




DORA: Distributed Oracle Agreement with Simple Majority^{**}

Prasanth Chakka*, Saurabh Joshi[†], Aniket Kate[‡], Joshua Tobkin[§] and David Yang[¶]
*[†][‡][§][¶]Supra Research
[‡] Purdue University
[¶] Hamad bin Khalifa University

Abstract—Oracle networks feeding off-chain information to a blockchain are required to solve a distributed agreement problem since these networks receive information from multiple sources and at different times. We make a key observation that in most cases, the value obtained by oracle network nodes from multiple information sources are in close proximity. We define a notion of agreement distance and leverage the availability of a state machine replication (SMR) service to solve this distributed agreement problem with an honest simple majority of nodes instead of the conventional requirement of an honest super majority of nodes. Values from multiple nodes being in close proximity, therefore, forming a coherent cluster, is one of the keys to its efficiency. Our asynchronous protocol also embeds a fallback mechanism if the coherent cluster formation fails. Through simulations using real-world exchange data from seven prominent exchanges, we show that even for very small agreement distance values, the protocol would be able to form coherent clusters and therefore, can safely tolerate up to $1/2$ fraction of Byzantine nodes. We also show that, for a small statistical error, it is possible to choose the size of the oracle network to be significantly smaller than the entire system tolerating up to a $1/3$ fraction of Byzantine failures. This allows the oracle network to operate much more efficiently and horizontally scale much better.

Index Terms—Blockchain, Oracle, Byzantine Agreement, Agreement Distance

I. INTRODUCTION

Connecting existing Web 2.0 data sources to blockchains is crucial for next-generation blockchain applications such as decentralized finance (DeFi). An oracle network [12], [19] consisting of a network of independent nodes aims to address this issue by allowing blockchain smart contracts to function over inputs obtained from existing Web 2.0 data, real-world sensors, and computation interfaces.

Performing this information exchange securely, however, is not trivial. First, only a few data sources may be available to pick from, and some of them may crash (due to a *Denial of Service* (DOS) attacks or system failures), or even send incorrect information (due to a system compromise or some economic incentives). [15], [18] Second, as most of the data sources today do not offer data in a signed form, the oracle network also becomes vulnerable due to the compromise of a subset of oracle network nodes, a subset of data sources, or due to the compromise of a combination of the two. Third, the adversary may go after the availability of the system (and at times safety) by malevolently slowing down the protocols.

We address these issues and propose a robust and scalable distributed solution for solving the oracle problem. While our approach can withstand extreme adversarial settings, we make some real-world synchrony and input-data distribution observations, and introduce oracle execution sharding. This makes our solution scale quite well as the number of oracle services and the size of the oracle network grows.

One of the key objectives of an oracle service is to take a piece of off-chain information and bring it to the on-chain world. Therefore, any such service must have three components, (i) sources of information, which we shall refer to as data sources, (ii) network of nodes, and (iii) target component in an on-chain environment, for example, a smart contract. To maintain fault tolerance capabilities as well as the decentralized nature of the service, it is necessary to have multiple data sources in addition to having a network of multiple nodes. The oracle agreement problem focuses on producing a unique value that is representative of the values emanating from the honest data sources that are feeding information to the oracle network. We need a protocol for ensuring that all the honest oracle nodes have the same output that is representative of all the honest data sources. Notice that this is non-trivial as all the honest nodes may still have different outputs since they may be listening to different sets of data sources at slightly different times. We call this problem a *Distributed Oracle Agreement* (DORA) problem. DORA shares the same termination and agreement properties with the well-studied *Byzantine agreement* (BA) problem [8], [27]. However, the crucial validity property for DORA is significantly more generic. BA demands that the output be the same as an honest node’s input if all the honest nodes have the same input. DORA is a generalization of this, where the output will be a value within a range defined by the minimum and maximum honest inputs. As DORA generalizes the BA problem, it requires the standard 67% honest majority among the participating nodes. As the system scale and number of participating nodes increase, solutions to DORA may not scale, especially when we collect many different kinds of variables. For a full-fledged blockchain system, we expect the number of variables, for which representative values are to be computed, to be in the order of several hundred.

