

# EuroToken

A Central Bank Digital  
Currency (CBDC) with  
off-line transfers

R. W. Blokzijl

- Stablecoin
- Blockchain
- Cryptocurrencies
- TrustChain
- CBDC

wesselb94@gmail.com



# EuroToken

## A Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) with off-line transfers

by

R. W. Blokzijl

to obtain the degree of Master of Science  
at the Delft University of Technology,  
to be defended publicly on July 12, 2021.

Student number: 4269519  
Project duration: November 11, 2020 – July 12, 2021  
Thesis committee: Dr.ir. J.A. Pouwelse, TU Delft, supervisor  
Dr. C. Lofi, TU Delft

*This thesis is confidential and cannot be made public until July 13, 2021.*

An electronic version of this thesis is available at <http://repository.tudelft.nl/>.





# Abstract

After the release of Bitcoin in 2008 many advances have been made in the crypto space. The feature-set, scalability, transaction cost, and efficiency have all improved. Yet, as the development continued, the idea of Bitcoin or any other cryptocurrency as a digital payment form, stated to take a backseat to its utility as a store of value and investment vehicle. Additionally, cryptocurrencies are missing the crucial features of scalability in transactions per second and lacking basic price stability. This leaves whether fully decentralized currencies can ever function as a global payment system to be determined.

Meanwhile, the world of payments outside the crypto-sphere is also making a transformation. With the use of physical money declining in favor of privately banked “IBAN money”, payment systems are going digital. With decentralized cryptocurrencies insufficient as payment solutions, centrally controlled currencies like Tether and Diem, previously known as Libra, are trying to fill this exact hole in the market. Banks have been found unreliable, unavailable to many people across the world, and unable to provide the convenience and feature set of the new currencies. Consequently, the global digital payment system may eventually belong to the first bidder, be they decentralized, run by governments, or by private, profit driven corporations.

We present EuroToken, a design for a CBDC that is focused on solving the open issues in cryptocurrencies from a perspective of a trustworthy central bank. By centralising some infrastructure required to run a cryptographically secure currency, we achieve a network that can scale to arbitrary size, handle off-line transactions, and remain price-stable and guaranteed in value by the Central Bank.

The EuroToken system is a Peer-to-Peer blockchain system that stores every wallets’ history on the users personal device. This allows basic transactions without an online connection. Double-spend prevention is handled by a set of centralised nodes that periodically verify the transactions of a given user and condenses their chain into a single “checkpoint” block for scalability. In order to maintain price stability, we peg EuroToken to the existing IBAN system by allowing 1:1 exchange in either direction.

We present a working implementation of EuroToken including a wallet and an IBAN / EuroToken exchange. And show how our system can grow to an arbitrarily large scale without sacrificing efficiency.



# Preface

For my master thesis I was interested in the infrastructure that allows strangers outsource their trust in eachother, namely money. When I started cryptocurrencies we're a hot topic, but I did not expect them to grow in popularity as much as they did. Initially this research was directed towards the price stability benefits of a block-DAG system such as TrustChain and implementing a stablecoin connected to the IBAN system allowing each user to become a layer-2 bank. However, since starting this thesis, many central banks have announced the development of a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) and this project was very applicable with some redirection of focus.

This research has been done during the Covid-19 pandemic, which enforced a completely new and unstructured way of working. The falling away of the structure of on-premise work and coffee-machine meetings with fellow researchers, combined with a vaguely defined target has lead to delays in the completion of this thesis. While this thesis has taken my way longer than I hoped, I am thankful that I got to work such a hot field. And the lessons I learned in the management of my mental health, focus, and productivity will be with me the rest of my life. Regardless of the struggle of completing this thesis I am proud of the result of this research and am happy and relieved with its conclusion.

I would like to thank Dr. Johan Pouwelse for providing me with the opportunity of working in such an exiting field and for the feedback on the direction of my research. Additionally, I would like to thank my family for inviting me back home, and providing structure, social contact and support in a time when these were hard to come by.

*R. W. Blokzijl  
Delft, 2021-07-03*



# Contents

|                     |   |           |
|---------------------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b>            | <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1                 | The decline of cash. . . . .  | 1         |
| 1.2                 | Rise of insufficient challengers to traditional currencies . . . . .          | 2         |
| 1.3                 | The need for a future-proof currency . . . . .                                | 3         |
| 1.4                 | The technical debt of traditional finance . . . . .                           | 3         |
| <b>2</b>            | <b>Problem description</b>  | <b>7</b>  |
| 2.1                 | The difficulty of modern digital payment solutions . . . . .                  | 7         |
| 2.2                 | Requirements for a digital euro by the ECB. . . . .                           | 8         |
| 2.3                 | Trade-offs around double spending, scalability and decentralisation . . . . . | 9         |
| 2.4                 | The problem of off-line digital payments. . . . .                             | 10        |
| 2.5                 | The price stability problem. . . . .  | 11        |
| 2.6                 | Lack of real world implementations of broad featured CBDCs . . . . .          | 12        |
| 2.7                 | Research Focus and Structure . . . . .  | 13        |
| <b>3</b>            | <b>EuroToken Design</b>   | <b>15</b> |
| 3.1                 | Distributed accounting and networking . . . . .                               | 15        |
| 3.2                 | Block-DAG accounting . . . . .  | 15        |
| 3.3                 | Gateways: Euro to EuroToken exchange . . . . .                                | 16        |
| 3.4                 | Transaction finality and Double-spending . . . . .                            | 17        |
| 3.5                 | Checkpointing . . . . .   | 21        |
| 3.6                 | Off-line transactions and online validation. . . . .                          | 22        |
| 3.7                 | Regulation of validators . . . . .  | 23        |
| <b>4</b>            | <b>EuroToken Implementation</b>   | <b>25</b> |
| 4.1                 | Architecture . . . . .  | 25        |
| 4.2                 | EuroToken transfer protocol . . . . .   | 26        |
| 4.3                 | Wallet . . . . .  | 28        |
| 4.4                 | Exchange . . . . .  | 29        |
| 4.5                 | Validator. . . . .  | 32        |
| <b>5</b>            | <b>Evaluation</b>   | <b>35</b> |
| 5.1                 | Field trial . . . . .   | 35        |
| 5.2                 | Off-line trial . . . . .  | 36        |
| 5.3                 | Scalability in network size . . . . .   | 37        |
| 5.4                 | Scalability in history size . . . . .   | 37        |
| 5.5                 | Trade-offs in user and gateway validation times . . . . .                     | 38        |
| 5.6                 | Extensibility . . . . .   | 40        |
| 5.7                 | System evaluation and ECB requirements . . . . .                              | 40        |
| <b>6</b>            | <b>Discussion and future work</b>   | <b>41</b> |
| 6.1                 | Trade-offs between anonymity and off-line transactions . . . . .              | 41        |
| 6.2                 | Scalability without centralisation . . . . .                                  | 41        |
| 6.3                 | Price stability, deflation and remuneration. . . . .                          | 42        |
| 6.4                 | Interoperability . . . . .  | 43        |
| 6.5                 | Universal asset storage and granular monetary policy . . . . .                | 43        |
| <b>7</b>            | <b>Conclusion</b>   | <b>45</b> |
| <b>Bibliography</b> |   | <b>47</b> |



# 1

## Introduction

Eccentric visionaries have long been speculating on how the global financial infrastructure could be restructured to better serve the people of the world. When the Bitcoin [51] white paper was published in 2008, it seemed decentralized ledger technologies could be the missing link that would finally enhance the transparency, digital efficiency, and feature set of our payment system. 9 years later, Facebook announced a private currency controlled by a group of corporations [41]. 3 years after that the Chinese government announced that they had reached 92,771 transactions per second in a closed trial of their new Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) [43]. And the Eurosystem is set to make a decision on whether to start a digital euro project in mid 2021.

Currently, no decentralized currencies are in a position to challenge the upcoming “central coins”. Even the most prominent cryptocurrencies, including Bitcoin and Ethereum [29], simply lack the scalability and price stability necessary to be a valid medium of exchange and reliable store of value. While there have been attempts to create fully decentralized stablecoins, none have yet been proven to work in practice on a large scale. With high transaction costs and price uncertainty, the most fundamental problems of money are still unsolved by distributed currencies. The future of the financial system might be decided by competition between the governments of the world and opaque proprietary alternatives.

It's starting to become clear that the direction of crypto-currencies will not be determined by collections of anonymous individuals imagining a financial system that gives power back to the people. Governments and large corporations have joined the race for the world's leading digital currency. Motivated by profit, national interests, or the good of humanity, the winner will be left controlling and overseeing a significant chunk of the world's transactions.

The winner of this race might come to influence the most basic aspects of our daily lives. Where China and Facebook are making rapid progress, the Eurozone is still deliberating. Meanwhile, their presence in the race might be vital in incorporating the values of personal freedoms and privacy.

### 1.1. The decline of cash

Most monetary systems today rely on two types of money. Private money, managed by private banks, and public money, managed by the European Central Bank (ECB).

Public money is the money we have in our physical wallets. It consists of banknotes and coins and is often referred to as cash. Once upon a time it was possible to exchange this money for gold directly at the central bank of a country, and thus it derived its value directly from gold. Today however, the value of this money is guaranteed by the reputation and trustworthiness of the central bank [34]. No physical euros will be created unless by the central bank itself, and no one can seize them unless with physical force. This puts it in opposition to private money.

Private money is the money in our bank accounts. It derives its value from the reliability and reputation of the private bank and is only usable by instructing the bank to transfer it. Without permission from the bank, deposits, transfers and withdrawals are not possible. Effectively, these banks act as a central point at which any individual or group can be silenced by freezing their assets or withholding service. Additionally, if a bank overexposes itself to market forces and goes bankrupt, the money stored with them might not be paid back in full.

A person in the eurozone can weigh the risks and benefits of these two types of money. The ECB is a large, historically trustworthy, and democratically controlled institution. The persons public money (or cash) would only lose its value in the case of the complete failure of the European economic system and central bank. On the other hand storing value in banks has the benefits of the digital age. Where keeping money in the form of cash means exposure to the risk of having money physically stolen, money in banks is digitally secured. Both impact and risk grow with the amount of money held in cash.

In addition to people storing their money in private banks for security reasons, the digitalisation of society is a powerful motivator. Transacting using private money as opposed to public money allows for transfer of funds all over the world. The ability to use private money in e-commerce, as well as its ease of transfer, has made privately banked money the predominant way people interact with the economy.




Figure 1.1: UK Decline of cash over 2010-2020 [54]

As a result of digitalisation, the world is moving from cash to cards. In the year 2000, less than 22 percent of transaction in the EU were done by card. In 2019 this is over 47 percent [67]. This decline of central bank money leads to a number of unfavorable scenarios [42]. The decline of open and off-line money contributes to the financial exclusion of the unbanked and vulnerable in our society. In 2017, 3.6 percent of Europe's household had no registered bank account [49]. As more and more businesses move online or become pin only, these people will see their means of participation in society decrease.

Additionally, the increased reliance on private institutions can leave the entire euro system less transparent and more vulnerable to corruption. The 2008 crisis revealed the reliance of the financial world on opaque profit driven institutions with insufficient oversight. While the industry has been scrutinised heavily since then, the broader economy is still not insulated from future failings. The EU does require national funds to insure citizens at least 90% of their bank deposits, up to at least 20,000 euros per person [17]. But for many this is not sufficient to protect their lives savings.

To solve these issues, a digital currency is needed with the reliability of public money and the feature set of private money. An open digital coin, insured by the Central Bank that is easy to use, online capable, but not be reliant on any private institution for its core function of value storage.

## 1.2. Rise of insufficient challengers to traditional currencies

Decentralized currencies have been working hard to create the ideal currency that is open to everyone, anonymous, and not able to be controlled or destroyed by a single entity. Yet while the work continues, their slowing progress by increasing public attention is creating a market for flawed and inferior payment solutions.

To address the yet unsolved price stability issue, stablecoins have risen in popularity. While attempts at decentralized stablecoins do exist [63], it is so called centralised stablecoins that have gained a reputation as a digital alternative to the dollar. Tether [47] is the most prominent example of this. With a market cap of 62 billion dollars in June 2021, they are the 3rd largest crypto-currency by market

cap [19] after Bitcoin and Ethereum. In order to achieve the stability and dependability of their coin, Tether Holdings Limited acts as a centralised middle-man exchanging 1 tether for 1 dollar. Centralised stablecoins are often seen as an intermediary solution that provides a wrapper over the old monetary system in order to extend it with the features of digital currencies. These coins are essentially financial derivatives with the same flaws of their underlying currencies, except for the addition of some digital features.

On June 18, 2019, a new currency conceived by a group of Facebook engineers was announced under the brand name “Libra” [41]. Later renamed to Diem, it would be a new free floating currency managed and governed by a consortium of multi-national companies united under the banner of the Diem association. While Diem presents itself as a solution for the worlds 1.7 billion unbanked, it would essentially be a private world currency, controlled by corporations who will not be accountable to democratic processes.

These current most prominent bidders, while promising to be the future of public money are all but public. Merely by adding a better feature set in some areas, they attempt to become the future of money. Yet because of their specific set of trade-offs, they are falling short of the long term needs of society.

While distributed open-source communities of engineers are trying to create a system free of corruption and private interest groups are trying to extend their reach, governments around the world are beginning to realise the threat to the established order.

In order to not lose their influence of over their respective economies, governments around the world are looking into new digital versions of their currencies. The Federal Reserve has published their “Preconditions for a general-purpose central bank digital currency” [64]. The ECB has published a report specifying a number of Reasons to issue a digital euro, scenarios and implied requirements [42]. The government that has progressed the farthest so far is the Chinese government. With successful public trials [60] they seem to be closest to a working digital currency.

