country-specific digital signers, and their rights. In the example in Figure 5, we see a top-level domain and then structured into the country domain of [DE]. Trusted organisational units, such as the Department of Justice [DE.DE_Dept_Justice] can then map onto this, and where each trusted organisation unit or unit would have their own signing keys. Their associated public key would then be stored within Hyperledger with their common identity (ID), their claim rights.

3) *Triples Design Overview*: The triplets stored on Hyperledger Fabric data collections form the core metadata which allow us to decrypt data distributed on IPFS (or other distribution mechanisms in future work.) Figure 6 outlines the integration of the triplets on the ledger. Each credential file that the citizen (Alice) stores is encrypted with a unique 256-bit encryption key and uses AES GCM. This encryption key is then encrypted with the private key of Alice (and which is either stored in her digital wallet or within the Hyperledger infrastructure). This encrypted key is then stored along with the CID of the credential file and the location of the file (URI: Universal Resource Identifier). This location can either point to an IPFS store, or a URL (Universal Resource Location).

In order to support trust within each domain, the public key of the trusted credential signer is stored within each country domain (Figure 7). These are marked as a trusted signers for given credentials, such as AC for Academic Credential. These signers are only trusted for the credential types they have been defined in the trust policy. Each credential is then associated with a credential schema, which is used by the credential signer for core attributes and optional ones. The signer's public key maps to the structure defined in Figure 5. The trust infrastructure focuses on storing the URI for the encrypted credential, but will not have any access to the contents of the file, as the citizen can only rediscover the encryption key using the private key stored in their wallet.

Since the focus of this work is the integration of Hyperledger Fabric with IPFS, it may have been noted that the CID and URI will store the same content. As the IPFS protocol uses the CID to both identify and locate resources, this is as expected for IPFS. However, by using the property of URI as a separate field, we may choose to distribute our content in other mechanisms in future work such as Dropbox and Sharepoint (as examples). In such scenarios, the CID of a resource will remain the same but the URI will differ depending on where the resource is located. The encryption key will also remain the same. Such an architecture allows for an encryption key to be hosted within an external domain.

D. Resource Distribution

The InterPlanetary File System is a peer-to-peer content-sharing protocol widely used on the internet. This protocol

is used as our primary resource distribution mechanism in the developed prototype. All the resources distributed on the IPFS network, within our scenario, are encrypted. However, for greater security, a private instance of IPFS has been used as the testing ground in the scope of this codebase. A private IPFS functions the same as the public instance of IPFS. However, only nodes that possess a shared private key (referred to as the swarm key) can participate in the private IPFS network. The use of a private IPFS network helps prevent accidental disclosure of confidential or sensitive information.

VIII. GLASS E-GOVERNANCE DATA SHARING MODEL OVER THE EBSI INFRASTRUCTURE

This section discusses the fundamentals of the key building parts of the architecture reference model and exhibits their potential applications. The architecture reference model is assessed by creating a generic model of the GLASS data sharing model and services over the EBSI Infrastructure, as well as a use-case scenario model. Figure 8 illustrates a high-level design of the reference model for better understanding. Before discussing the architecture, we will first present an overview of the GLASS and EBSI components and essential services.

A. EBSI

1) *Business Application*: Since the GLASS-related business applications are not currently a part of EBSI, this layer's primary focus is to facilitate the integration of public and private sector applications with EBSI through the use of either core service APIs or by hosting a node and becoming part of the network. Users call the EBSI business interface, which allows applications to leverage the EBSI-exposed API interfaces to make a transaction to a smart contract in the EBSI ledger.

2) *Use cases*: The use cases are applications that demonstrate EBSI's capacity to provide public services across international borders. This set of use cases is geared toward streamlining administrative procedures and verifying digital information's integrity across industries. As a result, efficiency improves, and public confidence is boosted. Notarisation of papers, diploma administration, European Self-Sovereign Identity, and trusted data exchange were the first four use cases implemented in EBSI Version 1. SME finance, asylum, and the European Social Security Platform are the additional three use cases that were chosen afterwards.

3) *Core services*: The functional area of the main services has features that can be used in any use case. This layer offers the interfaces for the many EBSI services, both on-chain and off-chain, and contains the application enablers. These microservices are organised into five distinct categories within the core services layer. These tools and resources include: the Integration API; trusted registries; API security management; and the wallet library. In addition to these services, it also provides access to features related to digital identity. EBSI provides a business interface that calls the EBSI-exposed API interfaces to request to perform a transaction to a smart contract.




Fig. 5: Overview of the trust infrastructure.

4) *Chain and storage*: The supported distributed ledger and storage protocols are part of the chain and storage layer. EBSI V2 Ledger API allows users to interact with Hyperledger Besu (Read and Write) and Fabric ledgers (Read Only) [132]. Smart contracts are used to control and enable the execution of trusted transactions, that will record on the blockchain. Smart contracts are also used to manage Trusted Registries.

5) *EBSI infrastructure*: This layer is responsible for providing generic capabilities and connectivity to Blockchain networks. These capabilities include network, compute, and deployment capabilities. It also represents all the infrastructure components necessary to set up an EBSI node. The ledger checks that the proposed transactions are valid, approve them and stores them on the chain of blocks. The infrastructure is made up of a decentralised network with nodes that are currently being hosted by the member states who are participating. Currently, there are 25 nodes participating.