Let us first understand how one of the state-of-the-art oracle OCR protocol [40] works. An oracle network consisting of multiple nodes obtains different values from multiple sources

** Author names are in alphabetical order of their last name.




Fig. 1: OCR protocol: Network of oracle nodes obtaining data from data sources, running a Byzantine agreement protocol and then broadcasting the agreed upon value to the world via SMR/Blockchain

of information as shown in Figure 1 and agrees on a single report/output. As we discuss in Section III-B, this problem is closely related to the standard Byzantine agreement problem [23]. In presence of Byzantine nodes and non-synchronous communication links, the oracle network has to have at least $3f + 1$ nodes, where f is the upper-bound on the number of nodes that can turn Byzantine during the agreement protocol [7]. These oracle nodes, run a Byzantine agreement protocol, to agree on a subset of $2f + 1$ values. In OCR, one of the nodes is designated as a *leader* which would send this agreed-upon subset to the Blockchain. If the leader happens to be Byzantine, after a certain timeout period, the OCR protocol initiates a leader change.

A crucial point to note is that in OCR, the SMR/Blockchain is used merely as a means to broadcast/publish the agreed-upon set to the world. Even without the SMR/Blockchain, OCR protocol ensures that all the honest nodes of the oracle network agree upon the exact same subset of $2f + 1$ values. In the network with f Byzantine nodes, $2f + 1$ values are required to ensure that statistical aggregation via computing the median does not deviate *too much*. Essentially, $2f + 1$ values ensure that the median is upper-bounded and lower-bounded by values from the honest nodes.

Blockchain ensures that the messages on the chain have a total order. Further, it also ensures that any entity observing the state of a Blockchain would witness the exact same total order. Not utilizing the ability of Blockchain to act as an ordering service is a missed opportunity by the oracle networks in general.

A. Our Approach

We leverage the ordering capabilities of the Blockchain by presenting a protocol that both sends and receives information from the Blockchain to accomplish the goal of publishing a value on the Blockchain that is representative of the values from all the data sources. Towards computing a representative value, we redefine the notion of agreement. We say that two nodes *agree* with each other if the values that they obtained from data sources are within a pre-defined parameter called *agreement distance*. We say that a set of values form a *coherent*




Fig. 2: The oracle nodes collect information from various data sources. The oracle nodes exchange information with the aggregators to vote for the proposal of a coherent cluster of size $f + 1$. The aggregators post these clusters to Blockchain and all oracle nodes consider the first cluster to be authoritative.

cluster if all the values in that set are at most agreement distance away from one another. The oracle network now merely needs to agree on a coherent cluster of size $f + 1$. Since there would be at least one honest value in any such coherent cluster, any statistical aggregator such as the mean or the median would be at most agreement distance away from an honest value, thus ensuring that the final agreed upon value does not deviate *too much* from an honest value.

The way our protocol achieves the agreement on a coherent cluster of size $f + 1$ is that the first such cluster posted on the Blockchain would be considered authoritative for a given round of agreement.

Just like OCR protocol, we also have a designated node that we call an *aggregator*. These aggregators would gather $f + 1$ signatures on a proposed set of $f + 1$ values provided by the nodes and then post it on the SMR/Blockchain. To circumvent the problem of having a Byzantine aggregator, we sample a set of aggregators, henceforth called a family of aggregators, from the entire oracle network such that there is at least one honest aggregator. This helps us avoid having to initiate any aggregator change protocol. So now, we have multiple aggregators posting sets of size $f + 1$ to the Blockchain, but only the first one would be accepted as authoritative by the oracle network. Note that all such coherent clusters of size $f + 1$ contain values that are at most agreement distance away from some honest value.

With the redefined notion of agreement, and utilizing ordering capabilities of the Blockchain, we reduce the number of oracle nodes required to $2f + 1$ instead of the usual requirement of $3f + 1$. Figure 2 shows how information flows across various components of our oracle protocol. Note that now the oracle nodes only have to communicate back and forth with the family of aggregators. All the oracle nodes and the aggregators observe the total order in which information appears on the SMR/Blockchain. Aggregators are the only set of nodes that sends information to the Blockchain.