The battle for the future of the eurozone is still anyone’s game, and the outcome might depend on the decisions of the European commission. To avoid the euro being usurped by challengers from foreign nations or the private sector a design for a CBDC in-line with the ideals on which Europe is founded is required sooner rather than later.

### 1.3. The need for a future-proof currency

The world is moving online, and commerce is moving with it. E-commerce as a percentage of worldwide GCP has more than tripled in the last decade [50]. With this move to online shopping, commerce also moved from a solely local phenomenon, to incorporating global vendors. As illustrated in figure 1.2. EU trade with countries around the world, and especially China has seen significant growth over the last 10 years.

While increased globalisation brings wealth like never before, the increased global trade is not without its dangers to the EU. With China well underway in the race to the first digital currency, the digital yuan might find itself in an ideal position to dominate global trade. If China or any other currency can provide a feature set that is more friendly to global commerce than the current euro. The EU might see the control over their own economies fall away.

In addition to the threat of Chinese influence over European markets, opportunity also lies in the provision of a currency to the unbanked population of the world. Where the US dollar currently holds the position of the worlds “default” currency, this position might be taken over by the first CBDC as people from all over the world can be brought into modern commerce.

In order to stay relevant on the global stage, and to be able to serve its citizens in the modern age, the eurozone needs a currency with a competitive feature set on the global market.

### 1.4. The technical debt of traditional finance

People have been using various commodities as a unit of account and store of value since 6000 BC [37]. Since then money has taken various forms, at various layers of abstraction, but the function of money has always stayed the same: acting as a medium of exchange [48].

The first known true standardised gold coins have attributed to Lydian society back in 640 BC. Slowly over time the gold and silver contents of the coins became less important. Currencies as a proxy for trust, slowly became more dependent on trust in the system rather than the real value of the currency.




Figure 1.2: International trade 2010-2020 [6]

In 806 AD, this culminated in the first use of paper money in China. Since these events, the form of money has varied based on societal conditions. Because of its functional utility, money in the form of banknotes backed by gold has been a popular form of money that has been used in European society since 1440 [34].

By the end of the 1900s Europe had a system of many national currencies. These currencies were maintained on a national level often ensuring its value on the gold standard [34]. Meanwhile, private banks act as trustworthy and secure institutions, allowing people to store their money while they made a profit lending that money out. For international and cross-currency trade, people would swap different currencies in exchanges when needed, but because of the localised nature of society this was infrequent for individuals.

This system worked fine in an era where most exchange was done by cash, and most trade was done within national borders. But as the world became more connected and digitalised, different solutions had to be patched into the old system to be able to respond to the changing demands of the population. Private banks, who were once used only for large transactions and money storage, got a more and more central role in day to day transactions. In effect, the system as we see it today has accrued a lot of technical debt as its requirements changed over time. As a result a number of inefficiencies have emerged from this technical debt.

First, international money transfer. Even within the euro-system this can often take up to a week due to the way banks are interconnected, even the new SEPA transfers can take 1-2 business days. Second, banks as private institutions are vulnerable to bankruptcy. This makes them a “financial” semi-central point of failure, that take a good portion of the financial system with it. Third, transactions are dependent on bank IT systems. This makes them a “technical” semi-central point of failure, potentially leaving people unable to purchase their essentials. Fourth, people are tightly coupled to their banks. While having multiple bank accounts is possible, a lack of standardisation and interoperability makes people easily dependent on their one bank and its features. Finally fifth, with banks at the helm of all transactions, innovation is limited to those who have most to lose from any form of change.

With the rise of e-commerce, methods of payment that allow the user to transact over large distances are becoming essential. With our economies are moving online, our money can no longer lag behind. A new currency is needed that can provide near instantaneous money transfer across borders without any intermediary parties that needlessly increase the complexity.

Additionally, the new system should allow for new innovative initiatives, perhaps supporting some basic financial primitives. A new digital payment system could be able to integrate with, or even itself implement a continent wide system for e-invoicing, e-receipts, e-identity, and e-signatures into one system. This would have a profound impact on all of international trade, tightly integrating most financial tools into one universal system.

This thesis provides a design for EuroToken, a prototype for a Central Bank Digital Currency. Its primary purpose is to implement, for the first time, a currency that is: digital, central bank issued, universally accessible, Peer-to-Peer and price stable. Our unique design stems from an analysis of the fundamental challenges distributed technologies face today and exploring how an institution with the reliability, experience and reach of the European Central Bank (ECB) might provide solutions.

This thesis is also accompanied by a prototype implementation [26] [12] of the digital Euro. This implementation provides a demonstration of the feature set, including a connection to the existing IBAN-based banking system to allow exchange between the two types of Euro.



# 2

## Problem description

Can we create a digital, extensible, secure, scalable, price stable extension to the Euro that allows for near-instant world-wide and off-line transfer?

Over last century the world of finance has gone through significant paradigm shifts. Currencies traditionally started as a bottom up distributed system based on some commodity of value. While these currencies might seem to need no institution backing them, the reality of their material nature made physical security an unfortunate necessity. This naturally lead to institutions that act as centralised authority in order to protect the monetary assets.

This age-old solution to a physical problem is mirrored in the digitally accounted financial system of today. While the global dependence on digital money for everyday transactions is growing, the control over many aspects of the system rests in the hands of large opaque corporations. These private banks, who form the main engine of the financial system, now hold a luxurious position as the creators of money. The Copenhagen Business school estimates that banks in the UK alone have made 182 billion pounds in seigniorage.

With such a luxurious position it is no surprise that innovation in the sector has been slow. Innovation in payments is highly dependent on the current gatekeepers of the financial world as they hold the money of the users. Any attempt to innovate by other parties is conditional on the interoperability provided by the banks. While traditional physical currencies are still around as an alternative, their usage has declined due to the increasing utility of digital money in the age of the internet. The increase in the use of a digital payment solution, combined with the mismanagement of the current banking system, makes the need for a new open payment system evident.

In order to rectify the offset in the balance of power and to promote productive financial innovation, a new and open medium of exchange is required. Such a currency needs to be digitally efficient, transparent, accountable, and be fit for global transacting in the 21st century. In this chapter we explore the challenges in the creation of such a currency, specify the requirements for such a payment system and describe why a current solutions are still lacking.

### 2.1. The difficulty of modern digital payment solutions

The search for reliable, digital, money can be traced back as far as David Chaum in 1983 when he first released his paper on Blind Signatures for Untraceable Payments [31]. Rather than specifying a full design for a decentralized currency, Chaum describes a mechanism for preserving user privacy against third parties in digital transactions. Since then many implementations have been attempted, including Chaum's own eCash [27] [30]. ECash had the potential to become a standardised digital payment system right from the start. However, the financial institutions of the time had their sights set on another digital payment system. Normally industries come together to define international standards to aid interoperability and strengthen the market as a whole. But rather than standardise digital payments, the banks chose credit cards as their solution. In its competition with Credit Cards, eCash went bankrupt in 1998 [14].

The adoption of credit cards as the predominant online payment method subsequently lead to a steep rise in credit card fraud. After theft of social security numbers, theft of credit card numbers is

the predominant form of identify theft [25] [45]. Leaving the need for a digital identity out of scope, the inadequacy of the credit card system at protecting users has been proven again and again.

Over the years, alternative payment systems have been developed in response to the lack of good payment solutions. Direct consumer to merchant payment systems like PayPal [18], Venmo [20] and Skrill [10] have emerged to fill the feature gap left by credit cards. However, while these services do somewhat increase innovation in payment solutions, they don't solve the underlying issue of high coupling between users and their banks.

While the market is generating solutions to adjust for the lack of innovation, without a deeper paradigm shift the growth in the number of payment options will have one of two outcomes. Either the world of payments converges into a few large payment providers, basically reverting us back to an oligopoly similar to that of the banks. Or the payment systems stay segmented, leading to increasing complexity for users and merchants in supporting various payment methods, while creating large overhead in the financial system. The fundamental paradigm shift that is needed in the industry is one of universal integration.

More centralised solutions have attempted to ease the integration of traditional banks in order to allow other financial service providers to innovate. This is being pushed by European initiatives like PSD2. But because of the lack of standardisation in the industry, integration has to be implemented for every bank individually. When this integration is not properly implemented, users are stuck with their financials segmented across multiple payment providers and bank accounts. An issue that is worsened with cross border payments. It is evident that current initiatives are inadequate to solve the underlying problem: the tight coupling between a user and their banking/payment providers.

The problem of decoupling users from individual banks has been approached from many angles. Perhaps the most famous solution in recent years is Bitcoin [51]. While criticising a number of issues that lie at the heart of value accounting in our current system, the Bitcoin white paper proposes a digital payment infrastructure. With an associated currency it moves the very core of value accounting to a completely distributed and open system. 10 years after the publication of its white paper the cryptocurrency it is extremely popular as an investment vehicle. Yet any significant payment volumes have yet to be achieved. With transaction fees peaking at 59 US dollars [33] around April 21, 2021, Bitcoin is not, and perhaps never will be, fit to be a direct consumer facing payment system.

Other solutions to the tight coupling problem have been marginally successful on national levels. In the Netherlands the iDEAL system has succeeded in integrating most Dutch banks under a single online payment system. In Norway a similar product called Vipps exists that integrates all Norwegian banks. And similar systems exist in many European countries [3]. All these payment initiatives effectively create an abstraction layer over the individual banks, leaving the users bank transparent to the merchant. While this does create a single payment interface across a whole nation, the lack of international standardisation leads to the failure to support cross border payments. This makes these systems unable to properly support global e-commerce and trade. Additionally, these systems serve as another hurdle to new players in the banking sector, and they are still dependent on, and limited to, the feature sets of these systems.

The European Union is actively trying to integrate their financial system across borders. With payment-integration initiatives like SEPA, PSD2 and the European Payments Council, the EU is slowly moving towards a better integrated euro zone. Recently the union has started to explore digital currency alternatives to the current euro [42]. A newly designed euro has the potential to act as a single payment interface for both online and off-line transactions.

With this research we provide a design for EuroToken, a Central Bank Digital Currency designed to be an alternative to the current privately banked digital euro. It implements a blockchain based accounting system that exposes a generalised payment primitive that supports off-line and online digital payments out of the box. Through its open extensibility it provides an equal footing for financial institutions and individuals alike as it makes users the gatekeeper of their own fiscal lives.

## 2.2. Requirements for a digital euro by the ECB

We aim to create a payment system that is secure, scalable, off-line transferable, price stable and digitally capable. These requirements are derived from a recent report by the European Central Bank (ECB). In October 2020 the ECB published a report detailing a number of scenarios where a new digital euro could provide a benefit [42]. Associated with these a number of requirements are provided:

1. Enhanced digital efficiency
2. Cash-like features
3. Competitive features
4. Monetary policy option
5. Disaster back-up system
6. International use
7. Minimise ecological footprint (cost saving and environmentally friendly)
8. **Ability to control the amount of digital euro in circulation.**
9. Cooperation with market participants
10. Compliance with the regulatory framework
11. Safety and efficiency in the fulfilment of the Eurosystem's goals
12. Easy accessibility throughout the euro area
13. Conditional use by non-euro area residents

In the evaluation of this project in a later chapter, we will explore to what extent our implementation conforms to these requirements. The technical requirements are emboldened in the list, as they will be guiding in our design. The rest will only be speculated on as they do not pertain to the topic of computer science and fall outside our area of expertise. Because of the broad nature, and political and legal angles of these requirements, a technical solution to these problems needs to conform to more technical requirements. For this reason we compiled the requirements to the following more concrete, functional requirements that this thesis will specifically focus on:

1. Be a secure system of accounting
2. Scale to the size of the European Union
3. Preventing unsanctioned money creation
4. Price stability
5. Disaster resilience through off-line transfer ability

## 2.3. Trade-offs around double spending, scalability and decentralisation

When designing a modern digital payment system with the ability to transfer funds off-line, Peer-to-Peer systems and Distributed Ledger Technologies (DLTs) are a worthwhile case study. Since Bitcoin in 2008, various crypto-currencies have iterated on the idea of a fully decentralized currency. After 12 years of development a number of trade-offs are becoming visible that show the limitations of this type of system.

Ideally a payment system has no central points of control. By keeping a payment system decentralized the failure of one part does not affect the functioning of the ability of the users to make payments. Such a system also has inherent scalability. However, keeping a currency secure from unsanctioned money creation is not a trivial problem in a fully distributed system.

The primary problem of unsanctioned money creation can be split into 2 different problems. First, for any transaction to be valid, the payer has to prove that they received these funds in the past. And second, they have not already spent the money.

The first of these is relatively easy to solve. To do this all transactions received in the past can be digitally “signed” by the sender. The signature of the sender on the transaction proves the transfer of funds from one party to another. When receiving funds, the transaction can be trusted by verifying that the sender has received the money in the past from someone else. This way every transaction can be recursively validated back to their original creation point.

The second problem is infamously known as the “double spending problem” and requires some trade-offs to solve. The goal is to construct a way to prove that for any given transaction, the balance of that transaction has not previously been spent by that user. In the first problem the validity of the funds can be proven by a couple signatures. In the double-spending problem the goal is instead to prove the non-existence of a signed transaction.

Solving the double spending problem without a centralised party like a bank that keeps track of all historic transactions is a difficult task. Blockchain based systems have had some success. The most well known distributed ledger technologies are Ethereum [29] and Bitcoin [51]. We will refer to these as

single blockchain networks. Both of these networks maintain a single ledger of transactions structured in a blockchain, which gives transactions a total ordering.