B. GLASS

The trust infrastructure based on country-wide domains is a key component of the GLASS architecture's adoption since it enables distributed Infrastructure of Trust between EU member states. In a manner analogous to EBSI, GLASS aims to provide an e-Governance framework that EU member states can employ. It examines the main technologies of a distributed ledger system that can provide governments, citizens, and businesses across the EU with efficient, transparent, cross-border functional, and user-friendly solutions to support public services.

1) *Business application*: The main goal of this layer is to facilitate and build links between organisations and individuals who can legally use the GLASS services. GLASS created a user's wallet, which is a key management application that gives the user a graphical interface for storing, managing, and securing digital keys. Signing transactions, statements, credentials, documents, or claims can be accomplished with the help of these keys. As a result, users are given the ability to connect with third parties in a reliable manner and form relationships with them.

2) *Use cases*: The core use cases in GLASS involve: moving to another Member State; a short-term visit to another country; and getting a job abroad [133].

3) *Core services*: The focus of this layer is concerned with establishing connections between a GLASS portal, a Hyperledger Fabric ledger, and a private IPFS network instance to establish a trusted e-governance data-sharing model. To achieve this, GLASS makes use of a number of identity trust capabilities and APIs that permit blockchain-based services to reach a superior standard of identity assurance and trust. Credential signing, credential sharing, ledger transactions, and encryption are all part of the core services, as are APIs for issuing verifiable credentials associated with electronic identification (eID).

4) *GLASS portal*: GLASS develops an e-government portal that incorporates distributed ledger technologies into a private instance of an IPFS network. This is to record and store an encrypted verified credential on a Hyperledger fabric ledger with access restrictions. The GLASS portal will aid in sharing




Fig. 6: Overview of triplets.

the encrypted resource over the (private) IPFS cluster. In this way, a CID for the encrypted resource will be made. Since the IPFS uses the CID to identify (hash) and locate resources, it also functions as a URI. Along with delivering the encrypted resource on IPFS, the GLASS portal will also communicate with Hyperledger Fabric to keep track of the CID, URI, and encryption keys that were used to encrypt the resource. Along with delivering the encrypted resource on IPFS, the GLASS portal communicates with Hyperledger Fabric to store the CID, URI, and encryption key used to encrypt the resource. The user is then given the result of the status check. If the steps were completed without error, the user would be given a CID and URI that correspond to their encrypted resource. This lets them or other people with permission find it in the future.

5) *Chain and storage*: GLASS can use IPFS as an option for the storage using an Internet-wide protocol for peer-to-peer content exchange. It involves the integration of Hyperledger Fabric with IPFS. IPFS is what's utilised to support the storing of verified credentials in any location, and it can be used for that purpose everywhere. In terms of security, it makes use of a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI), a Content Identifier (CID), and a Protected Encryption Key (Universal Resource Identifier). After that, these are able to be recorded in a secure Hyperledger Fabric record included within the EBSI architecture. Both URI and CID will be used to store the same data. However, utilising the URI property as its own separate

field will result in increased adaptability and will make it possible for the content to be stored and shared across several platforms, including Dropbox and Sharepoint. In these kinds of situations, the CID of a resource will continue to be the same even if its location changes, but its URI will be different depending on the location of the resource, as URI could point somewhere else. In addition to this, the encryption key will not be altered. A system with such an architecture makes it possible for an encryption key to be stored in an independent domain.

Hyperledger Fabric uses an internal piece of code called *chaincode* that trusted peers execute within an organisation. It allows new transactions to be added to the distributed ledger, makes it possible to query those transactions, and updates the ledger's current state. You can use this chaincode to create legally binding contracts, define assets, or manage distributed applications. We develop a GLASS-ipfs chaincode in Hyperledger Fabric so that users can create Glass resources and read the Glass resource Key. Our system's chaincode is comprised of numerous functions. For instance, there are functions that allow a user to insert a new triplet and read an existing triplet to obtain the encryption key of a resource.

6) *GLASS ledger*: Our permissioned blockchain, Hyperledger Fabric, is utilised for the storing of the triplets (CID, Key, and URI) for each resource that is encrypted and disseminated on IPFS. These triplets are




Fig. 7: Trust infrastructure within ledger.

stored in a hashed form. A data collection is used to store the triplets, while the ledger itself is utilised to record and read/write operations, and this is for the purpose of auditing and record-keeping.

The access control, because encryption keys are sensitive, the GLASS project has created two generic organisations to show how access policies work in Hyperledger Fabric. The two organisations are org1.org and org2.org. By default, org1.org has full access to generate new triplets and read existing triplet values. This permission also allows org1.org to read existing triplet values. On the other hand, the only authorisation org2.org possesses is the ability to generate new triplets; it does not have access to any encryption keys. This demonstrates that the Hyperledger Fabric environment is set up to use two data collections: one that is public and can be read by both organisations, and another that is private and can only be read by org1.org. The encryption key is kept in the second collection. The first collection holds the CID and URI of the GLASS resources. These two data sets, when combined, comprise the proposed Triplet concept.

