



# Catalyst Network

Technical White Paper

# Catalyst Network - Technical White Paper (DRAFT - V1)

Joseph Kearney\*- Atlas City

November 25, 2019

## Abstract

Distributed Ledger Technologies (DLTs) over the last decade have grown at an extraordinary rate, with new technologies being announced, developed and released on a daily basis. A majority of these technologies have not progressed from the original concepts set out by Satoshi Nakamoto in his seminal paper [1] with regards to speed, security, scalability and decentralisation. There has however been a clear demonstration for the appetite and innovation for wider markets to adopt these technologies. Catalyst marries together many existing technologies as well as some novel ones in order to create a framework which give a fast, scalable and fair ledger.

**This document is a work in progress and is subject to change.**

---

\*joseph.kearney@atlascity.io

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Catalyst Consensus Mechanism</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Producer Node Selection . . . . .	5
1.2	Notation . . . . .	6
1.3	Construction Phase . . . . .	7
1.4	Campaigning Phase . . . . .	8
1.5	Voting Phase . . . . .	9
1.6	Synchronisation Phase . . . . .	10
<b>2</b>	<b>Distributed File System</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	IPFS . . . . .	11
2.2	Integrating the DFS . . . . .	12
2.3	The Marketplace . . . . .	12
<b>3</b>	<b>KVM</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	From the EVM . . . . .	13
3.2	To the KVM . . . . .	13

# Introduction

DLTs are based upon the principle of a truly distributed network, allowing nodes on the network to transact both messages and objects, whether these are tokens, messages, timestamps or even rich file types. Distributed networks have many advantages over centralised systems. They prevent any one entity from holding too much influence within a system, inhibiting the influence of an unfair or malicious actor. Further, they allow trustless transactions, meaning that no member of a network has to trust any other single member on the network, and instead they facilitate trust of the network as a whole. However, distributed networks also present difficult challenges: particularly how do you fairly and efficiently ensure consensus among the network is reached, how are the files stored without causing the network to become extremely bloated, and how do you compute complex business logic at least as efficiently as on a centralised network. These are all problems that have been considered in the design process of Catalyst.

The technologies discussed in this paper are:

- The Probabilistic Byzantine Fault Tolerant (PBFT) consensus algorithm. This new consensus algorithm allows a fair and scalable mechanism for consensus and updates to the ledger to be agreed upon.
- The Distributed File System (DFS) - Catalyst integrates a distributed file system meaning that there is a separation between the ledger and what is stored on the ledger.
- The Kat Virtual Machine (KVM) - Based upon the innovative Ethereum Virtual Machine (EVM), the KVM improves and extends on the EVM. It allows smart contracts to be run on Catalyst.

These technologies solve three key issues identified within existing blockchain and DLT projects.

The first problem described was ensuring a fair consensus mechanism. The network coming to agreement on what transactions on a distributed network are fair and valid and those that are not are a key issue. Early blockchain and DLTs utilised proof of work, this originates from hashcash [2], which was designed as a prevention mechanism for email spam. This idea was then developed for the bitcoin blockchain, it required miners to perform a computationally hard problem in order for them to expend energy and thereby resources. This dissuades mining nodes from acting maliciously, as both the transactions they have added as well as the work they have performed can be verified. If their work is poor then the block they are trying to append to the blockchain will be rejected. This technique for consensus is Byzantine fault tolerant and can not be understated as the critical factor that has allowed blockchain technologies to grow. However, this has two critical flaws, firstly the amount of expended and wasted energy is extraordinary especially on large networks where the potential rewards are large. Secondly there has been a general trend towards centralisation at scale, as mining pools hold increase their share of the network power (and thereby the networks rewards).

The second issue considered while building the Catalyst network is how bloating on the network is avoided. Running a full node on many blockchains requires a significant amount of disk space, for example the Ethereum blockchain size has exceeded 1Tb [3] and continues to grow. Catalyst solves this problem through the integration of a Distributed File System (DFS). This enables much more control for peers on the network what elements of the ledger that they hold. This means lightweight nodes can be ran. Furthermore, large data files can be securely held on the ledger without causing issues for other nodes due to bloating.