Blockchain bases DLTs group all transactions into blocks, which are in turn organised in a linked list where every block refers to the block before it. Accounts are identified by a public key. Every transaction is a transfer from one public key to another, and is signed with the associated private key of the sender. Every transaction references previous transactions where the sender received money, thus ensuring the funds are available. Every transaction thus has “input” transactions. In order to allow a user to send less than the output of a previous transaction, a transaction can have multiple “outputs”, sending to multiple public keys including the senders. To solve the double spending problem, any “output” of any transaction can only be spent once, and any transaction that spends an already spent output is rejected. If a user has spent that output before, that transaction will exist somewhere in the chain, thus proving the new transaction to be fraudulent.

The problem with single blockchain systems is their inherent lack of scalability. Since the entire chain has to be checked for any conflicting transactions, the entire blockchain, and thus the entire history of the network, has to be kept by everyone that wants to validate a transaction. This means all new blocks have to be distributed to all nodes in the network periodically to redistribute the new transactions made. The speed of the network to propagate transactions, and the limited puts a practical limit on the amount of transactions a single blockchain network can handle since the whole world has to be informed.

To improve the scalability of this system Ethereum 2.0 [5] proposes a network upgrade that adds multiple parallel blockchains called shards. These shards will be responsible for their own fraction of the transactions on the network, only interacting with one another when necessary. While this does increase the capacity of the network, the extent of the scalability gained has yet to prove itself.

Other attempts at a more scalable ledger exist. [7] builds on the concept of the “Tangle”. Instead of a blockchain, transactions reference each other in a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) model. Users are not required to maintain the entire DAG but are required to validate a number of existing transactions before their own transaction is validated. This lowers the chance of a double spend significantly, but requires of their users to do quite some work in order to be able to transact. While public nodes are available to validate transactions for you, these are currently run by enthusiasts and altruists. A criticism is that there is no reason the altruistic processing of transactions will continue into the future.

Another example is Nano [8]. Nano employs a block DAG that resembles a lattice structure which assigns a personal blockchain on a per-user basis. Transactions happen between users and are incorporated into both chains. Double spending is prevented by having blocks broadcast into the network and representatives nodes validating the transactions. These representative nodes are elected through a Delegated Proof of Stake (DPoS) mechanism. DPoS centralises the validation to some democratically elected “Delegates” that validate all transactions for a period of time. While very scalable, the DPoS validation system has been criticised for its centralisation into a few large nodes and the inaccessibility to start participating. Another risk is in the delegates forming cartels, as the weight of each user’s vote is proportional to the size of their wallet.

The double spending problem has many potential solutions, all with their own set of trade-offs. A payment solution that aims to scale to a global level using distributed technologies must carefully balance double-spending, scalability and decentralisation.

## 2.4. The problem of off-line digital payments

The ability to provide off-line payments is an unsolved problem in the world of digital payment solutions. Solving the double spending problem in a Peer-to-Peer network is a challenge on its own. Doing so without a live connection to that network increases the complexity even further.

The problem of double spending and off-line payments is best understood in terms of the CAP theorem. Consider the total set of transactions to be the database, and reads and writes to be updates to the balances of any user. If we decide we want off-line payment, we implicitly choose the value of *partition tolerance*, thus creating a trade-off between *availability* and *consistency*. We can either read a user’s balance, or be sure we know the correct balance of the user. An off-line transaction happens in a very particular context, however. While the two interacting users have no connection to the network, they do have a direct connection between them. This makes their histories *available* to validate the first half of the transaction.

An “off-line transaction” is thus a transaction done without access to a sufficient set of peers to

validate the *consistency* of the history of the sender. This means that if any user accepts an off-line transaction is **not** possible to know whether a conflicting transaction exists in another part of the network.

Any network wanting to prevent double spending will accept only 1 in a set of conflicting transactions, usually the first to arrive. Anyone accepting an off-line transaction is therefore at risk until they check in with the network. For this reason a transaction is usually not accepted by the receiving user until we have some guarantee that all conflicting transactions will be dropped by the rest of the network. This is the concept of transaction finality. A transaction is considered *final* if the rest of the world will accept your transaction, rejecting all conflicting transactions.

Most blockchain based systems achieve this guarantee by having a globally distributed blockchain storing all transactions that *finalises* any transaction with some *eventually negligible* probability of conflict.

In all of these systems, the receiving user still chooses when they accept the transaction. While its possible to wait until the network can be reached before goods are exchanges, any users that have a different basis for trust can defer the validation. Instead of relying on the network based, the exchange is based on the trust of the receiver in the sender.

Of course the trust between users is hard to quantify, and shouldn't be fully relied upon. However, increasing the trust between two transacting users in the period between the transaction and the check-in with the network is the key to implementing dependable off-line transactions.

## 2.5. The price stability problem

The primary purpose of a payment system is to be an “intermediary store of value”. This means that anyone that chooses to exchange their assets or services for a currency, can later trade it in for something else of a same, or similar value. If a currency cannot keep its value stable over time it will fail to be a good intermediary store of value, thus making it a bad payment system. In order to maintain the viability of a currency as a good option for payment, the price thus has to remain stable over time. This concept alone eliminates nearly all the new cryptocurrencies as good payment solutions as their price is dependent on daily market fluctuations and investor speculation.

This raises the question: How do we keep a method of payment solutions truly price stable? While this is really a question for economists to answer, in order to create a digital payment solution, we do need some method of stabilizing the currency. Stable “value” means that what you can purchase today with a unit of currency is about the same as you can purchase tomorrow with that same unit. However, the “value” of most things is constantly shifting based on what someone is willing to pay for it, and is thus subject to the laws of supply and demand. This makes the regulation of the value complex.

Stablecoins like Tether [47] outsource the problem of defining value to an external system, usually an existing fiat currency. The system works by “pegging” the stablecoin against some collateral. Say a “token” is always directly exchangeable at central exchange *A* for the US dollar at a 1:1 ratio. This will cause the price of the token in the market to follow the price of the dollar. If the price of the token in the market dips *below* 1 dollar, anyone can buy the dollar on the market, and directly sell it at exchange *A* for 1 dollar, making an instant profit. This decreases the amount of tokens in the market. Because of this reduced supply the price in the market will increase back in the direction of 1 dollar. If the price in the market is *above* 1 dollar instead, any investor can buy the token at exchange *A* for 1 dollar, and sell it on the market for a profit, thus increasing the supply and decreasing the price back in the direction of 1 dollar. If the price in the market is always 1 dollar, its “value” can be also said to be 1 dollar.

This principle is behind practically all stablecoins on the market. However, this immediately leads to the next problem: How to run a 1:1 exchange. The simplest solution is also the most successful at the moment. Tether [47], currently the 5th largest crypto-currency by market cap, uses a central exchange to ensure a 1:1 exchange ratio between the US dollar and its crypto-token USDT. The obvious problem with this is the fact that the system has a critical centralised element. Without proper oversight such a system could be secretly severely under-collateralized. Other centralised stablecoins like USDC [13] and the Stasis Euro [11] utilise audits by private auditing firms to increase transparency, however the system remains centralised.

Fully distributed stablecoins like MakerDAO [63] and EOSDT [4] do exist. These are kept at a stable price by providing an exchange of 1 token for 1 dollars worth of “collateral”. This collateral is some blockchain accounted token of value. To make sure the system does not get under-collateralized when

the price of the collateral changes, the system is over-collateralized at all times. While these systems have seen some success already, they are very dependent on the value of their collateral, there is still debate on whether they are able to work in a constant down market of the collateral. Regardless, their target for stabilisation is still some external thing of known stable value, in this case the US dollar.

## 2.6. Lack of real world implementations of broad featured CBDCs

In recent years, the discussion around central bank digital currencies has been lively among central banks [61] [58] [53] [52] [38] [56] [22] [23] [59] [35] [55] [57]. Central banks around the world are publishing discussion papers and road maps, some even dare make some design decisions. Yet, except China [60], no countries have deployed a real world trial. Meanwhile, the currencies that do have real world trials have closed systems and are managed by either corporate conglomerates [41] or totalitarian states.

While stablecoins like Tether have demonstrated the appetite in the world for digital stable currencies, their fundamental flaw is in their centralised nature. The Tether Holdings Limited company holds the power over the entire currency, thus never allowing it to become a widespread payment system.

There exists theoretical work from academia, but these usually focus on double spending problem and the system for monetary policy. RSCoin [36], sponsored by the Bank of England presents a solution that centralises a solution to the double-spending to nodes run by various trusted parties. This choice is justified by the fact that the banks of today could run these nodes for profit. Multi-chain models have also been proposed [65], boosting the scalability of the system while maintaining transparency and auditability. However, while these consensus mechanisms are promising, they are both fundamentally limited to online transactions.

Many currencies aim to demonstrate and try to succeed on a specific set of features. Yet the world is still waiting for a currency that is sufficiently capable to be a CBDC. In “Central bank cryptocurrencies” [24] Morten Linnemann Bech and Rodney Garratt analyse the set of features a CBDC needs to support. This main feature set is illustrated in figure 2.1.




Figure 2.1: The money flower: a taxonomy of money [24].

EuroToken is a prototype for a Central Bank Digital Currency. Its primary purpose is to implement, for the first time, a currency that is: digital, universally accessible, central bank issued, Peer-to-Peer and off-line capable.

## 2.7. Research Focus and Structure

While a complete redesign of Europe's monetary system is obviously out of scope for this thesis, the previously described problems and requirements lead us to the following question:

---

Can we create a digital, extensible, secure, scalable, price stable extension to the Euro that allows for near-instant world-wide and off-line transfer.

---

The rest of this document describes the design, implementation and evaluation of the EuroToken system. The EuroToken system is a conceptual design that aims to fit the requirements stated in the previous section. We include a limited proof-of-concept that tests and demonstrates the key aspects of the design.

The structure of this work is as follows, in the next chapter we describe the design of the EuroToken system. The design is approached from the fundamental questions of a currency and answers these fundamental questions before making any other design choices. The design aims to provide the following features:

1. Be a fully functional system of accounting
2. Preventing unsanctioned money creation
3. Scale to the size of the European Union
4. Be off-line transferable

In order to not be limited in the same way as Bitcoin and similar currencies, we choose to sacrifice the following feature: Decentralisation. This gives: us the required leeway to create a scalable and off-line capable system without sacrificing double-spending protection.



# 3

## EuroToken Design

Any payment system that aims to replace public money while being able to operate at the scale of the euro system needs to conform to a number of requirements. Such a system needs to be scalable, privacy aware, allow Peer-to-Peer transactions off-line. It needs to be price stable, exchangeable for euros, and most importantly, it needs to be secure and cheating resistant.

In this chapter we first describe how a distributed block-DAG provides a good basis for a scalable, private, and off-line friendly transaction system. We then explain how we position the system in relation to the euro, how the price can remain stable, and how a system can mimic the properties of cash. We then go in to the details of how the system is secured, and how we prevent double spending while still remaining scalable and allowing off-line transactions. Finally, we explore how the system can be regulated and how the gateways can be audited to ensure their integrity.

### 3.1. Distributed accounting and networking

The possibilities and limitations of any virtual currency are dependent on its system of accounting. In order to conform to the off-line, scalability and transparency requirements, a system of distributed accounting is chosen. As the fundamental building block for the EuroToken system we use a Hyper-Sharded block-DAG that keeps track of every users' transaction history on their own edge device. By storing all information required for transacting at the physical end points of transactions, we create the possibility of direct off-line transaction between users, without any link to the outside world.

While the EuroToken system design is independent of the underlying communication technology, the off-line requirement leads to some limitations on the way users interact. Since off-line users cannot connect to servers we choose to work with a Peer-to-Peer system that allows users to find each-other based on personal identifiers.

We will build our design on a generic Peer-to-Peer networking technology that provides the mechanisms required for our use case. We specifically require the ability to discover the network location of users given their public key that is used to identify their wallet. This allows us to almost abstract away from locating users using IP addresses and ports, leaving this to specific implementations. As a result we only have to worry about maintaining a users public key to identify and communicate with them across time. Our Peer-to-Peer network should not only abstract away from IP addresses, but also from the IP network completely. For example, it must provide communication over Bluetooth or NFC without the need for any internet connection. This is necessary for demonstrating the off-line capabilities of the EuroToken system.

### 3.2. Block-DAG accounting

For our distributed accounting system we choose to use on a block-DAG structure. As illustrated in figure 3.1 every user has a personal blockchain structured as a chronological, one-dimensional string of "blocks". Every block will include a cryptographically secure hash identifying what block preceded it. Because of the collision resistance of the hash, any block will uniquely identify all blocks that come before it. Given the knowledge that the latest block in this history is valid and unique, this allows for

the entire history of a user to trusted. Every block will also contain a single transaction that declares the transfer of funds from one user to another. Additionally, the block includes a reference to a corresponding block in the chain of the transaction counterparty. This effectively creates a system of double accounting, where every transaction is recorded by two parties.




Figure 3.1: Block-DAG structure

One way to view this system is that every block contains “declaration” by the user, or a reference to the declaration of another user. These declarations are digitally signed by the declaring party and form the first half of any transaction.