C. The GLASS over EBSI model

This section describes the proposed reference model architecture. The architecture reference model is made up of

numerous identity trust components that enable blockchain-based services to attain a high level of identity assurance. The architecture reference model can take advantage of the EBSI service by integrating its eSignature and eID properties, which are capable of EU cross-border identification based on the eIDAS network because the infrastructure consists of all EU Member States. In addition, the reference model fosters confidence by encrypting and storing user credentials in IPFS, which all EU state members can subsequently verify to ensure that a robust association is created between the user's digital identity and his entity in the physical world. In this section, the architecture reference model will present an example of a student from a university in one of the European countries who can use the GLASS e-governance data sharing and trust model to request qualification in the form of verifiable credentials signed by the university. The student can then present this verifiable qualification in the form of a verifiable presentation that an employer can verify within the ecosystem (Figure 9) and for the required credentials (Figure 10). Figure 11 illustrates a high-level design of the reference model of GLASS for better understanding.

EBSI differs from GLASS in that it does not include the user's wallet as part of its design, whereas GLASS provides the user's wallet. However, EBSI provides all the




Fig. 8: GLASS and EBSI layers

APIs required to communicate with a blockchain ledger and conduct verified transactions. Therefore, EBSI permits any wallet capable of generating an EBSI-compliant DID. On the other hand, GLASS offers wallet functionality for both citizens and organisations. Consequently, the GLASS wallet can be used to identify users and associate their DIDs within the EBSI ledger. (1) In Figure 11, the two primary identifiers are illustrated in this model. The first is for the citizen, while the second is for the organisation. Also referred to as legal persons and natural persons, legal persons can be any organisation, such as a university, tax authority, or any other government body. In contrast, a natural person is merely an individual or a citizen.

Client wallets can generate and store a pair of public and private keys on the device using the EBSI wallet API. After that, the on-boarding process can begin to record and anchor the information in the EBSI ledger. The authorised authority or issuers are registered in the EBSI ledger using the trusted issuer registry API. Individuals will be recorded in the EBSI ledger via a specific API. Similarly, the trusted Apps registry API adds the authorised verifier to the EBSI ledger.

In reference to Figure 11:

- (2) A student can then request a certificate from a university, which can be presented to an employer in another country.
- (3) The university issues the student certificate signed using the university's private key. Using our architecture, a legal organisation, in this case, the university, with

the necessary permissions, can use the GLASS portal to encrypt and distribute resources via the private IPFS network securely.

- (4) The portal performs automatic encryption and distribution of GLASS resources across the private IPFS network before resource access. The security is handled by means of Advanced Encryption Standard-256 Cipher Block Chaining (AES-256 CBC). The plaintext file is deleted from the server once encryption is complete.
- (5) In the proposed model, the IPFS protocol is the main way that resources are shared. In our design, all resources shared on the IPFS network are encrypted, but for more security, testing was done on a private instance of IPFS. A private IPFS works the same way as a public IPFS, but nodes can only join the private IPFS network if they have a shared private key called the "swarm key." Using a private IPFS network effectively prevents sensitive or private information from getting out by accident.
- (6) We will receive back the CID and URI.
- (7) When an encrypted resource is distributed over IPFS, the GLASS portal simultaneously records and maintains the metadata triplet (CID, encryption key, and URI) in the Hyperledger Fabric data collections.
- (8) This activity is recorded in the ledger of the permissioned blockchain so that it can be audited afterwards. Role-based security allows the GLASS portal to read and retrieve encryption keys from the Hyperledger Fabric data collection and decryption of




Fig. 9: GLASS example with academic credential presentation




Fig. 10: Example credentials

GLASS resources if the user has the required permissions.

- (9) In the verification phase, the student will send the signed version of the signed credentials to an employer in any other country within the ecosystem.
- (10) Finally, the verifier queries the EBSI ledger to verify the issuer's DIDs by accessing the repository of trusted signers' public keys and DIDs. In this case, the DID can be resolved by anyone in the ecosystem.

IX. CONCLUSION

At its core, enhanced e-governance could bring increased efficiency, increased quality, and increased effectiveness of government services [7]. But, there are many political narratives that can stall its development including the digital divide, anti-corruption, the loss of privacy, social change, and the increasing control from government agencies [7].

GLASS [134] focuses on developing an e-Governance framework that could be adopted by the European Union's member states, while EBSI focuses on the provision of trusted identity data. Key features of EBSI are the provision of GDPR compliance and eIDAS 2 signatures. The two infrastructures could thus provide an integrated approach to enhanced e-

Governance services across the EU, and future support the freedom of movement of EU citizens.

REFERENCES

- [1] EBSI, "Architecture - EBSI Documentation -." [Online]. Available: <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-building-blocks/wikis/display/EBSIDOC/Architecture>
- [2] GLASS, "GLASS for Citizens," <https://www.glass-h2020.eu/for-citizens>, 2020, [Online; accessed 10-February-2021].
- [3] GLASS, "GLASS home -." [Online]. Available: <https://www.glass-h2020.eu/>
- [4] B. Leiding, P. Sharma, and A. Norta, "The machine-to-everything (m2x) economy: Business enactments, collaborations, and e-governance," *Future Internet*, vol. 13, no. 12, p. 319, 2021.
- [5] A. Addo and P. K. Senyo, "Advancing e-governance for development: Digital identification and its link to socioeconomic inclusion," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 2, p. 101568, 2021.
- [6] D. Coursey and D. F. Norris, "Models of e-government: Are they correct? an empirical assessment," *Public administration review*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 523–536, 2008.
- [7] D. Draheim, I. Pappel, M. Lauk, K. McBride, Y. Misnikov, T. Nagumo, F. Lemke, and F. Hartleb, "On the narratives and background narratives of e-government," 2020.
- [8] M. C. Valdavidia, M. Iaconisi, and S. Pilos, "Is public sector ready for blockchain? is blockchain ready for the public sector?" *European review of digital administration & law*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 7–17, 2021.