The final issue Catalyst aims to solve is the ability for complex business logic and smart contract to be ran on the ledger. While smart contracts are capable of being ran on a wide variety of blockchains frequently they are simple and incapable of running complex solutions. Often also requiring a user to write smart contracts in a specialised language.

# 1 Catalyst Consensus Mechanism

Distributed networks have no single point of trust to determine the validity of transactions, therefore concurrency must be ensured by other methods. Typically this requires a majority of the network's participants to agree on a particular update of the ledger and the account balances / holdings held within. Blockchain technologies generally employ Proof-of-Work (PoW) and occasionally Proof-of-Stake (PoS) mechanisms in order to gain consensus across a network. However, these methods are prone to increasing centralization at scale as well as in the case of PoW high energy consumption. Other networks employ a small amount of trusted nodes that ensure the validity of transactions, however this is highly centralised and almost as fallible as the single point of failure systems that DLT endeavors to avoid.

Catalyst integrates a newly designed consensus mechanism, based on Probabilistic Byzantine Fault Tolerance (PBFT). This is a collaborative rather than competitive protocol, meaning that all honest work performed by nodes on the network benefits the security of the network and that all participating nodes are rewarded equally. For each ledger cycle a random selection of worker nodes are selected, the nodes become the producers for a cycle or number of cycles. The producer nodes perform work in the form of compiling and validating transaction thereby extracting a ledger state change for that cycle.

The protocol is split into four distinct phases:

- Construction Phase - Producer nodes that have been selected create what they believe to be the correct update of the ledger. They then distribute this proposed ledger update in the form of a hash digest.
- Campaigning Phase - Producer nodes designate and declare what they propose to be the Ledger State Update as determined by the values collected from other producer nodes in the producer pool.
- Voting Phase - Producer nodes vote for what they believe to be the most popular Ledger State Update as determined by the producer pool according to the candidates for the most popular update from the other producer nodes.
- Synchronisation Phase - In this phase the producers who have computed the correct ledger update can broadcast this update the rest of the network.

This section is based on the work set out in [4], where the original research into the creation of a new consensus mechanism is laid out.

The various parameters and thresholds mentioned in this chapter and their impact on the levels of security and confidence in the successful production of a ledger state update are discussed in the following paper [8].

## 1.1 Producer Node Selection

Original work for the Catalyst consensus mechanism states that the peers are selected with relation to the PID and the hash of the previous data. As the PID can be manipulated by a user and thereby weight in their favor of selection to become a producer this is not usable.

Research into a RANDAO provides a viable alternative [5][6]. This is a process by which each user creates their own random value and by combining these random numbers across the network they calculate a global pseudo-random number. The larger the network the more random the number will be. The proposed process works as follows:

- Define  $p$  as the maximum integer that the hashing function used can represent.
- Each node  $n$  in the worker pool  $N$  generates a random number  $r$  in the range  $[0, p]$ .
- To this random number the hash of the previous ledger state,  $D$ , must be added mod  $p$ .

- $n$  then creates a Blake-2b hash of the combined random number  $H(r + D)$ .
- Each  $n$  must then send their value  $r$  to the contract.
- If they do not send their  $r$  value they are not eligible to become a producer node.
- Each  $n$  in  $N$  sends their  $H(r + D)$  to a hard coded smart contract. This creates the global random value  $G$ . This is done through addition of all the random numbers mod  $p$ .
- The smart contract must determine:
  - Whether  $n$  did submit all correct information. i.e.  $r$ , and  $H(r + D)$ .
  - That  $n$  did in fact use the  $D$  value when generating the random number. This is done by taking the  $r$  value submitted by the user and hashing with  $D$ .
  - Ensuring  $n$  has paid a sufficient stake to take part in the selection process.
  - Validating that each worker  $n$  has only distributed one random number to the smart contract.
- Failure of any one of these points means the smart contract will not accept the submission of a random number from  $r$  and and stake made will be lost.
- This global random can the be used to determine the producers for the next cycle(s).
- This is done by determining the nodes that have a  $H(r + D)$  closest to the  $G$  value using a XOR hamming distance search on the binary tree.