In the case of a transaction this works as follows. The sending user (Alice) will create a new (half)block with a declaration stating “I transfer 1 EuroToken to Bob”. We call this the “proposal” block. When Bob receives this block from Alice, he can accept it by creating a block in his own chain and returning it to Alice. We call this the “acceptance” block. Before Bob accepts the block, he first validates the history of Alice by requesting enough of her chain to make sure that Alice doesn’t validate any of the network rules that would invalidate Bob’s receiving of the money. Once Bob is satisfied with the correctness of Alice’s transaction history he creates and returns the acceptance block, finishing the transaction. The acceptance block includes the hash of Alice’s proposal block, thus entangling the chains of Alice and Bob together. Bob maintains the proposal as a signed proof by Alice that the transaction happened. He can use this to prove that the declaration of Alice at any point in the future.

### 3.3. Gateways: Euro to EuroToken exchange

The viability of any currency as a store of value over a given time frame is dependent on the stability of its price over that time frame. This is an issue that has plagued decentralized cryptocurrencies from the very beginning. The hope is that the currency will stabilize itself when it reaches a critical adoption level. However, even currencies like the euro and US dollar don’t remain stable without periodic interventions by their respective central banks.

The euro has long served as the core of the financial infrastructure of the European economy. It has essentially done this using two consumer facing versions of money: the euro as a central bank backed, physical token of value (the public euro), and the euro as a digital, privately managed, unit of account (the private euro). These public and private types of money serve citizens in different ways. The public euro is the safest store of value since it’s guaranteed by the central bank, it also has the advantage of requiring no internet connection to use. Meanwhile, the private euro has digital advantages in usability and security, derives its value from the “reliability” of private banks, and are typically only insured by

governments up to 100,000 euros [17]. With the declining usage of public money in favor of digital money, the need for a new type of euro to fill the gap left by public money is getting stronger.

For these reasons we present the EuroToken system as a 3rd type of money. Instead of reinventing the wheel of “stability” we connect the EuroToken system directly to the euro system, while providing extra features on top of the current euro system. Additionally, EuroToken will create for new monetary policy options for the ECB to stabilize the eurozone as a whole.

In order to properly connect EuroTokens to the euro system, an easy and value-transparent method of exchange is required. Just like private and public euros are exchangeable through local banks, a mechanism is needed to exchange between euros and EuroTokens at a 1:1 ratio. To do this, we implement a “gateway” between the private euro system and the digital euro. This gateway implements the EuroToken protocol on the one hand, and interfaces with banks on the other.

In our current design, the gateways are designed to be run by public parties associated with the central bank. Any detailed speculation on the best way to connect such a system to the established euro is best left to economists at the ECB. However, we envision a possible future where multiple gateways are run by existing private money institutions who perform the heavy lifting of day to day exchange. In such a system private banks would act as a validation and exchange system for EuroToken without being allowed to leverage their EuroToken position. The Central bank could allow these private institutions to conform to reserve requirements in the form of EuroToken holdings rather than only cash or central bank reserves. By not allowing private banks to mint new EuroTokens, but only exchange them, the central bank can control the amount of EuroToken in circulation similarly to current public money. This also allows the quick isolation of EuroToken from a failing euro or bank, in the same way as physical public money will still be limited in supply if the digital euro fails.

This way of connecting to the euro also allows for a smooth transition to a digital form of public money, while the established and regulated financial institutions are still positioned properly in a place where financial services can be provided.

## 3.4. Transaction finality and Double-spending

In order to remain a viable store of value, a currency needs to provide protection against any non-sanctioned creation of that currency. If a network allows its users to “create” new money in any significant way, the value of the coin will drop as the supply surges, thus undermining the most fundamental function of the currency, to be an intermediary store of value. The structure of the blockchain provides an immutable and signed history of any transactions, thus enabling users to prove that the funds they are attempting to send actually exist. However, the blockchain does not inherently allow users to prove that they have not spent, and will not spend, the same balance again.

In this section we explain how the EuroToken network prevents unsanctioned creation of currency.

### 3.4.1. The double spending problem

Spending the same money twice, in our personal blockchain system works as follows. An adversary, lets call her Eve, will create perform a legitimate transaction with Alice. This transaction will get recorded in the chain of Alice, as well as in the chain of Eve. If Eve now wants to spend this balance again with Bob, she cannot simply add the new transaction to her chain. Before Bob accepts a transaction he will request all required blocks to validate that Eve received this money in the past. Eve now has to hide the transaction with Alice in order to make Bob believe the balance is still available. When Eve and Bob then create a new transaction, the proposal block of Eve, will be in the same place as the block with Alice would be. They will both refer to the same “previous” transaction, thus creating a fork in her chain.

This is what is called a “double-spend attack”. This attack is only detectable if both of the conflicting blocks are found. Since we have opted for a distributed blockchain this detection becomes a non-trivial problem to solve. Without a mechanism to stop this the money from 2 conflicting blocks might be used in new transactions many times before the 2 original conflicting blocks end up at the same peer and a double spend is detected.

Bitcoin and similar currencies solve this problem using a global blockchain that everyone can read. This allows users to check whether a given balance has already been spent by inspecting the global database of transactions. However, the global knowledge of the Bitcoin chain is inherently unscalable. Additionally, the details of the Proof of Work method of block generation leaves a certain measure of




Figure 3.2: Usage flow of cash, private money, and EuroToken.

uncertainty in regard to the “finality” of any transaction in the newest blocks. This often requires users to wait up to an hour to be sufficiently confident their transaction really happened.

A solution to this problem in a network with a distributed block-DAG, starts with the realisation that the issue of detecting double-spending can be reduced to the issue of detecting “chain forking” in our network. The usage of the blockchain allows us to make sure that all transactions are ordered and consistent, this means that a double-spend needs to happen in the form of 2 separate versions of the same chain. Thus requiring 2 blocks that refer back to the same historic block. This is a fork in the chain.

We cannot prevent a user from creating 2 conflicting blocks in their chain since their chain is stored on their own device. But we can make sure that the rest of the network only accepts one of the 2 blocks, thus only accepting 1 “spending” of the balance. This choice between 2 conflicting blocks needs to be consistent to ensure anyone in the network is working with the “same history”. Additionally, forks need to be detected and resolved before the balance is spent again by any of the 2 receiving parties. This way a double-spend will not propagate into the network and is limited to the users involved in the 2 transactions. To resolve the conflict between blocks we define the concept of “transaction finality”: For a transaction to be final, it needs to be “accepted” by the network, while any conflicting transaction will be guaranteed to be rejected by the network.

The transaction finality problem in our network has several possible solutions. In [28] Brouwer presents a method of distributing blocks to a randomly and fairly selected list of witnesses that would probabilistically detect any conflicting block before the receiver would accept them. In [44] Guerraoui Et. Al presents a more theoretical method of block broadcasts. These might be good candidates for future research.

### 3.4.2. Rolling balance

Currently, lacking a good exact and distributed solution, we choose to utilise a decentralized network of trusted validators. These validators maintain at least the last transaction of users that register with them. Any user who receives money, can verify the non-existence of a conflicting block with the associated validator of the sender.

In the rest of this section, we define the concepts of “spendable balance” and specify the information requirements for marking a transaction as finalised.

In order for Alice verify if Bob is able to send her the money he is sending, she needs to know that Bob has sufficient funds. For this reason a rolling a balance is maintained across all blocks. Where the balance  $B$  for a given block with sequence  $i$  ( $B_i$ ) is:

$$B_i = B_{i-1} + C_i$$

Where  $C_i$  is the change in balance for the block with sequence number  $i$ . This is negative when sending money. However, the balance of a user does not take into account the concept of transaction finality. So conceptually we work with the “spendable balance”.

### 3.4.3. Finality statements

Before Alice can add the output of a block she received from Bob to her “spendable balance”, the transaction from Bob first has to be finalised. To achieve this a validation is performed with Bob’s associated validator. This is done by sending the validator a finality proposal. The whole transaction flow is illustrated in figure 3.3.

The finality proposal block includes a list of hashes that reference transactions from Bob. Together with this block for the validator to sign, Alice will send all of Bobs blocks from the last transaction to validate to the last block the validator knows about. The way for Alice to determine what information this is, is explained in the section on checkpointing later in this chapter. In addition to Bob’s blocks, she will also send her “accepting blocks” that include the transaction in her chain. This is to make sure she can only claim a transaction from Bob once. Bob’s validator will then verify that:

1. There are no other transactions that conflict with the one to Alice.
2. There are no other “accepting blocks” already linked to this transaction.
3. Bob’s chain is valid up to the last transaction to verify.




Figure 3.3: Off-line transfer and finalisation

If this is the case it will sign the proposal. If a later transaction from Bob is received that marks a fork in his chain, the fork from Alice becomes the only accepted fork, and the other one is rejected. Using this finality statements as proof of this, Alice is now allowed to spend the output of the transaction.

In the case that a different fork from Bob has arrived at the validator first, the fork where Alice receives money is rejected. Since Alice has already accepted the transaction in her chain and may have built other transactions after it (though not spent the output), she is requested to submit a new finality proposal without this block. Since Alice is not permitted to spend the funds from Bob until it has been finalised this is the point where double spending is prevented.

Note that the specific handling of this event might not involve Alice's forfeit of the funds. We discuss this further in the section on off-line payments and conflict resolution.

For a block to be considered valid:

1. All standard block-DAG invariants are maintained.
2. All blocks preceding it are verified and found valid.
3. The total spent amount is less than the spendable balance.

For an acceptance block to be considered final the following is also required:

1. A finality proposal with associated acceptance from the validator of the sender exists in the chain of the user AFTER the transaction.

#### 3.4.4. Spendable balance

Once a transaction is finalised, the “spendable balance” of Alice changes. The spendable balance changes at two events. The first is when she spends money, and the second is the finalisation of an earlier receiving transaction. As such the spendable balance  $SB_i$  for a given block with sequence number  $i$  is:

$$SB_i = SB_{i-1} + F_i - S_i$$

Where  $S_i$  is the total amount spent in the block with sequence number  $i$ ,  $F_i$  is the total amount finalised in the block with sequence number  $i$ .

#### 3.4.5. Finality without centralisation

In the future we envision the system to take one of three routes regarding transaction finality. First, the system could be built on a future breakthrough in distributed transaction finality, no longer requiring a central node. Second the system could be built on a probabilistic but bounded transaction finality, where the rare double-spend is eventually detected and settled through the legal system. Or third, like in our solution, the system is built on trusted nodes that verify transactions for user. Like the gateways, these validators could be run by regulated financial institutions. Such a system would most resemble the current financial system, with the added benefits of off-line transactions, programmable money, a standardised system of accounting, instantaneous international transactions, etc.

### 3.5. Checkpointing

Because of transaction finality, when Alice receives the transaction from Bob, she can rely on the finality statements, rather than having to validate the chain of everyone he received money from. This reduces the validation load to only Bob's chain. However, this still has some scalability issues. First, Bob's chain will grow larger over time, thus slowly increasing the validation load. Second, all this information needs to be stored by Alice until it can be delivered to Bob's validator.

The way this problem has been solved in traditional blockchain systems is through the global blockchain and limited transactions per second. By having only miners or stakers being required to maintain the whole blockchain, only a few machines have to know the entire history and store all that data. But, as mentioned earlier, this is still inherently unscalable.

To solve this issue of validation scalability, we define a form of checkpointing. We periodically create a checkpoint block in a user's chain that includes a summary of the entire chain before it. This information is:

1. The total “spendable balance” at that point in the chain

2. The public key of the validator who is responsible for this wallet.
3. A statement that the validator has received all blocks before this point

Alice now knows the blocks that are already stored by the validator. When Alice is receiving money from Bob, she only requires Bob's blocks down to his last checkpoint.

A second issue this solves is one of privacy, when Bob has to send Alice all of his chain for verification, Alice gets access to potentially sensitive transaction data. Since the checkpoint serves as a statement of validity for the entire history before that point, all privacy-sensitive details can be omitted. When off-line, transactions cannot be checkpointed and need to be shared with all counterparties, for this reason a future area of research a method of privatization to conceal transferred amounts through homomorphic encryption.

### 3.6. Off-line transactions and online validation

An off-line transaction is a transaction where both parties have no connection to the rest of the network. Because of the issues discussed earlier there is no way of preventing someone from hiding any number of blocks from a previous transaction from the other party without checking with the rest of the network for conflicting blocks. To prevent double-spending transactions from duplicating currency there is a need for the network to detect and prevent them. This means storing all blocks, ensuring they are valid and verifying that no conflicting blocks exist. This online check, becomes the main challenge in creating a system that supports off-line transactions.

To limit the scope of this problem, the EuroToken system maintains a distinction between transactions and their finalisation. A transaction is first signed by two parties locally and included in their blockchains. All information required to do this is already stored in the wallets of the two parties. After the signing of the transaction, it is finalised with the network, storing it and making sure it does not conflict with any other transactions known to the network.

During the period that a transaction is not finalised, another conflicting transaction might get finalised, thus leaving us with a double-spend attempt. When users are connected to the internet the risk can be reduced to zero. An online interaction can simply combine the finalisation step with the transaction, only transferring goods or services once the transaction is finalised. We envision this as the default way for users to interact, especially for large transactions. Using the system described so far, there are multiple approaches to handling this risk in off-line transactions, each with their own trade-offs.

The first is to hold the sender responsible for double-spending. In the case of a double spend, the sender is barred from checkpointing or gaining any checkpoints until they repay the network. In the case that their debt cannot be repaid the network is on the line. In this case the creation of illicit money is considered an acceptable risk.

The second and more realistic solution is to make the receiver bear the risk. In the case that a sender has sent the same money to 2 people only 1 can receive it. This is handled at the point of finalisation. The money simply goes to the receiver that finalised the transaction first. The other has to forfeit the received funds. At this point the network can still hold the sender responsible, tainting their reputation and not allowing them to transact off-line again. This can be achieved with a mechanism of occasional attestation from their gateway, that no double-spends have been detected in by this user in the past.