Under unusual circumstances when none of the aggregators is able to form a coherent cluster, our protocol switches to a fallback mechanism. In this fallback mechanism, the requirement of total nodes again increases to $3f + 1$ out of which the aggregators wait for $2f + 1$ nodes to provide a value and compute a median. In this fallback mechanism, the arithmetic mean can not be used anymore since the values introduced by the Byzantine nodes in this set of size $2f + 1$ could be unbounded. Therefore, our fallback mechanism, along the same lines as OCR, computes a median from the agreed upon set of size $2f + 1$.

Our idea of the reduced requirement for the number of nodes, hinges upon the honest nodes producing values in close proximity most of the time. To prove that this assumption is practical and well-founded, we take BTC price information from 7 exchanges, that include FTX, and run a simulation of our protocol on this data covering a 30 day period that includes the turbulent period of FTX collapse [24]. We run simulations where the round of agreement happens every 30 and 60 seconds. These simulations corroborate our close proximity of honest values assumption. We observe that for agreement distance as low as \$25 and \$53, when the average BTC price is around \$19605, a coherent cluster can be formed in 93% and 99% rounds of agreement.

To further scale our solution, we introduce execution sharding by sampling multiple sub-committees from the $3f + 1$ nodes available in the entire system. The size and the number of such sub-committees are chosen such that each sub-committee has an honest simple majority with a very high probability. Since under normal circumstances we only need an honest simple majority, we equally divide the responsibilities to track multiple variables and bring their price information to the chain equally among these sub-committees. Since a sub-committee can now only provide a probabilistic safety guarantee, we analyze it in Section IV-B and establish that with a few hundred nodes, the safety guarantee holds with a very high probability.

The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We redefine the agreement notion by introducing a parameter called *agreement distance* (Section II).
- We propose a novel protocol that achieves agreement with $2f + 1$ nodes, where f of the nodes could be Byzantine (Section III-C).
- We propose a multi-aggregator model in our protocol to ensure liveness without introducing extra latency of aggregator/leader change (Section III-C).
- We demonstrate via empirical analysis of real-world data (Section IV) that most of the time the honest nodes would be able to provide values in very close proximity, therefore, the protocol can function with $2f + 1$ nodes with very small margins of potential error.
- Probability analysis of effects of the size of the network of nodes and the size of the family of aggregators on the safety of the protocol is provided in Section IV-B. It is evident that with a few hundred nodes in the entire system, and with 10 – 15 nodes in the family of

aggregators, the protocol can function safely with very high probability.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce some preliminaries and notations to which we will refer for the remainder of this paper.

A. Oracle Network

Let $|S|$ denote the cardinality of a set S . We shall use $\mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(X)$ to denote the median of a set X of values. Our oracle network consists of a set N_t of $|N_t|$ nodes, which we also call a tribe. Among these, at most $f_t < \frac{|N_t|}{3}$ nodes may get compromised, that is to turn Byzantine, thus, deviating from an agreed-upon protocol and behaving in an arbitrary fashion. A node is *honest* if it is never Byzantine. We assume a static adversary that corrupts its nodes before the protocol begins.

From these N_t nodes, towards developing scalable solution, we also uniformly randomly draw a sub-committees N_c , henceforth called a clan, of size $|N_c|$ such that at most $f_c < \frac{|N_c|}{2}$ nodes are Byzantine in a clan. The clan nodes are sampled uniformly at random from the tribe, and we ensure that the statistical error probability of a clan having more than $\lfloor \frac{|N_c|}{2} \rfloor$ Byzantine nodes is negligible. Probability analysis for such sampling is provided in Section IV-B.

All oracle nodes are connected by pair-wise authenticated point-to-point links. We assume this communication infrastructure to be asynchronous such that the (network) adversary can arbitrarily delay and reorder messages between two honest parties. As typical for all asynchronous systems, for the system’s liveness properties, we assume that the adversary cannot drop messages between two honest parties.

We initialize the protocol with a unique identifier to prevent replay attacks across concurrent protocol instances but do not explicitly mention this in the text.

