

Selecting Miners within Blockchain-based Systems Using Evolutionary Algorithms for Energy Optimisation

Akram Alofi

School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham
Birmingham, United Kingdom
Computer Science Department, Jamoum University
College, Umm Al-Qura University
Jamoum, Saudi Arabia
ama848@cs.bham.ac.uk

Robert Hendley

School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham
Birmingham, United Kingdom
r.j.hendley@cs.bham.ac.uk

Mahmoud A. Bokhari

Computer Science Department, Taibah University
Medina, Saudi Arabia
Optimisation and Logistics, School of Computer Science,
The University of Adelaide
Adelaide, Australia
mabokhari@taibahu.edu.sa

Rami Bahsoon

School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham
Birmingham, United Kingdom
r.bahsoon@cs.bham.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we represent the problem of selecting miners within a blockchain-based system as a subset selection problem. We formulate the problem of minimising blockchain energy consumption as an optimisation problem with two conflicting objectives: energy consumption and trust. The proposed model is compared across different algorithms to demonstrate its performance.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Software and its engineering** → *Peer-to-peer architectures*;

KEYWORDS

Blockchain, Mining, Optimisation, Evolutionary Algorithms

ACM Reference Format:

Akram Alofi, Mahmoud A. Bokhari, Robert Hendley, and Rami Bahsoon. 2021. Selecting Miners within Blockchain-based Systems Using Evolutionary Algorithms for Energy Optimisation. In *2021 Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion (GECCO '21 Companion)*, July 10–14, 2021, Lille, France. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3449726.3459558>

1 INTRODUCTION

Blockchain technology is a novel form of replicated database (‘distributed ledger’) that operates autonomously without a centralised control. It has several key characteristics, such as auditability, anonymity, persistence and decentralisation. Although this technology holds much promise for the future, it also has some challenges. A major issue is the energy consumption of the Proof of Work (PoW) consensus algorithm. PoW consumes a large amount of energy and will have significant environmental consequences if it is widely employed. In November 2019, a transaction of the most common

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).
GECCO '21 Companion, July 10–14, 2021, Lille, France
© 2021 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-8351-6/21/07.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3449726.3459558>

Table 1: Examples of Blockchain Objectives for Optimisation Models

	Environmental	Security	Performance
Mining Device	[9]	[8]	[8]
Number of Nodes	[6]	[6]	[6]
Consensus Algorithm	[9]	[13]	[13]
Blockchain Type	[4]	[13]	[1]

blockchain-based system (Bitcoin [7]) required on average 431 kWh of electricity which is enough energy to power 21 US homes for 24 hours [12].

Since PoW based blockchain-based systems employ considerable computing resources (and thus have considerable energy consumption), many researchers and organisations have proposed alternative consensus algorithms, in an effort to reduce its energy consumption. However, minimising energy consumption has not been formulated as an optimisation problem. In this work, we formulate the problem of selecting miners for mining blocks in a blockchain-based system as a subset selection problem.

The problem is represented as selecting a set of miners within a blockchain network, where each miner demands a level of energy and has a level of reputation. Given the conflicting goals of minimising energy and maximising trust, we use evolutionary algorithms (EAs) to select miners that consume less energy and have high reputation values. The fitness function considers energy versus reputation.

2 OPTIMISATION PROBLEM FORMULATION

Blockchain-based systems are like many other real-world applications where there are trade-offs. In blockchain-based systems, the many objectives show the advantages of compromise, which can be considered one sort of optimisation problem. These objectives include, among others, energy consumption, trust, decentralisation, scalability, performance and security. We have summarised some conflicting blockchain objectives that can be utilised to optimise blockchain-based systems (See Table 1).

There have been several interesting and successful implementations of multi-objective optimisation evolutionary algorithms

(MOEAs) for finding optimum and near-optimum solutions for different real-world application problems such as optimising the energy use of software [2, 3]. However, MOEAs have not been used to optimise for energy use and trust in blockchain-based systems.

2.1 Optimisation Model

In this work, we utilise MOEAs to improve the energy consumption of blockchain-based systems. We formulate the problem of minimising the energy consumption of a blockchain-based system by selecting a subset of miners, which decreases the energy use and maximises the trust level of the system; miners selection seeks high reputation values.

2.1.1 Energy Consumption Objective. The focus of this work is on saving energy expended by miners during computing procedures to boost the sustainability of blockchain-based systems. The energy consumed during mining procedures accounts for a large proportion of the energy consumed by blockchain-based systems. Reducing this energy consumption level is the optimisation objective: the smaller the energy value, the fitter the solution. We calculate the total energy of each miner based on the energy consumption of the devices used during 24 hours.

2.1.2 Reputation Objective. Our model, which was inspired by PoS and PoW, features a reduced number of miners, which means we need to increase the blockchain-based systems' trust levels to aid the PoW consensus algorithm. The trustworthiness of miners within a blockchain network is evaluated after each published block. Thereafter, the reputation values are calculated using two features: each miner's stake and the number of blocks added by each miner are collected and used to calculate the reputation values.

