Discussion of Auer, Monnet and Shin's Permissioned Distributed Ledgers and the Governance of Money

Hanna Halaburda (NYU)

CB&DC Virtual Seminar, 26 March 2021

Hanna Halaburda (NYU) Discussion of Permissioned Distributed Ledgers

INCENTIVES IN PERMISSIONED BLOCKCHAIN

- timely topic
 - after permissionless, we finally look closer at permissioned systems
- first to analyze the incentives in permissioned system in such a detail
- we learn a lot about the forces
 - also illustrates the general issues that we are up against in analysis of permissioned blockchains
- three parts in this paper
 - model of trade (credit to late producers)
 - validation game
 - \blacktriangleright optimal design: number of validators, τ , compensation, etc

VALIDATION GAME – TWO STAGES

- Iabel validation
 - verify the label of producers
 - vote by sending a message
- 2 production validation
 - verify whether production took place according to plan
 - vote by sending a message
 - verification and sending messages is costly
 - validators need to be compensated
 - they are also subject to bribes
 - $\bullet\,$ payoff only if τ of validators validates a good state
 - \implies coordination game
 - solved by a global game with variable cost as private information
 - higher τ limits incentives for bribes, so makes the system more secure, but also makes preventing free-riding more costly

WHAT IS "THE LEDGER" IN A DISTRIBUTED SYSTEM?

- all validators (nodes) keep a copy but the copies can differ
- if all nodes are equal (and opportunistic), maintaining consistency of the ledger between the nodes is the major challenge
 - voting? who would tally the votes? do you trust them?
 - *local voting*: all nodes send their votes to all other nodes, so everyone tallies the votes
 - * but nodes can send different votes to different recipients
 - ★ my tally may be different than your tally
 - ★ need multiple rounds to reconcile and make sure we all update the ledger the same way
 - $\star\,$ this is why BFT so much more complicated than just voting
- if one node is more important than others (*notary*), this node keeps the authoritative copy ("the ledger"), and tallies validators' votes
 - do we trust this node to write in "the ledger" what the nodes have voted for?
 - what do validators do that the notary cannot?

WHAT DO WE NEED THE VALIDATORS FOR?

- what benefits do we expect from a decentralized system in a permissioned setting?
 - a consensus where no node is more important than another?
 - * not in this setting, because we have the *notary* node
 - validators checking consistency of the ledger by keeping the *notary* node in check from misreporting?
 - * what would happen if after validators vote, the *notary* writes a different value to the ledger?
 - validators aggregating some dispersed information from outside of the ledger (i.e., oracles)?
- whatever we expect, we should NOT expect cost savings
 - redundancy of operations (and cost) is necessary in distributed systems

WHAT DO VALIDATORS BRING TO THE VALIDATION GAME?

Iabel validation

- verify the label of producers which they read from the ledger
- vote by sending a message to the ledger
- wasn't this information already there?
- 2 production validation
 - verify whether production took place according to plan
 - * do they actually observe the production, sensor readings?
 - \star do they all observe the same data or a noisy signal?
 - * is it something that the notary cannot observe directly?
 - $\star\,$ what is the benefit of the redundancy?
 - vote by sending a message
 - economic benefits? why is decentralization and redundancy beneficial? we know it is more costly
 - cannot be modeled separately

IDENTITY AND INCENTIVES IN PERMISSIONED SYSTEMS

- are validators' identities known?
- the producer knows their identities if he can target the bribes
- validators would benefit from colluding even without bribe
 - if they collude and incorrectly claim that B producer is a G producer, they get z¹ instead of 0
- punishment with probability π misbehaving validators are caught
 - who catches them?
 - why not punish them more than just exclusion? if you put high enough fine on them, you can prevent misbehavior more effectively

- great, detailed paper
- extremely important
- gets us thinking about the incentives and optimal design
- as well as challenges in analyzing permissioned blockchains
 - modeling the benefits of decentralization in a permissioned setting