Fig. 11: GLASS over EBSI model

- [9] O. Lo, W. J. Buchanan, S. Sayeed, P. Papadopoulos, N. Pitropakis, and C. Chrysoulas, "Glass: A citizen-centric distributed data-sharing model within an e-governance architecture," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 6, p. 2291, 2022.
- [10] EBSI, "EBSI wiki -," [Online]. Available: <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-building-blocks/wikis/display/ebsi>
- [11] I. Lykidis, G. Drosatos, and K. Rantos, "The use of blockchain technology in e-government services," *Computers*, vol. 10, no. 12, p. 168, 2021.
- [12] T. Rathee and P. Singh, "A systematic literature mapping on secure identity management using blockchain technology," *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1319157821000690>
- [13] X. Tang, Z. Jia, and W. Yang, "Blockchain application status and ecology," in *Blockchain Application Guide*. Springer, 2022, pp. 35–48.
- [14] S. Singanamalla, A. Mehra, N. Chandran, H. Lohchab, S. Chava, A. Kadayam, S. Bajpai, K. Heimerl, R. Anderson, and S. Lokam, "Telechain: Bridging telecom policy and blockchain practice," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12350*, 2022.
- [15] K. Paide, I. Pappel, H. Vainsalu, and D. Draheim, "On the systematic exploitation of the estonian data exchange layer x-road for strengthening public-private partnerships," in *proceedings of the 11th international conference on theory and practice of electronic governance*, 2018, pp. 34–41.
- [16] A. Buldas, A. Kroonmaa, and R. Laanoja, "Keyless signatures' infrastructure: How to build global distributed hash-trees," in *Nordic Conference on Secure IT Systems*. Springer, 2013, pp. 313–320.
- [17] D. Draheim, "Blockchains from an e-governance perspective: Potential and challenges," *Proceedings of the EGOSE*, 2020.
- [18] T. Bazhenova, "Digitalization of belarus economy: prospects of the industry," *Section 1 Globalized Economy: Challenges and Prospects*, p. 21, 2018.
- [19] P. I. Akpan-Obong, M. P. Trinh, C. K. Ayo, and A. Oni, "E-governance as good governance? evidence from 15 west african countries," *Information Technology for Development*, pp. 1–20, 2022.