This system can also be expanded to full disaster-proofing by allowing the receiver to off-line spend the money without having first finalised the transaction. The second receiver of this money will then have to accept that they are on the line if either the first receiver or the original sender end up double spending. At this point the choice can be made to hold the first receiver responsible for a double spend of the original sender. Potentially putting the first receiver in debt to the second receiver for some portion of the lost amount.

Note that any solution that holds anyone responsible at a later point in time is vulnerable to a Sybil attack and thus cannot allow permission-less and anonymous accounts. This would therefore require integration with some form of identity system. Integrated identity, combined with the fact that transactions are always signed by both parties, ensures that a proof of double-spending always exists. This proof is also discovered no later than the finalisation attempt of the receiver that validated second. The validator can then pursue legal action against the sender for fraud.

Our solution takes the simplest approach. We put the receiver at risk while a transaction is not finalised. We also do not allow non-finalised transactions to be sent again. Any solution that permits the re-spending of unfinalised transactions are much more complicated since a UTXO model would likely need to be implemented. While this is not inherently incompatible with EuroToken, our solution has left this out of scope.

## 3.7. Regulation of validators

While we take the trustworthiness of validators for granted in this thesis. It is entirely conceivable that trusted validators could cheat by allowing certain wallets to double-spend. To add to this, using the checkpoint functionality a validator can specify a higher spendable balance than is actually logged in the chain, thus having another way to create money. Without going into too much detail we would like to give our perspective on the regulation of validators.

Our solution is similar to the present banking system. When comparing our system to the current way private institutions are regulated, the blockchain structure of transaction can provide a powerful method of maintaining the integrity of the institutions. While we cannot prevent fraud at the institutional level, EuroToken does provide an opportunity to standardise the detection of fraud to allow for easy regulation.

In order for a regulator to check that a validator has done their job with integrity, they need to be sure of 2 things:

1. That all “statements” have been made consistently with the rules of the network.
2. That no other “statements” have been hidden from the regulator.

“Statements” in this context, describe anything that the rest of the network puts their trust in. These are:

1. Finality statements
2. Checkpoints

Both of these statements are made in the form of “accepting blocks” and are stored by users and their validators with an associated hash. We now propose a two round system for validating all statements within a given time period. In round one, we validate that all statements have been made correctly and publicly store the hashes. In the second round, once we have the hashes of all statements available, we validate that all statements from other validators exist.

In the first round all information in the database of the validator is processed for consistency. Since all statements by the validator are made in the form of blocks in their personal blockchain, they have an explicit order, in which they can be “replayed”. The blocks of the validator, together with the blocks of all the users the validator is responsible for, are processed in the same way as the validator was responsible for processing them. This step in the process ensures that all statements are made correctly.

In the second round, we ensure that there is no statement withheld by the validator. This is done by publicly publishing a signed list of the hashes of all statements made by the validator. This allows regulators to cross-check that all inter-validator statements have been reviewed by a validator. To make this step more efficient, we propose that when checking a validators consistency, regulators generate a list of statements for each distinct validator they interacted with to increase the efficiency of distributing these hashes to relevant parties.

A possibility also exists to allow the public access to these records to ensure the integrity of their institutions.



# 4

# EuroToken Implementation

In this chapter we describe the implementation of the EuroToken protocol, as well as the prototype we built to test and showcase the capabilities of the EuroToken system. The protocol is implemented on top of IPv8. It includes an Android/Kotlin implementation as well as a Python implementation. We built a Euro to EuroToken exchange and transaction validator on top of the Python implementation. On top of the Kotlin implementation we built a wallet app that is fully capable of securely transferring EuroTokens between wallets, as well as exchange them with the EuroToken exchange.

## 4.1. Architecture

The architecture of the EuroToken system has two main components. The gateway and the wallet. The gateway is managed by a central trusted party and fulfills two main functions from the design. These are to asynchronously validate transactions made by users, as well as handling the exchange between EuroToken and Euros. As such it maintains a bank account as well as its own wallet. The wallets are operated by each user, and they are fully capable of transferring funds between each-other without having to interact with anyone in the euro system.




Figure 4.1: EuroToken architecture

In figure 4.1 we model the main communication channels. Within the P2P EuroToken system we have all wallet to wallet, and wallet to gateway communication. This communication happens directly between the communicating nodes using Peer-to-Peer technology.

In the Euro System, we make use of bank APIs for gateway to bank communication. The communication with the ECB symbolises monetary policy enacted by the ECB on bank EuroToken reserve

requirements or possible direct exchange of euro for EuroToken.

Rather than implementing both an exchange and a validator we chose to implement and test these as a single entity. However, since the gateways roles might be split in the future the technical implementation of the gateway keeps the validator roles separate from the exchange roles. This results in a single EuroToken exchange software product, that is able to perform either or both of the functions.

## 4.2. EuroToken transfer protocol

The method for the accounting and transferring of EuroTokens lies at the heart of this project. Because of this the choices regarding the implementation of the networking stack and blockchain technology will have a direct effect on the feature set and scalability of the whole EuroToken network. We need a network stack that allows online communication as online across the world, as well as direct device to device communication. Finding and connecting to any wallet without relying on central servers is a main requirement. In addition, the off-line transfer ability of the system is best demonstrated by creating an Android client. Another requirement is therefore that an implementation is available for Android as well.

One option is to implement a full blockchain protocol and associated network stack from the ground up to adhere to our exact requirements. This would give us a lot of control over the exact feature set of the network. However, since the science of distributed networking algorithms has mostly settled, most Peer-to-Peer communication technologies have already been implemented somewhere.

The second option is to build upon some existing Peer-to-Peer networking library, while implementing the blockchain protocol ourselves. This option has some benefits as the usage of a block-DAG is not yet very common, and thus is not implemented as a stand-alone package anywhere. For the P2P library we have several options. We considered LibTorrent [16], Libp2p [15] and IPv8[9]. LibTorrent has a number of interesting Peer-to-Peer features like peer discovery and data transfer but sadly fell short when it comes discovery of peers based on public keys. It can be classified more as a file location protocol than a peer location protocol. This would mean we would have to implement a peer location system ourselves. Libp2p is a modular Peer-to-Peer networking stack that provides a large suite of P2P tools. Libp2p uses a Distributed Hash Table (DHT) to allow peer discovery based on a peer-id [46]. Libp2p does have a JVM/Android implementation available, which also makes it possible to create an Android client. Finally, we looked at IPv8. IPv8 offers direct peer discovery based on public key and provides a framework for interaction called Overlay networks. Overlays provide a context for peers to interact within with particular message types. Crucially, IPv8 also has an implementation in Kotlin [40].

Rather than implementing the blockchain mechanism ourselves, there is a third option. IPv8 includes a module called TrustChain. TrustChain is in essence a block-DAG type distrusted ledger technology[39]. The technology does not fully solve double spending in the way we originally designed it, so some work is required to adapt TrustChain to the EuroToken system, but it provides a good basis for our implementation.

We choose to build on IPv8/TrustChain for this project as it allows us to build on their Kotlin implementation for the wallet as well as the Python implementation for the gateway.

### 4.2.1. TrustChain structure

Every user runs a *Peer* which consists of a public/private key pair as well as a collection of their *transaction* history in the form of their *blockchain*. The Peer can be uniquely identified by their public key. Every statement made by the peer is signed using their private key, and the validity of any signature can be verified using the public key of the Peer.

Every peer has a list of their own history of transactions in the form of a collection of *blocks*. Every block is created and signed by a Peer, and includes the details of the transaction as well as a cryptographically secure hash of the previous block signed by the user. Importantly, the hash of a block uniquely identifies the block, as the collision resistance of cryptographically secure hashes ensures the infeasibility of finding another block with a given hash. The block thus uniquely references the previous transaction of the Peer. Since every transaction uniquely references the block before itself, the hash of any one block, recursively identifies every transaction made before by the Peer. This is as long as the Peer honestly references to their previous block. This referencing mechanism effectively links all blocks together in a gradually growing chain, thus making is a *blockchain*.

Every Peer within TrustChain has their own chain, yet most transactions are *between* users. For

this reason all transactions are made to happen in the chains of both users involved. In TrustChain, this is achieved by having one of the two parties create a proposal block. In addition to the public key of the Peer, their previous hash, and the contents of the statement, the proposal also includes the public key of the counterparty. When the counterparty receives the proposal and agrees to the terms in the statement, they create an acceptance block. This acceptance block functions includes the public key of the counterparty, as well as the hash of their previous block, thus placing it in their blockchain. In addition, the acceptance includes a reference to the proposal, thus linking them together. Both the proposal and acceptance blocks are then stored by both users, so they can both prove the transaction fully happened.




Figure 4.2: TrustChain block-DAG, interconnected personal blockchains [39].

### 4.2.2. EuroToken extension

The structure inherited from TrustChain conforms quite well to the block-DAG design we want to implement. However, neither the Python, nor the Kotlin implementation includes any logic for running a currency. Before TrustChain can be used for EuroToken, it needs to be expanded to allow for value tracking and transfer.

TrustChain is fairly open for extension. It allows users to define their own block-types as well as validation logic for these blocks. TrustChain ensures the chain is valid by enforcing basic block invariants like hash correctness and signature validity. It makes use of IPv8 for its communication and exposes an API to create and sign blocks to other peers. TrustChain will then handle the process of sending the blocks to the receiver over the IPv8 network.

To create the EuroToken logic, we define 4 TrustChain block types. In order to conform to the scalability requirements, all EuroToken proposal blocks by a user will include the balance of that user. This is part of the rolling-checkpoint mechanic that allows us to scale each user's personal blockchain indefinitely without sacrificing scalability. The EuroToken block subtypes are as follows:

#### Transfer block

The transfer block is the core of how users interact. The proposal is created by the sender of a transaction, and the acceptance by the receiving party. The block includes the amount to be sent as well as the balance of the sender at that point. The receiver will verify that the balances of the sender are valid before creating the acceptance. The receiver will then calculate the spendable balance all the way back to the last checkpoint block in order to validate whether the balance of the sender is spendable.

#### Checkpoint block

In order to be able to spend the balance a user has received they need to proof that a validator has taken notice of the blocks of the senders. The checkpoint block serves as this proof of validator. The

proposal is created by the user and the acceptance is created by the validator. A checkpoint block is only considered valid if both the proposal and acceptance exist. If the acceptance does not exist, the block is meaningless and any validation will keep recursing the chain until a checkpoint with associated acceptance is found.

### Tokenisation block

A tokenisation is a special type of transfer that is done by a Central Bank exchange. This block is the only way in which new EuroToken are allowed to enter the system and will only be considered valid if it is signed by a designated party. The proposal is made by the exchange and the acceptance is made by a user.

### De-tokenisation block

The de-tokenisation is the opposite of a tokenisation. The proposal is made by a user and acts as a transfer to an exchange. The exchange then also creates an acceptance block, completing the transfer. The tokenisation and de-tokenisation blocks are used to convert between Euro and EuroTokens.

## 4.3. Wallet

The main user facing implementation of the EuroToken network is the wallet. The wallet allows users to transfer funds to any other wallet anywhere on earth over the internet, or directly from device to device over Bluetooth. The wallet also has the capacity to exchange Euro for EuroToken and vice versa.

Instead of building a wallet from scratch we build on top of the TrustChain superapp [12] [62]. This app was developed to showcase the capabilities of the Kotlin implementation of IPv8 [40]. The superapp is implemented as a collection of different subapps that use the same underlying IPv8 implementation. The app includes multiple other projects which we can integrate with the EuroToken system.




Figure 4.3: TrustChain Superapp [12]

### 4.3.1. Peer-to-Peer transfer

The main feature of the wallet is its ability to transfer EuroTokens. Before a user can send money to another user, they first need to know their public key. While sending blocks directly to a user is possible as part of the IPv8 implementation, the sharing of public keys is left to us. For this reason we implemented 2 ways of handling this. The first way is by generating a payment request with QR code. This works best when the users are in the same room, or can share the QR code through some other means.




Figure 4.4: Wallet transfer by QR

A second and more user-friendly away to send money is through the already existing chat app PeerChat. PeerChat allows users to add each other as contacts and then uses IPv8 to send public key addressed messages. Instead of reimplementing contact management, we added EuroToken payments to PeerChat. The integration of payments into a chat application mirrors apps like the Chinese WeChat Pay and the Norwegian Vipps. We believe this method of payment in the most natural for users.

Regardless of how users send money, their entire transaction history is available within the EuroToken sub app. Here all the different transaction types can be seen. The transaction screen also shows debug information like all checkpoints that have been performed with a validator. It also shows information about whether an acceptance block has been received from the counterparty. On this screen money can be paid back as well, and blocks can be resent in case of network failure.

## 4.4. Exchange

In order to ensure the stability of EuroToken it has to fully integrate with the existing IBAN-based banking system. To achieve this an exchange is created to be run or regulated by the ECB. This exchange forms the bridge between the digital EuroToken and the rest of the Euro systems and is therefore called the gateway. The exchange mechanism must support the two main flows of value.

The first we call the tokenisation flow. This flow handles the exchange of Euro for EuroToken, thus minting new EuroToken. This involves the handling of payments into a bank account, verifying this, and paying out an equivalent amount of EuroToken to the users' wallet. The second flow is the de-




Figure 4.5: Contacts [62] and payments via PeerChat




Figure 4.6: Wallet transactions

tokenisation flow. This flow does handle the opposite conversion. It handles a payment of EuroToken and pays out the equivalent amount to a IBAN bank account.