This method is secure from manipulation as hashing algorithms are one way functions meaning that there is no provably efficient method to inverse a hashing function i.e. retrieving a message  $m$  from a digest  $H(m)$ . If a node does not input a value into the smart contract then they are not eligible for selection for becoming a producer for that cycle(s).

Inclusion of the  $D$  value is necessary as this will prevent a producer from using known random values to create a desired digest that gives them an advantage when being selected. The value for  $D$  must fulfill two rules, firstly it must always be the same for all nodes in the worker pool, secondly it must change with each draw of a random number when determining the random selection of producer nodes. This prevents a user creating a hash using known input and digest combinations to gain an advantage when being selected. Furthermore if the hash of the previous ledger state is used as  $D$  it ensures that a prospective producer node knows the current ledger state. If they do not then their random number will be invalid as  $H(r + D_{prod}) \neq H(r + D)$ .

As described in RANDAO, this can be further extended to implement staking. Nominal fees to contribute can be added in order to prevent DDOS and Sybil attack without disincentivising participation. There is also the additional benefit of simplification of the overall consensus mechanism as it removes the need for a queuing mechanism as well as producing a verifiable method of keeping track of which nodes are registering to be workers for any given cycle. It also thereby in turn provides evidence to other nodes on the network who the producers for any given cycle are as the process will be verifiable.

This scheme will provide the Catalyst consensus mechanism with a verifiable, reliable and secure mechanism to generate a pool of producers. By randomly assigning which workers get to participate in the next ledger cycle, fairness is ensured.

## 1.2 Notation

A dictionary for the variables used in the proceeding description of the consensus mechanism can now be described for clarity:

- $p$  - Describes a single producer that has been selected randomly to perform work for the network for a given cycle.

- $P$  - The pool of producers who have been selected through the previously described producer selection mechanism for the particular cycle being described. It is made up of a set of producers  $p$
- $T$  - The mempool of any given producer  $p$ . It contains a group of transactions that will be used to for the update for a given cycle.
- $t$  - A single transaction that is found within the mempool  $T$ .
- $u$  - The local ledger state update generated by a single producer node. This is what that particular node believes to be the correct update for the given cycle.
- $\sigma$  - A pseudorandomly generated number.
- $E$  - The list of entries found within a single transaction  $t$ . A producer will create one of these lists for each valid transaction in  $T$ .
- $d$  - Hash tree containing all the signatures extracted from the transactions in  $T$ .
- $H$  - Hash of each list  $E$  combined with the salt  $\sigma$ .
- $L$  - Alphanumerically ordered list the pair  $E, H$ , sorted according to  $H$ .
- $G$  - The list of proposed updates  $u$  that producer  $p$  collects from other nodes in producer pool  $P$ . This is used to determine the most popular update.
- $\mathcal{L}(prod)$  - The list of producers from a particular producers set  $G$  that sent the most popular ledger state update.
- $L_{CE}$  - A producers list of compensation entries i.e. who a producer believes did the correct work for the network and thereby should be rewarded.
- $\mathcal{L}(vote)$  - The list of producers a specific producer found to have forwarded the correct vote for the most popular ledger state update.
- $LSU$  - Ledger State Update, this is the final ledger state update proposed by a producer node. It consists of the list of entries used to create the update, the hash tree containing the signatures and the list of compensation entries
- $V$  - A producers vote for the correct  $LSU$  formed of the hash of the  $LSU$ ,  $L_{vote}$  and the producers Id.
- $\mathbf{o}$  - The final producer output that is declared to the network.

### 1.3 Construction Phase

The first phase of the Catalyst consensus algorithm is the Construction Phase. Within which the selected producer nodes  $P$  calculate their proposed ledger state update or their local ledger state update. This is done by aggregating and validating all transactions that have occurred during a set time period. These transactions assuming their validity are integrated into the producers local ledger state update. From which they can create a hash of the update. This hash digest represents what they believe to be the correct update and is broadcast to the other producer nodes during for that cycle. Assuming the collision free nature of hash functions, the only mechanism for multiple producer nodes to have the same local ledger state update is by both using the same set of transactions.