- [20] M. Turkanović and B. Podgorelec, "Signing blockchain transactions using qualified certificates," *IEEE Internet Computing*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 37–43, 2020.
- [21] S. VETTORAZZI, "Establishing the connecting europe facility 2021-2027," 2018.
- [22] ToIP, "Achieving trusted digital transactions across the globe: OIX and ToIP align to make it happen," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://trustoverip.org/news/2022/06/15/achieving-trusted-digital-transactions-across-the-globe-oix-and-toip-align-to-make-it-happen/>
- [23] Dizme, "Position statement toward EBSI," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://lissi.id/about>
- [24] N. Anand and I. Brass, "Responsible innovation for digital identity systems," *Data & Policy*, vol. 3, 2021.
- [25] X. Liang, J. Zhao, S. Shetty, J. Liu, and D. Li, "Integrating blockchain for data sharing and collaboration in mobile healthcare applications," in *2017 IEEE 28th annual international symposium on personal, indoor, and mobile radio communications (PIMRC)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–5.
- [26] A. Havelange, M. Dumontier, B. Wouters, J. Linde, D. Townsend, A. Riedl, and V. Urovi, "Luce: A blockchain solution for monitoring data license accountability and compliance," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.02287*, 2019.
- [27] V. Jaiman and V. Urovi, "A consent model for blockchain-based health data sharing platforms," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 143 734–143 745, 2020.
- [28] E. Politou, E. Alepis, C. Patsakis, F. Casino, and M. Alazab, "Delegated content erasure in ipfs," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 112, pp. 956–964, 2020.
- [29] Z. Wang, Y. Tian, and J. Zhu, "Data sharing and tracing scheme based on blockchain," in *2018 8th international conference on logistics, Informatics and Service Sciences (LISS)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [30] S. Khatal, J. Rane, D. Patel, P. Patel, and Y. Busnel, "Fileshare: A blockchain and ipfs framework for secure file sharing and data provenance," in *Advances in Machine Learning and Computational Intelligence*. Springer, 2021, pp. 825–833.
- [31] A. Dubovitskaya, Z. Xu, S. Ryu, M. Schumacher, and F. Wang, "Secure and trustable electronic medical records sharing using blockchain," in *AMIA annual symposium proceedings*, vol. 2017. American Medical Informatics Association, 2017, p. 650.
- [32] P. Papadopoulos, W. Abramson, A. J. Hall, N. Pitropakis, and W. J. Buchanan, "Privacy and trust redefined in federated machine learning," *Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 333–356, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/2504-4990/3/2/17>
- [33] W. Abramson, A. J. Hall, P. Papadopoulos, N. Pitropakis, and W. J. Buchanan, "A distributed trust framework for privacy-preserving machine learning," in *Trust, Privacy and Security in Digital Business*, S. Gritzalis, E. R. Weippl, G. Kotsis, A. M. Tjoa, and I. Khalil, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 205–220.
- [34] A. A. Siyal, A. Z. Junejo, M. Zawish, K. Ahmed, A. Khalil, and G. Sourso, "Applications of blockchain technology in medicine and healthcare: Challenges and future perspectives," *Cryptography*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 3, 2019.
- [35] A. Omran, M. Abouyoussef, M. Ismail, and S. Bhatia, "Sharded blockchain-based online diagnostic system for suspected patients during pandemics," in *2022 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 2715–2720.
- [36] B. Shen, J. Guo, and Y. Yang, "Medchain: Efficient healthcare data sharing via blockchain," *Applied sciences*, vol. 9, no. 6, p. 1207, 2019.
- [37] X. Zheng, S. Sun, R. R. Mukkamala, R. Vatrpu, and J. Ordieres-Meré, "Accelerating health data sharing: A solution based on the internet of things and distributed ledger technologies," *Journal of medical Internet research*, vol. 21, no. 6, p. e13583, 2019.
- [38] IOTA, "IOTA & EBSI," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.iota.org/solutions/ebsi>
- [39] A. Theodouli, S. Arakliotis, K. Moschou, K. Votis, and D. Tzovaras, "On the design of a blockchain-based system to facilitate healthcare data sharing," in *2018 17th IEEE International Conference On Trust, Security And Privacy In Computing And Communications/12th IEEE International Conference On Big Data Science And Engineering (TrustCom/BigDataSE)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1374–1379.
- [40] M. Hölbl, M. Kompara, A. Kamišalić, and L. Nemec Zlatolas, "A systematic review of the use of blockchain in healthcare," *Symmetry*, vol. 10, no. 10, p. 470, 2018.
- [41] A. H. Mayer, C. A. da Costa, and R. d. R. Righi, "Electronic health records in a blockchain: a systematic review," *Health informatics journal*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 1273–1288, 2020.