To handle this flow we build the exchange node. This node exposes a web frontend that allows the user to exchange their money in either direction. The exchange is implemented in Python, and is based on the Python implementation of IPv8 [9].

#### 4.4.1. Buy and sell instantly

The frontend of the exchange is kept as simple as possible for demonstration purposes. Users do not need to log in, and can buy or sell their EuroTokens directly on the front page.

The screenshot shows the EuroToken Exchange Frontend. At the top, there are two large buttons: a green one with a white plus sign labeled 'EURO -> EUROTOKEN 1.00€ -> 1.00ET' and a blue one with a white minus sign labeled 'EUROTOKEN -> EURO 1.00ET -> 1.00€'. Below these are two main sections:

- Euro -> Eurotoken:** Contains an 'Amount (Euro)' input field with '0.00' and a 'Convert' button. Below it is a table of transactions:
 

| Created                     | Amount           | Price       | ID                           | Next Action  |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------------------|--|
| 2021/04/22, 11:49:08.597591 | 300.00 eurotoken | 300.00 euro | rGusqqMIV2z5zxnFsrm60RrAERk= | <button>Connect to gateway</button> <span style="color:red;">Delete</span> |
| Created                     | Amount           | Price       | ID                           | Next Action  |
- Eurotoken -> Euro:** Contains an 'Amount (EuroToken)' input field with '0.00' and a 'Convert' button. Below it is a table of transactions:
 

| Created                | Amount | Price | ID | Next Action |
|------------------------|--------|-------|----|-------------|
| NL91 ABNA 0417 1643 00 | 0.00   | 0.00  |    |             |
|                        |        |       |    |             |

Figure 4.7: EuroToken Exchange Frontend

#### 4.4.2. Exchange flow

The flow of exchange is different in each direction and require different steps from the user.

##### Tokenisation

In our prototype we use the payment system API of a popular bank to enable users to pay us Euros[21]. The tokenisation flow can be seen in figure 4.8. The tokenisation step is the most complex. This is because the sending of money to a user requires the exchange to know the public key of the user. In order to obtain EuroTokens the user accesses the web interface of the exchange, which will lead it through the following steps:

1. The user specifies the amount of EuroToken to buy. This creates a new transaction. The user then scans a QR code generated by the exchange using the wallet. The QR code contains the IPv8 public key of the exchange, as well as a payment ID. The wallet will then send a special connect message to the exchange over IPv8 with the payment ID. When the exchange receives the message, the public key of the sender of the message is stored in association with the payment. This will be the public key to which the EuroToken will be transferred once the transaction is complete.
2. The exchange creates a new payment request with the bank for the specified amount, towards which the user is then redirected.
3. The exchange is alerted by the bank once the payment is complete.
4. The exchange will now send the money over IPv8 to the account from step 1.




Figure 4.8: EuroToken Tokenisation Flow

### De-tokenisation

The de-tokenisation flow is a simpler process. If the user knows the public key of the exchange it can be performed completely in the wallet app. The user would simply send a de-tokenisation transaction to the exchange which includes the IBAN the user would like the money to be paid out to as part of the block.

However, if the user does not know the public key of the exchange, the interaction has to happen through the exchange web UI. This would involve the following flow:

1. The user inputs the amount to exchange along with their IBAN.
2. The exchange generates a QR code which includes their public key, a payment ID, as well as the amount to be paid.
3. The user scans the QR code and transfers the amount in the app. The gateway then validates the transaction and pays out the Euro to the IBAN.

Within the app the exchange flows are handled using the pages shown in figure 4.9.

## 4.5. Validator

Along with the exchange, the validator is one of the special nodes that allow the EuroToken system to function. As shown in figure 4.6, a validation checkpoint is automatically requested after a transaction has been received by a user. For our implementation we merge the concept of the checkpoint and the transaction finality statement. As such, the checkpoint makes the entire balance of the user “spendable”.

The main task of the validator is to maintain the last blocks of all users in the network. This makes it impossible to double-spend in the network since any conflicting block has already been accepted by the validator. This makes the first block to arrive to the validator the one and only block at that position in a users chain.

Since the output of a transaction is only spendable when a checkpoint exists after it in the chain, the wallet automatically performs a checkpoint after every transaction. This keeps the amount of blocks that have to be validated during every transaction as low as possible. This leads to every transaction involving only 4 half-blocks from the perspective of the sender. A sender only needs to share the transaction proposal itself, the block before (which is a checkpoint proposal), and the associated checkpoint acceptance. The receiver then only needs to verify the correctness of these 3 blocks and send back the acceptance to the sender. This preserves the transaction privacy of the both the sender




Figure 4.9: Wallet exchange

and the receiver, revealing only the relevant transaction. We do have the option to vary the checkpoint frequency, and we explore the trade-offs of various frequencies later.



# 5

## Evaluation

In this chapter we will evaluate our solution to the problems as explored in the problem description. We first describe two field trials that showed the proof-of-concept in action. This demonstrates how EuroToken is able to perform the basic functions of money and allows for off-line transfers. We then describe some structured experiments that measure the scalability of the network and evaluate whether the promise of a double-spend proof but still scalable network has been met. Finally, we evaluate the extensibility and feature set as a whole, and discuss whether they meet the ECB requirements specified in chapter 2.

### 5.1. Field trial

The purpose of the implementation in the super app was to demonstrate the features of the EuroToken system. In order to test the implementation and the viability of the protocol in the real world, a field trial was conducted. We tested the EuroToken system at café Doerak in Delft [2]. As showcased in figure 5.1, the owner of the café generated a payment request for the amount of a single coffee and displayed it in the restaurant. Customers could then scan the code to transfer the money. The owner would immediately see the money appear in their EuroToken account in the app.



Figure 5.1: Field trial

This trial showcased the simplicity of taking digital payments without having to go through the pro-

cess of registering with a traditional payment provider or credit card reseller. Using the EuroToken system all the owner of Doerak needed was a smartphone in order to participate in the modern economy.

## 5.2. Off-line trial

By building the EuroToken app on IPv8 we could build on the Bluetooth transfer features to implement the off-line transfer of funds. In order to test this implementation and showcase the off-line transfer capabilities of the EuroToken system, we conducted a trail away from civilisation. As showcased in Figure 5.2, in the mountains of Norway, away from all network connectivity, we conducted a transfer of funds using the Bluetooth connect feature of the superapp.



Figure 5.2: EuroToken off-line trial

There is some room for improvement in the practicality of off-line transfer of data between two devices. We found the process of creating a Peer-to-Peer Bluetooth connection between two mobile devices somewhat cumbersome. And the system would greatly benefit in usability from proximity based data transfer via NFC.

Regardless of the possibilities for improvement, the trial successfully showed the viability of off-line transfer. It shows the potential of the EuroToken system to act as a disaster proof payment system that remains functional far away from civilisation and during any disaster that would wipe out global communication infrastructure.

The user trades the risk of deferring transaction validation until they connect to the network again for off-line transfers. This allows for instantaneous transfer of funds, without requiring a connection to anyone in the rest of the network in order to perform the initial transfer. Possibilities of reducing the transaction risk between initial transfer and transaction finalisation is an interesting topic for future research. Using reputation systems or digital identity solutions combined with judicial accountability, the risk could potentially be reduced significantly.

In order to prevent double spending, the current implementation of the protocol disallows the re-spending of transactions that have not first been finalised. In order to provide a full disaster mode, re-spending funds without full transaction validation by the network is a must. This could be achieved by expanding the protocol to enable the settling of multi-hop transfers. This would require each consecutive receiver to accept more risk than the one before, as they are vulnerable to the double spending of all unfinalised transactions before.

### 5.3. Scalability in network size

In order for the EuroToken system to be able to function at the scale of the eurozone, the ability to scale is crucial. In order to evaluate how the system performs as the number of users grows, we performed a number of experiments.

We adapted the Python implementation to simulate the network at various sizes. We configured a set number of nodes to continuously transact with one another and perform checkpoints with their validator whenever they had received a set number of transactions. The nodes chose random transaction partners for each transaction and checkpointed with their gateway after every 4 transactions. In order to assess the scalability of the network, we ran several experiments where we varied the number of transaction nodes in the network. For each transaction we measured the time taken for each node to validate the transaction and how many transactions have been validated in order to calculate the transactions per second of the gateway. We also recorded the number of blocks the gateway validated for each transaction they validated.




Figure 5.3: Effect of network size on scalability

The results of our experiments are illustrated in figure 5.3. While there initially seems to be a drop in transactions per second as an effect of the number of users in the network, this effect is crucially missing when looking at the number of blocks read. This discrepancy can be explained by the circumstances of our test environment. Since all nodes are run on the same machine there is some competition over resources like disk access. When looking at the number of blocks read to validate a single transaction, the increase in nodes in the network, even when users have a complex transaction history, has no effect on the complexity of validating a single transaction for the gateway.

In addition to varying the number of transaction nodes, we also wanted to test the effect of increasing the number of gateways. Based on our implementation we expect a linear relationship between the number of gateway compute power in the network and the transactions per second that can be validated. This is because there is no communication between the gateways that makes their validation dependent on one another. We ran 4 transacting nodes split among 1, 2 or 4 gateways. We then again measured the TPS of the gateways.

As illustrated in figure 5.4, the number of gateways seems to have some effect on the per gateway transactions per second. However, the number of blocks validated per transaction for each gateway is always 16. We believe the drop in TPS to be caused by the shared resources between the nodes in our test environment. When we look at the total transactions per second of the network, we do see an increase in total network TPS with a growing gateway count. We expect this to grow linearly in the real world, when resources do not have to be shared among gateways.

### 5.4. Scalability in history size

Another way in which EuroToken achieves scalability is by using checkpointing to mitigate the effect of a growing chain size. We claimed that this allows the network to scale indefinitely as the personal chains of the users grow.

In order to measure the real effect of checkpointing we set up a simulation where multiple users transacted until they had performed 1000 transactions on their chain. All users started with an empty




Figure 5.4: Scalability in gateways

chain and transact together at the same rate. This means that all the chains have the same length throughout the testing process. We measured both the time taken to validate a transaction, and the number of blocks validated.




Figure 5.5: Effect of chain length on number of blocks validated

The results are illustrated in figure 5.5. Here we plotted the number of blocks required to validate a transaction as a function of the number of transactions the user has sent before this. This shows that the number of blocks a user or gateway has to validate does not change as the size of the chains increase.

In figure 5.6 we show the time it takes to validate a transaction as a function of the number of transactions in the users' history. Here we do see a gradual rise in the processing time as the chains grow. However, since the number of blocks validated seems to stay constant over time this rise in validation time is best explained by the rising cost of database lookups of the blocks, which takes longer as the size of the SQLite database grows over time. This can easily be mitigated in a real world solution using more efficient block storage. Since all blocks before the last checkpoint has been evaluated and are no longer required for validation in the future, these can be written to a longer term storage as to not unnecessarily increase the validation times.

Most importantly, the number of block required to validate stays constant over time. This is a direct result of checkpointing, as users only need to validate blocks down to the last checkpoint. This separates EuroToken from currencies like Bitcoin where the database of blocks is constantly growing leading to higher validation costs and validation times especially during startup.

## 5.5. Trade-offs in user and gateway validation times

The EuroToken derives its scalability and off-line transaction ability from the application of checkpointing. The collapsing of all transactions before a given point into a single checkpoint block allows any counterparty to simplify the entire history of a user to only the balance in the checkpoint block. This pre-




Figure 5.6: Effect of chain length on validation time

vents the exponential growth in blocks required to validate, which allows the system to remain efficient over time. In this section we explore the effect of various checkpointing frequencies and demonstrate its trade-offs.

We simulated a network of randomly transacting users. We varied the number of transactions the users performed between checkpoints. Each user executed over 1000 transactions each run. We measured the total number of blocks their counterparties had to read in order to validate the transaction. The entire network varied their checkpointing frequencies together.




Figure 5.7: Effect of checkpointing on validation

The effect of checkpoint frequency is illustrated in figure 5.7. As the time we wait between checkpoints increases the effort for each transaction increases for the clients.

When we look at the effect on the gateway, we get a different image. While the number of blocks the gateway has to validate does grow with the transactions between checkpoints, the gateway has to do this less frequently. This removes overhead from the validations, allowing the gateway to validate

more transactions as the frequency of validation decreases.

When implementing EuroToken in the real world, some attention should be dedicated to this. Users are incentivized to checkpoint as frequently as possible, while this might not be optimal for the network.