Each producer  $p$  in the set of producers  $P$  follows the same protocol. The construction phase begins with producer  $p$  beginning their construction phase by flushing their mempool. This mempool  $T$  is made up of  $n$  transactions  $t$  where  $n$  is the number of transactions that have been broadcast to the network and have been stored by  $p$ . These transaction are used to create  $p$ 's local ledger state update  $u$ .

The producer at this point also creates a hash tree  $d$ , this is to store the the signatures that are extracted from each transaction in  $T$ . A salt  $\sigma$  is created utilizing a pseudo-random number generator using the previous ledger state update  $U - 1$  as its seed.  $p$  then proceeds with the following steps:

1. Producer  $p$  verifies that each transaction in  $T$  is valid following the rules set out in [7]. From each of the  $n$  transactions in  $T$  the entries  $E$  that constitute the transaction  $t$  are extracted to form a list  $E = e_1, \dots, e_m$  for  $m$  entries in  $t$ . The producer should therefore end up with  $n$  lists for  $E$  from  $T$ . each signature from the transactions are also extracted and added to  $d$ .
2.  $p$  for each  $E$  it created then creates a corresponding hash digest as:

$$H = \mathcal{H}[E \parallel \sigma]$$

Each pair  $(E, H)$  is added to a list  $L$ .

3.  $p$  then sorts list  $L$  into lexicographical order according the hash values  $H$ .
4. The producer  $p$  then extracts the transaction fee value from each transaction in  $T$  to create  $v$  which is the total sum of all transaction fees.
5. The local ledger state update  $u$  for producer  $p$  can then be calculated. Firstly the list  $L$  is concatenated (denoted by  $\parallel$ ) with the hashtree  $d$  and a hash digest is created as:

$$u = \mathcal{H}(L \parallel d)$$

$u$  is then concatenated with  $p$ 's unique peer identifier  $Id$  to create:

$$h = u \parallel Id$$

6.  $h$  is then broadcast to the other producer nodes on the network.

Producer  $p$  also collects other producers partial ledger update values. At most they will collect  $P - 1$  values. Optimally every producer in  $P$  will receive the same set of transactions therefore for every  $p$  in  $P$  will have the same partial ledger update  $u$ . However this is unlikely due to all transactions not being received by a small group of nodes. Equally they may not hold  $G$  where  $G = h_1, \dots, h_P$ , meaning they may not receive a proposed update from all candidates.

## 1.4 Campaigning Phase

The second phase of the consensus mechanism is where producer  $p$  generates and proposes a candidate, which it calculates to be the most popular ledger state update.

Beginning this phase producer  $p$  has a set of partial ledger updates  $G$  that it has received from other producer nodes. Each  $h$  within  $G$  contains a producers hash of the proposed update ( $u$  and a peer identifier ( $Id$ )). The most popular  $u$  value can be found, this gives us  $u^{maj}$  from there the subset  $G_{maj}$  can be created, which is the amount of votes for the most popular update. Two thresholds must be considered first is  $G_{min}$  this is the minimum amount of updates it has received from other producers in order to generate a valid candidate. The second is  $G_{thresh}$  this is the threshold value for which a minimum number of votes must be in favor of  $G_{maj}$  which the most popular vote found within  $G$ . So in order to proceed with declaring a candidate  $G > G_{min}$  and  $G_{maj} > G_{thresh}$ .

Beginning this phase producer  $p$  has a set of partial ledger updates  $G$  that it has received from other producer nodes. Each  $h$  within  $G$  contains a producers hash of the proposed update ( $u$  and a peer identifier ( $Id$ )). The most popular  $u$  value can be found, this gives us  $u^{maj}$  from there the subset  $G_{maj}$  can be created, which is the amount of votes for the most popular update. Two thresholds must be considered first is  $G_{min}$  this is the minimum amount of updates it has received from other producers in order to generate a valid candidate. The second is  $G_{thresh}$  this is the threshold value for which a minimum number of votes must be in favor of  $G_{maj}$  which the most popular vote found within  $G$ . So in order to proceed with declaring a candidate  $G > G_{min}$  and  $G_{maj} > G_{thresh}$ .