A signed messages m from a node p_i are denoted by $m(\cdot)_i$. Similar to most recent SMR/blockchain designs, we assume a $(n, n - f)$ threshold BLS [9], [28] signature setup. We denote an $n - f$ threshold signature on the message m as a quorum certificate QC_m .

While the use of threshold signatures offers a simple abstraction and can be verified on Ethereum, we can also employ a multi-signature (multisig) setup allowed by the employed blockchain.

B. Oracle Data Sources

A data source is responsible for providing the correct value of a variable τ , which could be, say, the price of Bitcoin in US Dollars. Let DS denote a set of data sources and $BDS \subset DS$ denote the subset of these data sources which could be Byzantine. We say that a data source is Byzantine if : (i) it lies about the value of the variable, or (ii) if it is non-responsive. Otherwise, we will consider the data source to be honest. We assume that $|BDS| \leq f_d$, where f_d is the upper bound on the number of Byzantine data sources.

The goal of the tribe is to reach a consensus in a distributed fashion about a *representative value*, denoted as \mathcal{S} , of a particular τ . The notion of a representative value depends on the

underlying τ . For example, we can say that the representative value of a particular stock could be considered to be a mean of the values of the stock at various stock exchanges.

In this paper, for now, we assume that for the variable τ of interest, the arithmetic mean μ of values of τ from various data sources is the representative value.

An observation of a node p_i from a data-source ds_j of a variable τ is denoted as $o(p_i, ds_j, \tau)$. We say that an observation $o(p_i, ds_j, \tau)$ is an honest observation if both p_i and ds_j are honest. In an ideal world without any Byzantine nodes or Byzantine data sources, we would like the protocol followed by the oracle network to have the following property:

Property 1 (Ideal Representative Value). $\mathcal{S} = \frac{\sum_{ds_j \in DS} o(p_i, ds_j, \tau)}{|DS|}$ where p_i refers to any one of the honest nodes.

When the context is clear, we will just use o to denote an observation. Let O denote the set of all observations. We will use O_{p_i} to denote the observations made by node p_i . $\mathcal{H}(O)$ and $\mathcal{B}(O)$ denote the set of honest observations and Byzantine observations respectively. Let $\mathcal{H}_{min}(O_{p_i}) = \min_{\mathcal{H}(O_{p_i})}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{max}(O_{p_i}) = \max_{\mathcal{H}(O_{p_i})}$ indicate the minimum and maximum values from a given set of honest observations $\mathcal{H}(O_{p_i})$. We will just use \mathcal{H}_{min} and \mathcal{H}_{max} to refer to the minimum and the maximum values amongst all honest observations $\mathcal{H}(O)$.

We say that two observations o_1 and o_2 agree with each other if $\|o_1 - o_2\|_1 \leq \delta$. That is if the L_1 distance between them is at most δ , where δ is a pre-defined parameter known as *agreement distance*. A set of observations $CC \subseteq O$ is said to form a *coherent cluster* if $\forall_{o_1, o_2 \in CC} : \|o_1 - o_2\|_1 \leq \delta$.

We will use the terms *majority* and *super majority* to denote that some entity has a quantity strictly greater than $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{2}{3}$ fraction of the total population respectively. For example, an honest majority within a set of nodes would indicate that more than half of the nodes are honest. An honest super-majority would similarly indicate the fraction of honest nodes to be strictly greater than $\frac{2}{3}$ of all the nodes within the set.

Let \mathcal{S}_r denote the value for which the oracle network achieved a consensus for it to be considered as the representative value for a round r . We will use \mathcal{S}_{r-1} to denote the value emitted by the oracle network in the previous round.

1) *Expected Representative Value with Byzantine Actors*: We consider two kinds of bad actors in the system: (i) Byzantine data sources, and (ii) Byzantine nodes. We assume that Byzantine nodes and Byzantine data sources can collude in order to (i) prevent the oracle network from reaching a consensus in a given round, or (ii) prevent the oracle network from achieving Property 1.