- [42] B. Yüksel, A. Kıpçtı, and Ö. Özkasap, "Research issues for privacy and security of electronic health services," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 68, pp. 1–13, 2017.
- [43] A. Abbas and S. U. Khan, "A review on the state-of-the-art privacy-preserving approaches in the e-health clouds," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 1431–1441, 2014.
- [44] A. Azaria, A. Ekblaw, T. Vieira, and A. Lippman, "Medrec: Using blockchain for medical data access and permission management," in *2016 2nd International Conference on Open and Big Data (OBD)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 25–30.
- [45] H. Yang and B. Yang, "A blockchain-based approach to the secure sharing of healthcare data," *Nisk Journal*, pp. 100–111, 2017.
- [46] A. Al Omar, M. S. Rahman, A. Basu, and S. Kiyomoto, "Medibchain: A blockchain based privacy preserving platform for healthcare data," in *International conference on security, privacy and anonymity in computation, communication and storage*. Springer, 2017, pp. 534–543.
- [47] T. Bocek, B. B. Rodrigues, T. Strasser, and B. Stiller, "Blockchains everywhere-a use-case of blockchains in the pharma supply-chain," in *2017 IFIP/IEEE Symposium on Integrated Network and Service Management (IM)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 772–777.
- [48] C. Stamatiellis, P. Papadopoulos, N. Pitropakis, S. Katsikas, and W. J. Buchanan, "A privacy-preserving healthcare framework using hyperledger fabric," *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 22, p. 6587, 2020.
- [49] D. Ichikawa, M. Kashiya, and T. Ueno, "Tamper-resistant mobile health using blockchain technology," *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, vol. 5, no. 7, p. e111, 2017.
- [50] Q. Xia, E. B. Sifah, K. O. Asamoah, J. Gao, X. Du, and M. Guizani, "Medshare: Trust-less medical data sharing among cloud service providers via blockchain," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 14 757–14 767, 2017.
- [51] A. D. Dwivedi, G. Srivastava, S. Dhar, and R. Singh, "A decentralized privacy-preserving healthcare blockchain for iot," *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 2, p. 326, 2019.
- [52] S. Sharma, K. Chen, and A. Sheth, "Toward practical privacy-preserving analytics for iot and cloud-based healthcare systems," *IEEE Internet Computing*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 42–51, 2018.
- [53] A. Dubovitskaya, V. Urovi, M. Vasirani, K. Aberer, and M. I. Schumacher, "A cloud-based ehealth architecture for privacy preserving data integration," in *IFIP International Information Security and Privacy Conference*. Springer, 2015, pp. 585–598.
- [54] F. Casino, T. K. Dasaklis, and C. Patsakis, "A systematic literature review of blockchain-based applications: current status, classification and open issues," *Telematics and Informatics*, vol. 36, pp. 55–81, 2019.
- [55] Y. Ming and T. Zhang, "Efficient privacy-preserving access control scheme in electronic health records system," *Sensors*, vol. 18, no. 10, p. 3520, 2018.
- [56] A. Roehrs, C. A. da Costa, and R. da Rosa Righi, "Omniphr: A distributed architecture model to integrate personal health records," *Journal of biomedical informatics*, vol. 71, pp. 70–81, 2017.
- [57] S. Henningsen, M. Florian, S. Rust, and B. Scheuermann, "Mapping the interplanetary filesystem," in *2020 IFIP Networking Conference (Networking)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 289–297.
- [58] J. Benet, "Ipfs-content addressed, versioned, p2p file system (draft 3)," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.3561*, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.3561v1>
- [59] S. D. Lerner, "Dagcoin: a cryptocurrency without blocks," *White paper*, 2015.
- [60] Y. Chen, H. Li, K. Li, and J. Zhang, "An improved p2p file system scheme based on ipfs and blockchain," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 2652–2657.
- [61] M. Ali, R. Shea, J. Nelson, and M. J. Freedman, "Blockstack: A new decentralized internet," *Whitepaper*, May, 2017.
- [62] P. Sood, P. Palsania, S. Ahuja, S. Kumar, K. Khatter, and A. Mishra, "Decentralised & collaborative docupad using blockchain," in *2022 IEEE Delhi Section Conference (DELCON)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–8.
- [63] M. Cuevas, "Stacks 2.1: Apps and smart contracts for bitcoin," <https://stacks.org/stacks-21-what-to-expect>, 2022, [Online; accessed 28-Nov-2022].
- [64] S. Muralidharan and H. Ko, "An interplanetary file system (ipfs) based iot framework," in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Consumer Electronics (ICCE)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–2.
- [65] N. Nizamuddin, K. Salah, M. A. Azad, J. Arshad, and M. Rehman, "Decentralized document version control using ethereum blockchain and ipfs," *Computers & Electrical Engineering*, vol. 76, pp. 183–197, 2019.