If the thresholds are met the following can take place:

1.  $p$  creates a list  $\mathcal{L}(prod)$ . To this list  $p$  appends the identifier of any producer that correctly sent the  $u$  value that equals  $u^{maj}$ . If  $p$ 's  $u$  value is also the same as  $u^{maj}$  then they should append their own  $Id$ .



2. Producer  $p$  then creates their candidate for the ledger update  $c$  which is calculated as  $c = u^{maj} || \#(\mathcal{L}(prod)) || Id$
3. Producer  $p$  will then broadcast their preferred update  $c$  to the other producers.

$p$  during this phase will be collecting the  $c$  values from other producers. At the end of this phase of the cycle  $p$  will hold a set of  $C$  candidates.

## 1.5 Voting Phase

The third phase of the ledger cycle is the Voting Phase within which a producer  $p$  from the  $C$  candidates it has received decides on what it believes should be the global ledger state update i.e. the update that should be applied to the ledger for that cycle.

1.  $p$  verifies that the same first hash value  $u^{maj}$  is embedded in a majority of producer candidates.
2.  $p$  is required at this point to have created the majority ledger update. As only with this partial update can they participate effectively. Therefore their  $u == u^{maj}$

If each producer collects the first hash value generated by every producer, any two producers would build the same list of identifiers  $\mathcal{L}(prod)$ . However even in highly efficient distributed network it is unlikely that all producers will retrieve all information. Therefore it must be assumed that the list of identifiers held by  $p$  is incomplete,  $p$  however must ensure that they hold enough information to confidently issue a vote on the update to the ledger. The identifier of a producer is appended to the hash they distribute because:

- To verify that  $p$  is a producer node and that they in fact were one of the winners of the random draw described in ??.
- To evaluate and track the quality of the work performed by  $p$ .
- To ensure that the correct producers withing  $P$  are rewarded for their work maintaining the ledger.

New transaction entries (compensation entries) are created using the list's  $\mathcal{L}(prod)$  produced by the producers  $p$ . This allows reward and fees to be paid to the correct users. These new transaction entries will be appended to the final ledger state update for that cycle. Therefore a complete ledger state update should consist of:

- The list of transaction entries integrated into the new ledger state all  $E$  lists.
- The transaction signatures from  $T$  held in  $d$ .
- Compensation entries rewarding the producers from  $\mathcal{L}(prod)$ .

The voting process thereby must confirm the correct list of identifiers involved in producing the correct ledger state updates. The final list for  $\mathcal{L}(prod)$  is generated by merging the producers lists together. In order for a producer  $p$  to have their  $Id$  added to the final  $\mathcal{L}(prod)$  they must appear in at least 50% of the  $\mathcal{L}(prod)$  lists distributed by  $P$ . This ensures that no producer can just append their own  $Id$  to their update whether that update was correct or not and gain a reward for it.

This process ensures that only producers that have provided the correct update may receive this part of the reward, thereby preventing unethical behavior from producers by declaring that they got the correct update when in fact they did not. However, it does introduce the problem of producers that have created the wrong ledger update being disincentivised from proceeding in the consensus process further. Therefore producers that vote for the correct update whether or not they produced the correct update should also receive a portion of the reward. This is determined by the list  $\mathcal{L}(vote)$  that each  $p$  creates to store the Id's of the producers which they gained votes from that voted for the correct update.