3 EVALUATION

To evaluate our proposal, we use a blockchain simulator (Bitcoin-Simulator [5]) to collect miners' data (the number of blocks produce by each miner and the rewards and fees miners earn). The simulator was set to simulate the behaviour of 160 miners for mining 4073 blocks. To run our experiments, we use the MOEA framework¹. Since we address the optimisation of the energy consumption for selecting miners as a new optimisation problem, we integrated our proposed fitness functions into two EAs (SPEA2 and NSGAII). We also use the Random Search (RS) algorithm as a baseline for our comparisons. Each algorithm was run 100 times with an evaluation budget of 40,000 per run. To approximate the Pareto front, we combine each algorithm's non-dominated set of solutions.

Figure 1 shows that SPEA2 and NSGA-II consistently find non-dominated solutions from the Pareto front. For minimising the energy use and maximising the reputation, we can clearly see that the RS is the worst performing among the algorithms.

The results of the statistical test (two-tailed Wilcoxon rank-sum test [11]) and the effect size (Vargha and Delaney effect size [10]) for the performance of each algorithm show that the hypervolume of the Random Search algorithm is significantly lower than the other algorithm hypervolume. Of all the algorithms, NSGAII performed




Figure 1: Energy vs. Reputation

the best. The algorithm generated the most diverse, non-dominated set, which covers most of the search space.

For future work, we plan to conduct further experiments and investigations such as using different MOEAs and comparing their performance, conducting sensitivity analysis on the algorithms configurations. We will integrate our approach with the common consensus algorithm PoW and their variants to report on the effectiveness of the integration on its energy efficiency with several dimensions such as mining and energy source (e.g. renewable).

REFERENCES

- [1] Seyed Mojtaba Hosseini Bamakan, Amirhossein Motavali, and Alireza Babaei Bondarti. 2020. A survey of blockchain consensus algorithms performance evaluation criteria. *Expert Systems with Applications* 154 (2020), 113385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113385>
- [2] Mahmoud A. Bokhari, Brad Alexander, and Markus Wagner. 2018. In-Vivo and Off-line Optimisation of Energy Use in the Presence of Small Energy Signals: A Case Study on a Popular Android Library. In *Proceedings of the 15th EAI International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Systems: Computing, Networking and Services (MobiQuitous '18)*. ACM, 207–215. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3286978.3287014>
- [3] Bobby R. Bruce, Justyna Petke, Mark Harman, and Earl T. Barr. 2019. Approximate Oracles and Synergy in Software Energy Search Spaces. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 45, 11 (2019), 1150–1169. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2018.2827066>
- [4] Fran Casino, Thomas K. Dasaklis, and Constantinos Patsakis. 2019. A Systematic Literature review of Blockchain-based Applications: Current status, Classification and Open Issues. *Telematics and Informatics* 36 (2019), 55 – 81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2018.11.006>
- [5] Arthur Gervais, Ghassan O. Karame, Karl Wüst, Vasileios Glykantzis, Hubert Ritzdorf, and Srđjan Capkun. 2016. On the Security and Performance of Proof of Work Blockchains. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS '16)*. ACM, 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978341>
- [6] Seungmo Kim. 2019. Impacts of Mobility on Performance of Blockchain in VANET. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 68646–68655. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2918411>
- [7] Satoshi Nakamoto. 2008. Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System. (2008). Retrieved March 2, 2019 from <https://bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf>
- [8] Wei Ren, Jingjing Hu, Tianqing Zhu, Yi Ren, and Kim-Kwang Raymond Choo. 2020. A flexible method to defend against computationally resourceful miners in blockchain proof of work. *Information Sciences* 507 (2020), 161 – 171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2019.08.031>
- [9] Jon Truby. 2018. Decarbonizing Bitcoin: Law and Policy Choices for Reducing the Energy Consumption of Blockchain Technologies and Digital Currencies. *Energy Research & Social Science* 44 (2018), 399 – 410.
- [10] András Vargha and Harold D. Delaney. 2000. A Critique and Improvement of the CL Common Language Effect Size Statistics of McGraw and Wong. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics* 25, 2 (2000), 101–132.
- [11] Frank Wilcoxon. 1992. Individual comparisons by ranking methods. In *Breakthroughs in statistics*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-4380-9_16
- [12] Yang Xiao, Ning Zhang, Wenjing Lou, and Y. Thomas Hou. 2020. A Survey of Distributed Consensus Protocols for Blockchain Networks. *IEEE Communications Surveys Tutorials* 22, 2 (2020), 1432–1465.
- [13] Xiaoying Zheng, Yongxin Zhu, and Xueming Si. 2019. A Survey on Challenges and Progresses in Blockchain Technologies: A Performance and Security Perspective. *Applied Sciences* 9, 22 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3390/app9224731>

¹MOEA Framework version 2.13 available at <http://moeaframework.org>, accessed 10 December 2020.