In the presence of such Byzantine actors, even if a single dishonest observation gets considered for computation of the mean to compute \mathcal{S} , the Byzantine nodes can be successful in setting \mathcal{S} to deviate arbitrarily from the true representative value equivalent to a mean¹.

¹ Byzantine oracle nodes are problematic particularly as data sources do not sign their inputs.

Moreover, for the setting with $|N_t| \geq 3f_t + 1$ nodes, a rushing adversary can suggest its input only after observing the honest parties' inputs. Therefore, we can only aim for the following weaker property:

Property 2 (Honest Bounded Value). $H_{min} \leq \mathcal{S} \leq H_{max}$

As discussed in the literature [35], the agreed value is in the convex hull of the non-faulty nodes' inputs.

C. Primitive: State Machine Replication

In the form of state machine replication (SMR) [22] or blockchain, we employ a key distributed service for our system. An SMR service employs a set of replicas/nodes collectively running a deterministic service that implements an abstraction of a single, honest server, even when a subset of the servers turns Byzantine. In particular, an SMR protocol orders messages/transactions tx from clients (in our case aggregators) into a totally ordered log that continues to grow. We expect the SMR service to provide public verifiability. Namely, there is a predefined Boolean function *Verify*; a replica or a client outputs a log of transactions $\log = [tx_0, tx_1, \dots, tx_j]$ if and only if there is a publicly verifiable proof π such that $\text{Verify}(\log, \pi) = 1$.

Formally, an SMR protocol [21] then provides the following safety and liveness:

Property 3 (Safety). If $[tx_0, tx_1, \dots, tx_j]$ and $[tx'_0, tx'_1, \dots, tx'_{j'}]$ are output by two honest replicas or clients, then $tx_i = tx'_i$ for all $i \leq \min(j, j')$.

Property 4 (Liveness). If a transaction tx is input to at least one honest replica, then every honest replica eventually outputs a log containing tx .

We assume that there is an SMR/blockchain service running in the background that an oracle service can employ. Oracle network nodes are assumed to employ a simple put/get interface to the SMR service. They employ $\text{post}_{\text{SMR}}(\cdot)$ to post some (threshold) signed information (or transaction) on the SMR chain. Upon collecting and processing ordered transactions on SMR, the nodes employ “**Upon** witnessing” event handling to process the relevant messages. As communication links between oracle nodes and SMR service nodes are expected to be asynchronous, this put/get interface is expected to function completely asynchronously and provide guarantees that can be observed as an interpretation of SMR safety and liveness: (i) senders' messages appear on the blockchain eventually; (ii) different receivers observe messages at different points in time; (iii) however, all the nodes eventually observe messages in the exact same total order.

Notice that some recent works view blockchains as broadcast channels. In such cases, a sender node's message is expected to be delivered to all correct receiver nodes within a predefined number of blocks. If the receivers fail to deliver any message by the end of this period, the sender is treated as faulty. However, determining an appropriate time bound for any blockchain is challenging due to occasional network

asynchrony over the Internet, as well as transaction reordering, frontrunning [3], and eclipse attacks [2]. Even if a pessimistic bound can be established, it may be significantly worse than the usual computation and communication time. For example, in practice, the lightning network based on Bitcoin uses a time bound of approximately one day. [4] While newer blockchains with shorter block periods may be able to reduce the time-bound, the asynchronous primitive described above remains a better representation of modern blockchains.

III. THE ORACLE PROTOCOL

A. Data Feed Collection

The first step of an oracle service involves oracle nodes connecting with the data sources. As we assume that there are multiple data sources, some of them can be compromised and most of them do not sign their data feeds. Our key goal is to ensure that the honest (oracle) node's input to aggregators is representative of the honest data sources.

Towards ensuring the correctness of the honest nodes' inputs, we expect it to retrieve feeds from multiple data sources such that the median of the received values is representative of the honest values; i.e., it is inside the $[\mathcal{H}_{min}, \mathcal{H}_{max}]$ range of the honest data sources.

In this direction, we make a key synchrony assumption about communication links between data sources and oracle nodes. Unlike communication links between oracles nodes, we assume that links connecting data sources and oracle nodes to be bounded-synchronous such that if a node does not hear back from the data source over the web API/socket in a time-bound T_{ds} , the node can assume that the source has become faulty/Byzantine.