$p$  follows a series of steps:

1.  $p$  generates a list  $\mathcal{L}(vote)$  it then appends the  $Id$  of any other  $p$  that has forwarded a  $C$  candidate that satisfies  $u == u^{maj}$ .
2.  $p$  creates the combined list for  $\mathcal{L}(prod)$  of any  $p$  from  $P$  that appears in  $P/2$  lists.
3. Then  $p$  creates a list  $L_{CE}$ . This contains the contribution entries. This is for any user that is included in the combined  $\mathcal{L}(prod)$ . Each of these producers contained within this list will receive  $x$  tokens. If it is considered that  $X$  is the total number of tokens that are injected into the network at each cycle for the pool of  $P$  producers. The amount of entries into  $L_{CE}$  will be less than or equal to  $P$ .  $R$  is to be considered the total amount of reward that is to be split among all the producers that found the correct ledger update  $R = f_{prod}X + v$  where  $f_{prod}$  is the fraction of the injected tokens that are given to users found in the combined  $\mathcal{L}(prod)$ . While  $(1 - f_{prod})X$  is the value that is distributed to other nodes that have performed work.
4. Producer  $p$  can then create the candidate ledger state update for this cycle. This includes the reward allocations for producers according to their contributions. This ledger state update  $LSU$  can be defined as:

$$\mathbf{LSU} = \mathbf{L} \parallel \mathbf{d} \parallel \mathbf{L}_{CE}$$

$p$  then computes its vote (or *producer vote*):

$$V = \mathcal{H}(LSU) \parallel \#(\mathcal{L}(vote)) \parallel Id$$

5.  $p$  then forwards their  $V$  to the other producers and collects the producer votes  $V$  issued by its peers.

During the voting phase, the producer  $p$  collects the producer votes  $V$  broadcast by its peers. At the end of the voting phase, the producer  $p$  holds  $U$  producer votes  $V$  in its cache. This will be equal to or less than the number of producers who formed the correct update.

## 1.6 Synchronisation Phase

The Synchronisation phase allows those nodes that have produced the correct ledger update to then pass this update onto the rest of the network, thereby integrating the changes held within upon the overall state of the ledger.

During the synchronisation phase  $p$  executes the following steps:

1. Producer  $p$  selects from the producer votes  $V$  that it recieved the most popular unique  $V$ . The number of most popular votes received is defined as  $V_{max}$ . This  $V_{max}$  value must exceed a specified threshold  $V_{thresh}$ . So  $V_{max} \geq V_{thresh}$ .
2.  $p$  creates a list  $\mathcal{L}_{final}(vote)$ . To this list  $p$  appends the identifier of any producer that their given  $V == V_{max}$  *i.e.* they voted among the majority and only if they appear in at least half the  $\mathcal{L}(vote)$  values from the  $V$  values  $p$  collected.
3. If the producer  $p$  also created the correct ledger state update  $LSU$  then the they can write it to the DFS with the content address CID [?].
4. Producer  $p$  then creates the final producer output that can be declared to the network. This output is:

$$\mathbf{o} = CID \parallel \#(\mathcal{L}_{final}(vote)) \parallel Id$$

The producer then broadcasts  $\mathbf{o}$  to the network.

## 2 Distributed File System

Catalyst integrates its own Distributed File System (DFS) [9] based on the InterPlanetary File System (IPFS) protocol [10]. DFS, as the name suggests, is a peer to peer file system, where the files contained within are distributed across and accessible to a range of peers. This file system will have no down time nor any single point of failure, meaning that it is persistent in a way that

other, centralised file storage technologies are not. IPFS is a peer to peer protocol that allows storage of files across many nodes, this is done by giving each item stored a unique identifier. Any duplicates are removed across the network, this is done because two identical files will always receive the same identifier. Using this identifier a file can be looked up on the network and retrieved from those nodes that are holding the file. Using this IPFS protocol as the basis for the DFS on Catalyst means that the information that is transacted on the network does not need to be stored ‘on chain’, meaning that there is a separation of DLT and stored data, allowing nodes to pick and choose what data they hold so any information not relevant to a particular node is not held.

On the Catalyst network every node holds a DFS module. While all nodes will not hold all of the information stored on the DFS, they will be able to query and retrieve any information on the network. Furthermore, nodes will have the ability to query the existence of a file rather than being forced to download the file in order to check its existence. Nodes are required to hold the DFS module as it is used to store all information about the network. Some of the data secured on the DFS is the critical data that is used to sync the state of new nodes joining the network. This means that this data must be accessible at all times. Therefore, if a node wishes to check any single transaction on the network or even the overall state of the ledger itself it will have to be in sync with the network, which is done through the DFS.

