mas.s62 lecture 23 New Directions in Crypto 2018-05-07 Tadge Dryja

today future developments:

block / committed bloom filters sharding accumulators UTX0 commitments

block filters first: what is a bloom filter makeFilter([]obj) -> filter matchFilter(filter, obj) -> bool

can have false positives but not false negatives

block filters current SPV model client makes filter of all their utxos and addresses sends filter to server server matches filter w/ each block server sends only matching txs

block filters current SPV model bad for privacy <u>sending filter, not utxo / adr list</u> but nearly the same effect slow for servers

block filters

new(ish) idea: reverse this model
server makes filter from txs in block
client requests filter
client matches fitler to own utxos
client requests whole block on match

block filters

better privacy: server only learns
which blocks interesting to client

low CPU use for server

harder to lie / omit (?)

higher network traffic for client
current development: "neutrino"

sharding

mainly worked on for Ethereum

common from database world:

d data, n servers
 don't store d*n, store ~d, and
 shard data over all servers, so each
 holds (lim) d/n data

sharding

- difficult in blockchain / consensus /
 adversarial environment
- need to prevent spending invalid coins
- split single utxo set into multiple
 smaller shards
- need swaps between shards

multicoin vs shards multiple utxo sets is what we've got!

Cryptocurrencies: 1614 • Markets: 10776 • Market Cap: \$434,694,870,823 • 24h Vol: \$23,844,104,203

Is this "sharding"?

multicoin vs shards multiple utxo sets is what we've got!

Cryptocurrencies: 1614 • Markets: 10776 • Market Cap: \$434,694,870,823 • 24h Vol: \$23,844,104,203

Is this "sharding"?
want more than just swaps; need
fungibility between shards
real scalability improvement
(if it works!)

Accumulators

cryptographic sets inclusion / exclusion proofs add(accum, obj) -> accum del(accum, obj) -> accum

prove(accum, obj) -> bool

Accumulators

cryptographic sets inclusion / exclusion proofs

- add(accum, obj) -> accum
- del(accum, obj) -> accum
- prove(accum, obj) -> bool

simple example: composite numbers 13

accumulates primes. To "add", multiply. To "delete", divide.

add(3, 5) -> 15

- accumulates primes. To "add", multiply. To "delete", divide.
- add(3, 5) -> 15
- add(15, 7) -> 105

- accumulates primes. To "add", multiply. To "delete", divide.
- add(3, 5) -> 15
- add(15, 7) -> 105
- del(105, 5) -> 21

- accumulates primes. To "add", multiply. To "delete", divide.
- add(3, 5) -> 15
- add(15, 7) -> 105
- del(105, 5) -> 21
- prove(21, 7) -> true

RSA accumulators constant size accumulator, proofs efficient operations ... but trusted setup (composite n= p*q with unknown p, q)

other accumulators

- some are 1-way (can't delete)
- some can be batched, some can't
- some have trusted setup
- different tradeoffs for use case
- utxo vs stxo inclusion

accumulators great if you could get it working no more UTXO set, just accumulator constant size, regardless of set small proofs; wallets track proofs

accumulators profs are O(1)? O(log(n))? n = txs? blocks? aggregation? transitioning: need some bridge node actually faster? Bitcoin UTXO set only ~4GB

UTXO commitments exists in some coins (ETH), not yet in Bitcoin

simplest: take hash(UTXO set), put it in coinbase tx

UTXO commitments

somewhat more useful: Merkle root of UTXO set in coinbase tx every block

Can then "prove" an output exists

UTXO commitments

somewhat more useful: Merkle root of UTXO set in coinbase tx every block Can then "prove" an output exists

(prove with SPV security)

UTXO commitments skip years of initial block download! only verify last ~6 months of txs if everyone's been wrong for 6 months we have bigger problems, right?

UTXO commitments

issues

timing: adding even 1s in creating /
verifying a block centralizes mining

encourages more SPV-level
verification (trust the miners)

"there's a better way to do this" hash based, EC, RSA more research required
Lots of topics in this area to
improve:

privacy

scalability

functionality

MIT OpenCourseWare <u>https://ocw.mit.edu/</u>

MAS.S62 Cryptocurrency Engineering and Design Spring 2018

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <u>https://ocw.mit.edu/terms</u>.