- [66] N. Nizamuddin, "Smart contract," <https://github.com/SmartContract1/DocumentVersionControl>, 2021, [Online; accessed 15-Mar-2021].
- [67] "Remix - Ethereum IDE & community," <https://remix-project.org/>, 2021, [Online; accessed 31-Mar-2021].
- [68] M. Naz, F. A. Al-zahrani, R. Khalid, N. Javaid, A. M. Qamar, M. K. Afzal, and M. Shafiq, "A secure data sharing platform using blockchain and interplanetary file system," *Sustainability*, vol. 11, no. 24, p. 7054, 2019.
- [69] M. S. Ali, K. Dolui, and F. Antonelli, "IoT data privacy via blockchains and ipfs," in *Proceedings of the seventh international conference on the internet of things*, 2017, pp. 1–7.
- [70] R. Kumar and R. Tripathi, "Implementation of distributed file storage and access framework using ipfs and blockchain," in *2019 Fifth International Conference on Image Information Processing (ICIIP)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 246–251.
- [71] J. Sun, X. Yao, S. Wang, and Y. Wu, "Blockchain-based secure storage and access scheme for electronic medical records in ipfs," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 59 389–59 401, 2020.
- [72] C. H. C. Tabora, J. G. Vazquez, C. E. M. Marin, and P. G. Garcia, "Decentralized application for the classification of hotels based on ipfs and blockchain," in *International Conference on Tourism, Technology and Systems*. Springer, 2020, pp. 12–24.
- [73] J. Hao, Y. Sun, and H. Luo, "A safe and efficient storage scheme based on blockchain and ipfs for agricultural products tracking," *J. Comput.*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 158–167, 2018.
- [74] N. Nizamuddin, H. R. Hasan, and K. Salah, "Ipfs-blockchain-based authenticity of online publications," in *International Conference on Blockchain*. Springer, 2018, pp. 199–212.
- [75] A. VishwaVidyaeeetham, "A blockchain and ipfs based framework for secure research record keeping," *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 119, no. 15, pp. 1437–1442, 2018.
- [76] C. Patsakis and F. Casino, "Hydras and ipfs: a decentralised playground for malware," *International Journal of Information Security*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 787–799, 2019.
- [77] C. Karapapas, I. Pittaras, N. Fotiou, and G. C. Polyzos, "Ransomware as a service using smart contracts and ipfs," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [78] S. K. Dwivedi, R. Amin, and S. Volla, "Smart contract and ipfs-based trustworthy secure data storage and device authentication scheme in fog computing environment," *Peer-to-Peer Networking and Applications*, pp. 1–21, 2022.
- [79] V. Pasupathinathan, J. Pieprzyk, and H. Wang, "An on-line secure e-passport protocol," in *International Conference on Information Security Practice and Experience*. Springer, 2008, pp. 14–28.
- [80] R. Khara, "Impact of aadhaar in welfare programmes," *Available at SSRN 3045235*, 2017.
- [81] GOV.UK, "National identity register destroyed as government consigns ID card scheme to history - GOV.UK," 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/national-identity-register-destroyed-as-government-consigns-id-card-scheme-to-history>
- [82] F. S. Saunders, "The Terrible Truth About ID Cards - UK Indymedia," 2006. [Online]. Available: <https://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2006/04/338263.html>
- [83] European Union, *EU 910/2014 Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014 on electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions in the internal market and repealing Directive 1999/93/EC*, DG CONNECT, 2014, oJ L 257, 28.8.2014, p. 73 114.
- [84] —, *EU 2015/1501, Implementing Act on interoperability framework*, European Commission, 2015, eU 2015/1501.
- [85] —, *EU 2015/1502, Implementing Act on identity Levels of Assurance*, European Commission, 2015, eU 2015/1502.
- [86] —, *EU 2015/1984, Implementing Act defining the circumstances, formats and procedures of notification*, European Commission, 2015, eU 2015/1984.
- [87] —, *EU 2015/296, Implementing Decision on Member State cooperation for identity*, European Commission, 2015, eU 2015/296.
- [88] —, *EU 2015/1505, Implementing Act on Trusted List formats*, European Commission, 2015, eU 2015/1505.
- [89] —, *EU 2015/1506, Implementing Act on formats for signatures and seals*, European Commission, 2015, eU 2015/1506.
- [90] —, *EU 2015/806, Implementing act on trust mark*, European Commission, 2015, eU 2015/806.
- [91] —, *EU 2016/650, Standards for the security assessment of qualified signature and seal creation devices*, European Commission, 2016, eU 2016/650.
- [92] O. Delos, T. Debusschere, M. D. Soete, J. Dumortier, R. Genghini, H. Graux, S. Lacroix, G. Ramunno, M. Sel, and P. V. Eecke, "A pan-european framework on electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions in the internal market," in *Securing business processes*, S. Paulus, N. Pohlman, and H. Reimer, Eds. Vieweg+Tubner, Springer Science+Business Media, 2015, pp. 173–195.
- [93] D. Hühnlein, T. Frosch, J. Schwenk, C. Pischwanger, M. Sel, T. Hühnlein, T. Wich, D. Nemmert, R. Lottes, J. Somorovsky, V. Mladenov, C. Condovici, H. Leitold, S. Stalla-Bourdillon, N. Tsakalakis, J. Eichholz, F. Kamm, A. Kühne, D. Wabisch, R. Dean, J. Shamah, M. Kapanadze, N. Ponte, J. Martins, R. Portela, C. Karabat, S. Stojicic, S. Nedeljkovic, V. Bouckaert, A. Defays, B. Anderson, M. Jonas, C. Hermanns, T. Schubert, D. Wegener, and A. Sazonov, "FutureTrust — Future Trust Services for Trustworthy Global Transactions," in *Open Identity Summit 2016, 13.-14. October 2016, Rome, Italy*, ser. LNI, D. Hühnlein, H. Roßnagel, C. H. Schunck, and M. Talamo, Eds., vol. P-264. GI, 2016, pp. 27–41. [Online]. Available: <https://dl.gi.de/20.500.12116/602>
- [94] European Parliament and European Council, *Regulation EC 765/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 July 2008 setting out the requirements for accreditation and market surveillance related to the marketing of products and repealing Regulation EEC 339/93 (text with EEA relevance)*, EU, 2008, official Journal of the European Union, OJ L 218, 13.8.2008, p. 30–47.
- [95] EA, *EA Resolution 2014 (34) 22*, European cooperation for Accreditation, 2014, <https://european-accreditation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/34th-ea-ga-approved-resolutions-.pdf>.
- [96] ISO, *ISO/IEC 17065:2012(E) Conformity assessment — Requirements for bodies certifying products, processes and services*.
- [97] ETSI, *Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI) Trust Service Provider Conformity Assessment — Requirements for conformity assessment bodies assessing Trust Service Providers*, 2015, eN 319 403.
- [98] N. Tsakalakis, S. Stalla-Bourdillon, and K. O'Hara, "Identity assurance in the uk: technical implementation and legal implications under eidas," *The Journal of Web Science*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 32–46, 2017.
- [99] European Commission, "Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL amending Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 as regards establishing a framework for a European Digital Identity," Tech. Rep., 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2021%3A281%3AFIN&qid=1622704576563>
- [100] —, "Commission Recommendation (EU) 2021/946 of 3 June 2021 on a common Union Toolbox for a coordinated approach towards a European Digital Identity Framework," vol. 64, no. L 210, pp. 51–54, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reco/2021/946>
- [101] Thales, "Welcoming the Wallet - What the new European Digital Identity Framework means for citizens, governments and businesses," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.thalesgroup.com/en/markets/digital-identity-and-security/government/documents/what-is-EU-ID-wallet>
- [102] —, "Thales Major Citizen Survey Predicts Warm Welcome for New European Digital ID Wallet (EDIW)," [Online]. Available: <https://www.afp.com/en/news/1312/thales-major-citizen-survey-predicts-warm-welcome-new-european-digital-id-wallet-ediw-202206050050101,urldate={2022-06-16},year={2021}>
- [103] A. Queiruga-Dios, J. J. B. Pérez, and L. H. Encinas, "Self-sovereign identity in university context," in *2022 31st Conference of Open Innovations Association (FRUCT)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 259–264.
- [104] EBP, "Ukraine becomes the third non-EU nation to join the European blockchain partnership (EBP)," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.crypto-news-flash.com/ukraine-becomes-the-third-non-eu-nation-to-join-the-european-blockchain-partnership-ebp/>
- [105] P.-C. VASILE and A. DINU, "edis—electronic diploma integrity service."
- [106] A. Grech, I. Sood, and L. Ariño, "Blockchain, self-sovereign identity and digital credentials: promise versus praxis in education," *Frontiers in Blockchain*, vol. 4, p. 616779, 2021.
- [107] E. Baldacci and J. R. Frade, "Advancing digital transformation in the public sector with blockchain: A view from the european union," in *Disintermediation Economics*. Springer, 2021, pp. 281–295.