Integrating DFS allows the Catalyst network to remain lean as nodes on the network can choose to store only the data that they choose to hold. Furthermore, it allows the storage of many rich file types in a distributed manner, meaning that they are always accessible with no down time guaranteed (excluding the potential case of the internet being down). This is further under the assumption that at least one node on the network holds the data. If all nodes remove or unpin a file then that data will no longer be accessible to the network and must be re-added by a node.

In this section is a description of the IPFS platform that Catalyst uses, and then how Catalyst integrates this into its ecosystem.

## 2.1 IPFS

The InterPlanetary File System forms the basis of the Catalyst DFS. IPFS is the name for a distributed file system, a collection of protocols which specify how nodes are supposed to operate in the network, and various multilingual implementations of these protocols. As it is distributed, there is no one central entity that holds and controls the flow of information. Across the IPFS network nodes hold as little or as much data as they wish with multiple copies of the data being held across many unrelated nodes. This means that there is no single point of failure in the network. An attempted attack on the IPFS would require a majority of nodes to be taken offline to prevent access to the files held on the network.

IPFS uses a bittorrent style

In traditional computer file systems, files are indexed, referenced, and accessed through their location: for instance, ‘ /Documents/file.md’ would refer to a Markdown file inside a “Documents” folder inside the home directory of a user on UNIX systems. However, on a distributed system, there can be no global state that could be used for addressing content. Instead of location-addressing, IPFS and other distributed systems use content-addressing. The CID also means that all files stored on IPFS are immutable i.e. can not be edited as changing anything contained within the file means that that CID for that file will now be changed. Through linkage of these files it means that a version history of files can be created.

In a content-addressed system, every file on the system is given a unique, deterministic content identifier (CID) by hashing the content. Hashing works by deterministically using the contents of the file as the input for a standard encryption algorithm. Changing the contents of a file would change the hash of the file. This CID can then be used to index, reference, and access the file

directly, regardless of where it is. Advantageously, through content addressing, a malicious entity would not be able to send a user a false file in the place of the one that they have requested. This is due to the difficulty of reversing a hashing function. The CID associated with a file means that the file is not duplicated on the network. For example if Alice uploads file  $x$  it is stored on IPFS, other users can then download and hold the file, if then Bob uploads the same file  $x$  then because the CID for both files would be the same the duplication would not take place as the file is already held on the file system.

Once a file has a CID associated with it, a distributed hash table (DHT) can be formed. DHTs are key-value stores, where the key is the CID of the relevant file, and the value is an array containing all of the user IDs of any peer which holds the file.

IPFS integrates Merkle Directed Acyclic Graphs (Merkle DAGs). Merkle DAGs are abstract trees which result when multiple CIDs are used as the input for another hashing algorithm, resulting in chains where entire hierarchies of files can be referenced using a single CID. Any change to any constituent file at the bottom of the tree (the leaf nodes) percolates up to the next hash, and the next, causing the CID for the entire tree to change. Merkle DAG's are used compared to traditional Merkle trees as they allow a flow or direction of information to be established. Thereby allowing an order for the reading of the files to be set.

## 2.2 Integrating the DFS

Every node running on the Catalyst network must also be running the DFS module. This allows them on the most basic level to access the current state of the ledger and the validate previous updates to the ledger thereby allowing them to sync with the current ledger state. This is required as it is necessary for the all nodes on the network at the very least to know the current state of the ledger in order to send transactions.

The primary difference between the native IPFS protocol and the implementation utilised on Catalyst is how the peer IDs are created. While on the IPFS protocol the identifier for nodes is selected randomly, on Catalyst the nodes on the network will each have their own individual peer identifier<sup>[1]</sup> made up of:

- IP address
- Port number
- Public key

This allows user to be able to identify who on the network is holding specific files as each peer identifier for a node will be unique. This means that a peer on the network will have a clear target for where they can retrieve given information, furthermore it means that nodes claiming to hold specific files and information are accountable for being able to distribute these files. Through the use of Catalyst peer identifiers within the DHTs peers can make informed decisions on who they retrieve files from, for example if a node has been marked as malicious due to actions within the network, they will also not be trusted within the DFS.