## 5.6. Extensibility

EuroToken is designed to run mostly on the device of the user, only communicating with the validator using the standardised messages of IPv8 [9]. The communication protocol of EuroToken is thus completely open and accessible to anyone. The extensibility of the system is exemplified in the TrustChain superapp. The modular implementation allowed for EuroToken to be easily integrated into the Peer-Chat app. Another example of the extensibility of EuroToken can be seen in the implementation of an unrelated project. A group of students implemented a liquidity pool for exchange between Bitcoin and EuroToken using its API in the Superapp [66]. EuroToken is open and extensible to any compatible use case, giving it the potential to facilitate a competitive market for innovation,

## 5.7. System evaluation and ECB requirements

In the problem description of this document we described the requirements of a digital euro as specified by the ECB. In this section we review the extent to which the EuroToken system conforms to these requirements. The requirements are summarised as follows:

Table 5.1: (ECB requirements)

| #  | Requirement  | Conformance |
|----|--|-------------|
| 1  | <b>Enhanced digital efficiency</b>                                   | ✓           |
| 2  | <b>Cash-like features</b>  | ✓           |
| 3  | <b>Competitive features</b>  | ✓           |
| 4  | <b>Monetary policy option</b>  | ✓           |
| 5  | <b>Disaster back-up system</b>                                       | ●           |
| 6  | <b>International use</b>   | ✓           |
| 7  | Minimise ecological footprint  | ✓           |
| 8  | <b>Ability to control the amount of digital euro in circulation.</b> | ✓           |
| 9  | Cooperation with market participants                                 | ?           |
| 10 | Compliance with the regulatory framework                             | ?           |
| 11 | Safety and efficiency in the fulfilment of the Eurosystem's goals    | ?           |
| 12 | Easy accessibility throughout the euro area                          | ✓           |
| 13 | Conditional use by non-euro area residents                           | ●           |

Legend: | ✓ Provided | ● Partial / Future research | ? Out of scope

We achieve **enhanced digital efficiency** and a **competitive feature set** by designing EuroToken as a digital, Peer-to-Peer, programmable payment system. We achieve **cash-like features** with direct and off-line transferability without the need for intermediary parties. EuroToken provides the ECB with a new set of **monetary policy options** by having the Central Bank **controlling the amount of digital euro in circulation** through the control of the tokenisation and de-tokenisation of EuroTokens. The off-line transaction capacity could be extended to make EuroToken a **disaster proof** payment system. With backing during deployment of the ECB, EuroToken could become the standardised digital currency of Europe allowing **international** with ease. The rest of the requirements are legal questions and are left out of scope.

# 6

## Discussion and future work

The process of designing a digital currency is not something that can be done in one master thesis. There are many challenges left to solve before we have a distributed currency that has the features necessary to serve the payment needs of the entire eurozone. In this chapter we go over the three main contributions EuroToken makes, their limitations and their possibilities for improvement. We then more generally discuss the ability of EuroToken to conform to the requirements set forward by the ECB and what issues are still left to address.

### 6.1. Trade-offs between anonymity and off-line transactions

EuroToken achieves off-line transactions by making every transaction a signed statement by the sender that transfers their funds to the receiver. This statement is cryptographically linked to the wallet of the sender and can be used by the receiver at any time to prove that the transaction happened. This allows us to hold the sender accountable to their statement. While we provide a mechanism for the receiver to ensure that the sender has the funds available, we do not provide a mechanism to prevent the sender from off-line spending a second time.

The main limitation of our method of off-line transfers, and perhaps all methods of off-line payments, is that double spending is only prevented and addressed when interacting with the network online. While this does prevent illicit creation of currency, it still leaves some risk with the receiver. We see potential solutions to this problem in 2 areas. The first is at the point of transaction, and the second at the point of double-spend detection at the gateways.

At the point of detection the validator learns that one of their associated wallets has cheated. If the identity of the sender is known to the validator, they can block the sender from doing any online transactions until the double-spend has been resolved. The validator can refuse the signal of any checkpoints after the detection.

The validator could also include a reputation for the sender in every checkpoint, this can then be provided to future receivers at the point of transaction in order to give an indication of trustworthiness. The checkpoint could also include a statement specifying to what degree the identity of the sender is known to the validator. At the point of transaction the receiver can then verify these details about the sender. The receiver could choose not to interact with wallets that have been created very recently, have a poor reputation, hasn't checked in with the validator for a long time, or that don't have their identity registered with the validator.

Of course these solutions rely on the identity of the sender being known to the validator, something that may have negative implications on privacy. For this reason the identity itself could be registered with an identity provider that maintains all the personal information of the sender and only uses this in the event of detected cheating. The design of such a system and its integration with EuroToken has been left to future research.

### 6.2. Scalability without centralisation

In order to be scalable, price stable and off-line transferable, we have made a trade-off in decentralisation. The original promise of a decentralized currency with the three aforementioned features, while

promising, might never come to fruition.

Our design currently relies on trusted central validators to solve the main issues of digital currencies. In a decentralized system this role is usually performed by a blockchain or similar information store, combined with some consensus algorithm to determine what gets written. Our solution has a different concept of consensus by allowing anyone to make any transaction on their chain. By storing at least the last few transactions of a user, anyone can ask the validator if a double spend has happened. Consensus in our model, is thus delegated completely to the validator.

One possible criticism of this solution is that by its reliance on central validators, the problem of network-level double spending prevention only moves to the level of the validators.

In the context of decentralized finance (DeFi) this would disqualify the system entirely, but in the context of a trans European payment system, some level of centralisation can be tolerated and might even be desirable. Institutions have been the daily drivers of our monetary system for a very long time, and while not without its issues, the system has overall been successful. The issue of the auditing of the validators can also be solved in the same method as it has been in traditional systems. The digitally standardised nature of the system, would make this process much easier, and be nearly automatic.

While the risks that are associated with the centralisation of EuroToken are no worse than those of the current economic system, a system that does not rely on this should always be preferred. While not quite ready to be global payment systems, the decentralized currencies of the world have made significant progress over the last decade, especially in the efficiency of consensus protocols. The possibility still exists that a scalable solution to the global storage problem can be found. When this happens, the EuroToken system can start to rely on a decentralized method of consensus.

While the promise of decentralized finance has merit, another problem is the correction of illicit transactions. Stolen Bitcoin can never be retrieved, judgements to pay damages cannot be enforced, assets cannot be frozen, collection agencies cannot lay claim on distributed assets, etc. While some of these practices are considered by many to be cruel and outdated, they do stem from the general opinion of society on how the world and economy should be run, and our societies do rely on them. The mechanisms by which government sanctioned parties can intervene in our financial lives have been serving some human driven purpose. Any system that removes the ability of an authority to intervene needs to also solve these issues.

Ideally, these rules have been set by society through the democratic process. Any system that is completely disconnected from this mechanism will likely grow out of sync with the needs of the people. The utility of having some centralised, but highly scrutinised parties should not be underestimated.

### 6.3. Price stability, deflation and remuneration

The price stability of EuroToken is derived directly from the euro. By having the central bank guarantee the exchange between EuroToken and Euro both ways, the system is able to keep the price stable. This is not the whole story, however. EuroToken can derive its value from the euro if and only if the euro remains stable. EuroToken will effectively become an extension of the current euro, rather than a currency itself. While the euro is unlikely to negatively influence EuroToken, opposite influences also need to be addressed. This is also why double-spending prevention is so important. If some method of unsanctioned money creation is possible the hyperinflation that would take EuroToken down could take the entire euro system with it.

While preventing double spending is a technical problem, economic problems with the EuroToken system can also threaten the euro system as a whole. An example of this is the concept of deflationary currencies. While Bitcoin intentionally built in deflation in its currency and sells it as a feature, the ECB of intentionally maintain a steady inflation of the euro. This is done for the express purpose of discouraging people from storing their funds as euros, thereby encouraging money to be invested in relevant ventures. Any form of deflation would make the euro an investment. This would lead people to passively store the currency, thus decreasing supply, driving up the price, making it an even better investment. This positive feedback loop continues until the euro becomes the only viable investment and the economy grinds to a halt. Anyone with open loans is forced to default, investment dries up, prices and wages drop, and the currency ceases to be a good denomination of value.

Even an inflationary currency is not immune from this phenomenon. A constant but low inflation can be seen as an acceptable investment to some people. If this happens on any significant scale, the managed inflation of the ECB will be counteracted by people storing euro. In times of economic

turmoil, the euro will be the safest store of wealth leading to lower investment in the economy right when invest is most needed. Currently, both private and public money are fundamentally bad at storing large amounts of money. Holding a lot of physical cash is impractical and dangerous, meanwhile storing large amounts in the bank leads to exposure to the risk of bank failure, something that is extra likely in hasher economic times. The ability of a currency to be too good a store of value is an important consideration in the design of any currency. In the context of CBDC, the ECB has been speculating on some solutions to this problem. One way is to simply limit the amount of CBDC people are allowed to hold, or to charge interest above a certain limit [1].

This is only one example where the ECB needs direct control over its currency. The ECB is directly responsible for maintaining the price stability of the euro, and any digital euro variant will have to be a part of that [42]. Because of this the centralised nature of the EuroToken validators can act as the point of control for the ECB to enforce monetary policy, to stabilize the currency and our economy.

## 6.4. Interoperability

The ECB has not yet decided on the reach they want their CBDC to have. One option is to open the system to the world. This has the benefit of increasing the reach of the euro and easing the participation in the European economy. However, there is some risk associated with such tight coupling to other economies as the effect of monetary policy at home is reduced.

Using the validator as an intermediary, EuroToken provides the option to integrate with other CBDCs in several ways. The first is by creating a mechanism for exchange between the CBDCs without a counterparty. A validator could run both EuroToken and a hypothetical DollarToken and exchange between them at a rate that can be set by agreements between the two central banks. Effectively this allows for the coupling of currencies with an opt-out at any time.

## 6.5. Universal asset storage and granular monetary policy

The digital and Peer-to-Peer nature of EuroToken provides the possibility of anonymous users, while the validator centered design allows for integration of digital identity solutions. This can potentially allow for a system where different rules can apply to anonymous accounts. This would allow the ECB to encourage the adoption of the currency domestically, while discouraging usage abroad.

Additionally, the ECB can greatly increase the granularity of its monetary policy by defining different types of EuroToken accounts. Each account type can have different rules, risks and benefits which can be enforced automatically. These become particularly interesting when considering that the current banking system can eventually be integrated.

Currently, banks store and reinvent the money of their customers with the promise that their money will return with some interest. This investment is an important mechanism that keeps the price of the currency stable and money flowing. Even if economic instability encourages people to save their wealth, the amount of money in circulation remains mostly the same as all the money in the banks is re-invested into the economy on the other end. This banking mechanism can be recreated in EuroToken. By creating different accounts at different levels of risk, users can store their money with similar risks and benefits to the current banking system. On the other end of this wallet, the user can specify other parties that are allowed to reinvest their money.

The current banking system does not give their users a choice in what their money is invested in. Within EuroToken, wallets and identity can be decoupled from banking and investing operations thus creating a system where users can cheaply move their capital between banks, investors, and the ECB.

This effectively unites the whole financial world into one accounting system, while leaving the market open. Especially when combined with e-identity, e-signatures, e-invoices, e-receipts, and smart-contracts this could usher in a whole new wave of innovation.



# 7

## Conclusion

We present what we believe to be the first digital Euro deployment with (1) offline Peer-to-Peer transfers with the potential for full disaster-proofing, (2) arbitrary scalability, (3) a real-time connectivity to the existing IBAN-based banking system, while (4) being guaranteed by the central bank.

The future of money will be digital. With commerce and banking moving online, a new modern payment system is required with features fit for the digital age. The question is: who gets to decide how these currencies are designed? Private parties like Tether and Diem are attempting to become the central third party that provides us with a payment infrastructure, but at the cost of our dependence. If we don't want opaque corporations controlling our monetary system we must direct the control somewhere else. The European Central Bank is ideally positioned to provide the centralised control that is required to achieve the goals of money, while remaining accountable to its users.

In order to create a currency that is scalable we use a block-DAG structure where every user has their own personal blockchain. This system is inherently distributed in its data storage and control. We then centralise the validation of transactions in validators. These validators verify the correctness of the transactions and attest to their uniqueness and compliance with the rules of the network and regulations. By maintaining the transaction history of each user on their own personal blockchain we decouple the transaction at the point of trade from the validation of the transaction. This allows transactions to happen off-line, with the potential to be expanded to a disaster proof currency that allows users to trade digital currency without internet connectivity.

We ensure price stability the same way as the psychical euro. By allowing the currency to be exchanged for traditionally banked euros, through an exchange. This is how we peg the price of EuroToken to that of the euro. The exchange can be fully regulated and controlled by the central bank, and once the money is tokenised it belongs fully to the user, and represents a claim on the central bank itself. The party that runs the exchange is only responsible for validating correctness and exchanging euro and EuroToken according to ECB rules and regulations. This effectively creates a new digital form of public money that is owned by the individual and backed by the European Central Bank itself.

We implemented a proof of concept on top of the TrustChain blockchain, created a mobile wallet that allows people to transfer the currency, and implemented a gateway application that handles the transaction validation and exchange of EuroToken. We demonstrated our implementation in two field trials and verified the usability of the system. We enabled users to safely transact by scanning a QR code to send money using only their phone. We also showed the off-line transfer capability of the EuroToken in the real world.

We validated our design by running a simulation of multiple EuroToken wallets and validators. We measured how the network scales over time and found a linear increase in network transaction processing capacity as the number of validators increases. Additionally, we demonstrated how our method of checkpointing allowed for transactions between users in constant time in terms of both the size of the network, and the size of each user's personal blockchain.

Going back to our research question, EuroToken is a digital, extensible, secure, scalable, price stable extension to the Euro that allows for near-instant world-wide and off-line transfer. EuroToken allows our money to remain subject to the democratic process and keeps our transaction data out of the hands of those who are not incentivized to protect us. It has the potential to become the basis

for the financial infrastructure of Europe unifying the scattered payment and banking system of today, opening the door to a whole new wave of innovation.