- [108] F. Dizme, Lissi and MeineSichereID, "Position Statement toward EBSI," 2022. [Online]. Available: https://networkofnetworks.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/EBSI_Network-of-Networks_esatus_Danube_Tech_TNO.pdf
- [109] G. Fulli, E. Kotzakis, and I. Nai Fovino, "Policy and regulatory challenges for the deployment of blockchains in the energy field," 2021.
- [110] P. G. Sandner, A. Ferreira, and T. Dunser, "Crypto regulation and the case for europe," in *Handbook on Blockchain*. Springer, 2022, pp. 661–693.
- [111] R. Priem, "A european distributed ledger technology pilot regime for market infrastructures: finding a balance between innovation, investor protection and financial stability," *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance*, 2022.
- [112] D. Pöhn, M. Grabatin, and W. Hommel, "eid and self-sovereign identity usage: An overview," *Electronics*, vol. 10, no. 22, p. 2811, 2021.
- [113] G. Konstantinidis, "Identity and access management for e-government services in the european union—state of the art review," 2021.
- [114] S. Dalla Palma, R. Pareschi, and F. Zappone, "What is your distributed (hyper) ledger?" in *2021 IEEE/ACM 4th International Workshop on Emerging Trends in Software Engineering for Blockchain (WETSEB)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 27–33.
- [115] L. Cocco, R. Tonelli, and M. Marchesi, "A system proposal for information management in building sector based on bim, ssi, iot and blockchain," *Future Internet*, vol. 14, no. 5, p. 140, 2022.
- [116] CEF Digital, "What is eSignature," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://ec.europa.eu/cefdigital/wiki/display/CEFDIGITAL/What+is+eSignature>
- [117] Ethereum, "Ethereum accounts — ethereum.org," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/accounts/>
- [118] J. Sedlmeir, R. Smethurst, A. Rieger, and G. Fridgen, "Digital identities and verifiable credentials," *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 603–613, 2021.
- [119] EBSI, "EBSI Use Cases," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-building-blocks/wikis/display/EBSI/Use+cases>
- [120] —, "Distributed Storage - EBSI Documentation -," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-building-blocks/wikis/display/EBSIDOC/Distributed+Storage#DistributedStorage-WhatistheDistributedStorageservice>
- [121] —, "Off-chain Storage - EBSI Documentation -," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-building-blocks/wikis/display/EBSIDOC/Off-chain+Storage>
- [122] S. Bittins, G. Kober, A. Margheri, M. Masi, A. Miladi, and V. Sassone, "Healthcare data management by using blockchain technology," in *Applications of blockchain in healthcare*. Springer, 2021, pp. 1–27.
- [123] N. Directive, "Directive (eu) 2016/1148 of the european parliament and of the council of 6 july 2016 concerning measures for a high common level of security of network and information systems across the union," *OJ L*, vol. 194, no. 19.7, p. 2016, 2016.
- [124] Z. Z. S. X. H.-N. D. X. C. H. Wang, "Blockchain challenges and opportunities: a survey," *International Journal of Web and Grid Services (IJWGS)*, vol. 14, no. 4, 2018.
- [125] P. Papadopoulos, N. Pitropakis, and W. J. Buchanan, "Decentralised privacy: A distributed ledger approach," in *Handbook of Smart Materials, Technologies, and Devices: Applications of Industry 4.0*, C. M. Hussain and P. Di Sia, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 1–26. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58675-1_58-1
- [126] A. K. Marko Hölbl Marko KomparaOrcID and L. N. Zlatolas, "A systematic review of the use of blockchain in healthcare," *MDPI Symmetry*, 2018.
- [127] Hyperledger Fabric, "Smart Contracts and Chaincode," <https://hyperledger-fabric.readthedocs.io/en/release-2.2/smartcontract/smartcontract.html#system-chaincode>, 2020, [Online; accessed 31-Aug-2021].
- [128] Protocol Labs, "What is IPFS?" <https://docs.ipfs.io/concepts/what-is-ipfs/>, 2021, [Online; accessed 15-Mar-2021].
- [129] multiformats, "multiformats/cid: Self-describing content-addressed identifiers for distributed systems," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/multiformats/cid>
- [130] Michael Dufel, "Distributed Hash Tables And Why They Are Better Than Blockchain For Exchanging Health Records," https://medium.com/@michael.dufel_10220/distributed-hash-tables-and-why-they-are-better-than-blockchain-for/-exchanging-health-records-d469534cc2a5, 2017, [Online; accessed 8-February-2022].
- [131] P. Maymounkov and D. Mazieres, "Kademlia: A peer-to-peer information system based on the xor metric," in *International Workshop on Peer-to-Peer Systems*. Springer, 2002, pp. 53–65.
- [132] D. Li, W. E. Wong, and J. Guo, "A survey on blockchain for enterprise using hyperledger fabric and composer," in *2019 6th International Conference on Dependable Systems and Their Applications (DSA)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 71–80.
- [133] GLASS, "Moving to another member state," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.glass-h2020.eu/moving-to-another-member-state>
- [134] C. Chrysoulas, A. Thomson, N. Pitropakis, P. Papadopoulos, O. Lo, W. J. Buchanan, G. Domalis, N. Karacapilidis, D. Tsakalidis, and D. Tsolis, "Glass: Towards secure and decentralized egovernance services using ipfs," in *European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*. Springer, 2021, pp. 40–57.