## 2.3 The Marketplace

### WIP

The Catalyst network allows nodes to be rewarded for storing data added to the DFS by other nodes on the network. These may include large files or complex data sets. The reason for payment for holding of data is to provide incentive for peers on the network to store data for others. The market place works as a method of storage

## 3 KVM

### WIP

The Catalyst network integrates and improves upon the Ethereum Virtual Machine (EVM) to create the Kat Virtual Machine (KVM) [12]. This allows complex smart contracts to be run on Catalyst, as well allowing pre-existing smart contracts written in Solidity to be used on Catalyst. By extending the range of Op-Codes that are used on the EVM, we can ensure that significantly more complex operations can be performed.

### 3.1 From the EVM

EVM is the run-time environment that enables smart contracts on the Ethereum blockchain. It relies on the fact that when a smart contract is run upon two different machines using the same inputs both machines will retrieve the same output i.e. it is deterministic. Smart contracts can be written primarily in the Solidity language.

### 3.2 To the KVM

As EVM requires smart contract developers to write in Solidity this can prove to be restrictive. The KVM allows smart contracts to be able to write smart contracts in a wide variety of languages.

## Conclusion

Through the use of the technologies described

Further information on Catalyst and its applications can be found at:

Atlas City website - <https://www.atlascity.io/>  
Catalyst website - <https://www.catalystnet.org/>  
Catalyst GitHub - <https://www.github.com/catalyst-network>

## References

- [1] S. Nakamoto *et al.*, “Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system,” 2008.
- [2] A. Back *et al.*, “Hashcash-a denial of service counter-measure,” 2002.
- [3] S. Hackernoon, “The ethereum-blockchain size has exceeded 1tb, and yes, it’s an issue.” <https://hackernoon.com/the-ethereum-blockchain-size-has-exceeded-1tb-and-yes-its-an-issue-2b650b5f4f62>, 19/05/2018.
- [4] P. Bernat, J. Kearney, and F. Sage-Ling, “Catalyst network research: a new consensus protocol.” <https://atlascitywebsitedocs.blob.core.windows.net/sitefiles/catalyst-consensus-paper.pdf>, 07/11/2019.
- [5] B. Skvorc, “Two point oh: Randomness.” <https://our.status.im/two-point-oh-randomness/>, 07/05/2019.
- [6] randao, “randao.” <https://github.com/randao/randao/>, 26/03/2019.
- [7] catalyst network, “Transactionvalidator.cs.” <https://github.com/catalyst-network/Catalyst.Framework/blob/f23089d75ce876008ae1400f8044f538e07a3100/src/Catalyst.Core.Lib/Validators/TransactionValidator.cs>, 07/11/2019.

- [8] P. Bernat, J. Kearney, and F. Sage-Ling, “Catalyst network: Security considerations.” <https://atlas-city-website-docs.blob.core.windows.net/websitefiles/Catalyst%20Network%20Security%20Considerations.pdf>, 07/11/2019.
- [9] catalyst network, “Catalyst.core.modules.dfs.” <https://github.com/catalyst-network/Catalyst.Framework/tree/develop/src/Catalyst.Core.Modules.Dfs>, 07/11/2019.
- [10] J. Benet, “Ipfes - content addressed, versioned, p2p file system,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.3561*, 2014.
- [11] catalyst network, “Bytesextensions.cs.” <https://github.com/catalyst-network/Catalyst.Framework/blob/b761153e5e30a65b843d470cf60175256bd43276/src/Catalyst.Core.Lib/Extensions/BytesExtensions.cs>, 07/11/2019.
- [12] catalyst network, “Catalyst.core.modules.kvm.” <https://github.com/catalyst-network/Catalyst.Framework/tree/develop/src/Catalyst.Core.Modules.Kvm>, 07/11/2019.