# Bibliography

- [1] Interview with der spiegel. <https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/inter/date/2021/html/ecb.in210209~af9c628e30.en.html>. (Accessed on 06/13/2021).
- [2] Delft café premieres with eemcs blockchain euro. <https://www.delta.tudelft.nl/article/delft-cafe-premieres-eemcs-blockchain-euro>. (Accessed on 04/19/2021).
- [3] Empsa - european mobile payment systems association. <https://empsa.org/>. (Accessed on 04/28/2021).
- [4] Stablecoin on eos blockchain | eosdt. <https://eosdt.com/en>. (Accessed on 04/30/2021).
- [5] Ethereum 2.0 (eth2) vision | ethereum.org. <https://ethereum.org/en/eth2/vision/>. (Accessed on 04/28/2021).
- [6] International trade in goods. [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/International\\_trade\\_in\\_goods#Strong\\_increase\\_in\\_trade\\_in\\_goods\\_with\\_China\\_in\\_2010-2020](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/International_trade_in_goods#Strong_increase_in_trade_in_goods_with_China_in_2010-2020). (Accessed on 04/12/2021).
- [7] Tangle\_white\_paper\_v1.4.2.pdf. [https://assets.ctfassets.net/r1dr6vzfxhev/4i3OM9JTleiE8M6Y04Ii28/d58bc5bb71cebe4adc18fadea1a79037/Tangle\\_White\\_Paper\\_v1.4.2.pdf](https://assets.ctfassets.net/r1dr6vzfxhev/4i3OM9JTleiE8M6Y04Ii28/d58bc5bb71cebe4adc18fadea1a79037/Tangle_White_Paper_v1.4.2.pdf). (Accessed on 04/12/2021).
- [8] Nano\_whitepaper\_en.pdf. [https://content.nano.org/whitepaper/Nano\\_Whitepaper\\_en.pdf](https://content.nano.org/whitepaper/Nano_Whitepaper_en.pdf). (Accessed on 04/12/2021).
- [9] Tribler/py-ipv8: Python implementation of the ipv8 layer. <https://github.com/Tribler/py-ipv8/>. (Accessed on 03/23/2021).
- [10] Online wallet for money transfers & online payments | skrill. <https://www.skrill.com/en/>. (Accessed on 04/28/2021).
- [11] Stasis: Digital assets for intelligent investors. <https://stasis.net/>. (Accessed on 04/30/2021).
- [12] Tribler/trustchain-superapp: Kotlin implementation of trustchain and ipv8 with rich networking: multihoming of local bluetooth+4g, decentral social networking, udp hole punching, etc. <https://github.com/Tribler/trustchain-superapp>. (Accessed on 03/23/2021).
- [13] Introducing usd coin. <https://www.circle.com/blog/introducing-usd-coin>. (Accessed on 04/30/2021).
- [14] Requiem for a bright idea. <https://www.forbes.com/forbes/1999/1101/6411390a.html?sh=4e0608c6715f>. (Accessed on 04/12/2021).
- [15] libp2p. <https://libp2p.io/>. (Accessed on 04/26/2021).
- [16] libtorrent. <https://www.libtorrent.org/>. (Accessed on 04/26/2021).
- [17] Directive 94/19/ec of the european parliament and of the council of 30 may 1994 on deposit-guarantee schemes. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A31994L0019, May 1994>. (Accessed on 06/07/2021).
- [18] *Introduction to PayPal*, pages 1–12. Apress, Berkeley, CA, 2007. ISBN 978-1-4302-0353-7. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4302-0353-7\_1. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4302-0353-7\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4302-0353-7_1).

- [19] Tethers market cap. <https://forkast.news/tether-usdt-reserves-stablecoin-bitfinex/>, June 2021. (Accessed on 06/14/2021).
- [20] Amelia Acker and Dhiraj Murthy. Venmo: Understanding mobile payments as social media. In *Proceedings of the 9th international conference on social media and society*, pages 5–12, 2018.
- [21] ABN AMRO. Tikkie - bedrijven. <https://www.tikkie.me/bedrijven>. (Accessed on 04/27/2021).
- [22] De Nederlandse Bank. Digital currency issued by central banks can protect public interests in payment systems. <https://www.dnb.nl/en/actueel/dnb/dnbulletin-2020/digital-currency-issued-by-central-banks-can-protect-public-interests-in-payment-systems/>, . (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [23] Norges Bank. Central bank digital currencies. <https://www.norges-bank.no/contentassets/166efadb3d73419c8c50f9471be26402/nbpapers-1-2018-centralbankdigitalcurrencies.pdf?v=05/18/2018121950&ft=.pdf&v=05/18/2018121950&ft=.pdf>, . (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [24] Morten Linnemann Bech and Rodney Garratt. Central bank cryptocurrencies. [https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r\\_gt1709f.htm](https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_gt1709f.htm). (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [25] Siddhartha Bhattacharyya, Sanjeev Jha, Kurian Tharakunnel, and J. Christopher Westland. Data mining for credit card fraud: A comparative study. *Decision Support Systems*, 50(3): 602–613, 2011. ISSN 0167-9236. doi: 10.1016/j.dss.2010.08.008. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167923610001326>.
- [26] R.W. Blokzijl. [rwblokzijl/stablecoin-exchange](https://github.com/rwblokzijl/stablecoin-exchange). <https://github.com/rwblokzijl/stablecoin-exchange>. (Accessed on 03/23/2021).
- [27] Stefan A Brands. An efficient off-line electronic cash system based on the representation problem, 1993.
- [28] Jetse Brouwer. Consensus-less security, 2020. URL <http://resolver.tudelft.nl/uuid:d3d56dd8-60ee-47f7-b23a-cdc6c2650e14>.
- [29] Vitalik Buterin. Ethereum: A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform. <https://github.com/ethereum/wiki/wiki/White-Paper>, 2013.
- [30] D. Chaum. David chaum on electronic commerce how much do you trust big brother? *IEEE Internet Computing*, 1(6):8–16, 1997. doi: 10.1109/MIC.1997.643931.
- [31] David Chaum. Blind signatures for untraceable payments. In *Advances in cryptology*, pages 199–203. Springer, 1983.
- [32] David Chaum, Christian Grothoff, and Thomas Moser. How to issue a central bank digital currency, 2021.
- [33] CoinDesk. Bitcoin transactions are more expensive than ever - coindesk. <https://www.coindesk.com/bitcoin-transaction-fees-more-expensive-than-ever>. (Accessed on 04/28/2021).
- [34] Richard N. Cooper, Rudiger Dornbusch, and Robert E. Hall. The gold standard: Historical facts and future prospects. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1982(1):1–56, 1982. ISSN 00072303, 15334465. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2534316>.
- [35] Swiss Federal Council. Central bank digital currency. <https://www.news.admin.ch/newsd/message/attachments/59639.pdf>. (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [36] George Danezis and Sarah Meiklejohn. Centrally banked cryptocurrencies, 2015.
- [37] Glyn Davies. *A history of money: from ancient times to the present day*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, London, 2002.

- [38] Banque de France. Experiment on the use of central bank digital currency (cbdc). <https://www.banque-france.fr/en/communique-de-presse/experiment-use-central-bank-digital-currency-cbdc>. (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [39] Martijn de Vos and Johan Pouwelse. Real-time money routing by trusting strangers with your funds. <https://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid:c51ac99d-3013-44b3-8ddd-fbd951a2454a>, 2018.
- [40] TU Delft. Tribler/kotlin-ipv8: P2p communication library for android. <https://github.com/Tribler/kotlin-ipv8>. (Accessed on 04/26/2021).
- [41] Diem. White paper | diem association. <https://www.diem.com/en-us/white-paper/>, 04 2020. (Accessed on 03/19/2021).
- [42] ECB European Central Bank. Report on a digital euro. [https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/Report\\_on\\_a\\_digital\\_euro~4d7268b458.en.pdf](https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/Report_on_a_digital_euro~4d7268b458.en.pdf), 10 2020. (Accessed on 03/19/2021).
- [43] Forbes. Alibaba, tencent, five others to receive first chinese government cryptocurrency. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaeldelcastillo/2019/08/27/alibaba-tencent-five-others-to-recieve-first-chinese-government-cryptocurrency/?sh=33d423fb1a51>, 08 2019. (Accessed on 03/22/2021).
- [44] Rachid Guerraoui, Petr Kuznetsov, Matteo Monti, Matej Pavlovic, Dragos-Adrian Seredinschi, and Yann Vonlanthen. Scalable byzantine reliable broadcast (extended version). 2019. doi: 10.4230/LIPIcs.DISC.2019.22.
- [45] Charles M. Kahn and William Roberds. Credit and identity theft. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 55(2):251–264, 2008. ISSN 0304-3932. doi: 10.1016/j.jmoneco.2007.08.001. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304393207001250>.
- [46] LibP2P. Peer identity :: libp2p documentation. <https://docs.libp2p.io/concepts/peer-id/>. (Accessed on 04/26/2021).
- [47] Tether International Limited. Tether whitepaper. <https://tether.to/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/TetherWhitePaper.pdf>, 06 2016. (Accessed on 03/19/2021).
- [48] Karl Menger. On the Origin of Money. *The Economic Journal*, 2(6):239–255, 06 1892. ISSN 0013-0133. doi: 10.2307/2956146. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/2956146>.
- [49] Michael Ehrmann Miguel Ampudia. Financial inclusion: what's it worth? <https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/scpwp/ecbwp1990.en.pdf>, 01 2017. (Accessed on 03/23/2021).
- [50] Simona Moagar-Poladian, George-Cornel Dumitrescu, and Ion Alexandru Tanase. Retail e-commerce (e-tail)-evolution, characteristics and perspectives in china, the usa and europe. *Global Economic Observer*, 5(1):167, 2017.
- [51] Satoshi Nakamoto. Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system, 2009. URL <http://www.bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf>.
- [52] Danmarks Nationalbank. Central bank digital currency in denmark? <https://www.nationalbanken.dk/en/publications/Pages/2017/12/Central-bank-digital-currency-in-Denmark.aspx>. (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [53] Reserve Bank of Australia. Retail central bank digital currency: Design considerations, rationales and implications | bulletin – september quarter 2020 | rba. <https://www.rba.gov.au/publications/bulletin/2020/sept/retail-central-bank-digital-currency-design-considerations-rationales-and-implications.html>. (Accessed on 06/02/2021).

- [54] Bank of England. Central bank digital currency: opportunities, challenges and design | bank of england. <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/paper/2020/central-bank-digital-currency-opportunities-challenges-and-design-discussion-paper>, . (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [55] Bank of England. Discussion paper - central bank digital currency: Opportunities, challenges and design. <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/-/media/boe/files/paper/2020/central-bank-digital-currency-opportunities-challenges-and-design.pdf?la=en&hash=DFAD18646A77C00772AF1C5B18E63E71F68E4593>, . (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [56] Central Bank of Iceland. Rafkróna? - central bank digital currency. [https://www.cbi.is/library/Skraarsafn---EN/Reports/Special\\_Publication\\_12.pdf](https://www.cbi.is/library/Skraarsafn---EN/Reports/Special_Publication_12.pdf), September 2018. (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [57] Bank of Israel. Report of the team to examine the issue of central bank digital currencies. <https://www.boi.org.il/en/NewsAndPublications/PressReleases/Documents/Digital%20currency.pdf>. (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [58] ☐☐☐☐ Bank of Japan. Central bank digital currency. <https://www.boj.or.jp/en/paym/digital/index.htm/>. (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [59] Bank of Russia. A digital ruble | bank of russia. [http://cbr.ru/eng/analytics/d\\_ok/dig\\_ruble/](http://cbr.ru/eng/analytics/d_ok/dig_ruble/). (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [60] Reuters. China's \$1.5 million digital currency giveaway impressed analysts. shoppers, not so much | reuters. [https://www.reuters.com/article/china-currency-digital/chinas-1-5-mln-digital-currency-giveaway-impressed-analysts-shoppers-not-so-much-idUSL4N2H71NR?rpc=401&\\_t=10](https://www.reuters.com/article/china-currency-digital/chinas-1-5-mln-digital-currency-giveaway-impressed-analysts-shoppers-not-so-much-idUSL4N2H71NR?rpc=401&_t=10) 2020. (Accessed on 03/19/2021).
- [61] Sveriges Riksbank. E-krona pilot phase 1. <https://www.riksbank.se/globalassets/media/rapporter/e-krona/2021/e-krona-pilot-phase-1.pdf>, April 2021. (Accessed on 06/02/2021).
- [62] Matouš Skála. Technology stack for decentralized mobile services | tu delft repositories. <http://resolver.tudelft.nl/uuid:bd3a5fdb-430b-4af6-bc33-eab436f4f7db>, 08 2020. (Accessed on 03/23/2021).
- [63] The Maker Team. The maker protocol white paper | feb 2020. <https://makerdao.com/en/whitepaper/>, 02 2020. (Accessed on 03/19/2021).
- [64] Fed The Federal Reserve. Preconditions for a general-purpose central bank digital currency. <https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/notes/feds-notes/preconditions-for-a-general-purpose-central-bank-digital-currency-20210224.htm>, 02 2021. (Accessed on 03/19/2021).
- [65] Wei-Tek Tsai, Zihao Zhao, Chi Zhang, Lian Yu, and Enyan Deng. A multi-chain model for cbdc, 2018.
- [66] Just van Stam, Kevin Chong, Chris Lemaire, and Minas Melas. Liquidity pool · tribler/trustchain-superapp. [https://github.com/Tribler/trustchain-superapp/blob/master/liquidity-pool/README\\_GROUP2.md](https://github.com/Tribler/trustchain-superapp/blob/master/liquidity-pool/README_GROUP2.md). (Accessed on 07/04/2021).
- [67] ECB Statistical Data Warehouse. Share of card payments in number of total payment transactions. [https://sdw.ecb.europa.eu/quickview.do?SERIES\\_KEY=169.PSS.A.U2.F000.I1A.Z00Z.NP.X0.20.Z0Z.Z](https://sdw.ecb.europa.eu/quickview.do?SERIES_KEY=169.PSS.A.U2.F000.I1A.Z00Z.NP.X0.20.Z0Z.Z). (Accessed on 03/23/2021).