In this bounded-synchronous communication setting, data feed collection works as shown in Algorithm 1.

- 1) We expect that up to f_d data sources may become Byzantine.
Therefore, out of abundant caution, we mandate that every oracle node connects to $2f_d + 1$ data sources ².
- 2) Every node sends a request to their assigned set of data sources ADS and then starts the timer T_{ds} . (Lines 1 to 4)
- 3) Whenever a value v is received from a data source ds , the node stores in $obs[ds]$. (Line 7)
- 4) Upon *timeout* of T_{ds} gather all the values received so far in Obs . (Line 10)

Theorem 1. *At the end of Algorithm 1, $\mathcal{H}_{min}(Obs) \leq \mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(Obs) \leq \mathcal{H}_{max}(Obs)$.*

Proof. We will prove the theorem by contradiction. Without the loss of generality, let us assume that $\mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(Obs) > \mathcal{H}_{max}(Obs)$. The total number of all the honest values received by a node is at least $f_d + 1$ and the total number of all the Byzantine data sources is at most f_d ($\mathcal{B}(Obs) \leq f_d$).

²Our bounded-synchrony assumption for the source-to-node link is for simplicity. If these links behave more asynchronously, we can easily make the node contact $3f_d + 1$ data sources and wait to hear back from at least $2f_d + 1$ data sources to ensure that the honest nodes select a representative value.

Since all the honest data sources would report the correct value within T_{ds} , we would have $f_d + 1 \leq |Obs|$. Since $\mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(Obs) > \mathcal{H}_{max}(Obs)$ and $|\mathcal{H}(Obs)| \geq f_d + 1$, it must be the case that $|\mathcal{B}(Obs)| \geq (f_d + 1)$, a contradiction. One can similarly argue that $\mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(Obs) < \mathcal{H}_{min}(Obs)$ is not possible. \square

Algorithm 1 GetDataFeed(ADS)

Require: ($ADS \subseteq DS$) \wedge ($|ADS| = 2f_d + 1$)

- 1: **Upon** init **do**
- 2: $\forall ds \in ADS$ $obs[ds] \leftarrow \perp$
- 3: send the request to all $ds \in ADS$
- 4: start the timer T_{ds}
- 5:
- 6: **Upon** receiving value v from ds **and** $T_{ds} > 0$ **do**
- 7: $obs[ds] \leftarrow v$
- 8:
- 9: **Upon** *timeout* of T_{ds} **do**
- 10: **return** $Obs = \{obs[ds] | obs[ds] \neq \perp\}$
- 11:

B. Distributed Oracle Problem Definition

Once we ensure that every honest oracle node has produced a correct/representative value as its input, the oracle problem becomes a bit simpler. Since honest observations may still differ, therefore, we need to make sure that the honest nodes agree on exactly the same value, which is again representative of the honest nodes' inputs. We observe that this problem is related to the Byzantine agreement (BA) [7] and Approximate agreement [34], [35] problems from the literature on distributed systems. While the expected agreement and termination properties are exactly the same as for BA, the validity property coincides with the typical Approximate agreement definition. We call this problem a *distributed oracle agreement* (DORA) problem.

Definition 1 (Distributed Oracle Agreement—DORA). A distributed oracle agreement (DORA) protocol among n nodes $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ with each node having input v_i guarantees the following properties:

Property 5 (Termination). *All honest nodes eventually decide on some value.*

Property 6 (Agreement). *The output value S for all honest nodes is the same.*

Property 7 ((Min-max) Validity). *The output value is in the convex hull of the honest nodes' inputs. For scalar inputs, this coincides with Property 2: $H_{min} \leq S \leq H_{max}$*

Similar to the BA problem, it is easy to observe that DORA also requires an honest super majority. It is however interesting to observe that this bound persists even when the oracle nodes have access to the SMR/blockchain service defined in Section II-C. Unlike a typical broadcast channel, this SMR

channel is asynchronous to different receiving nodes. Therefore, it is not possible to differentiate between slow nodes and crashed nodes. The protocol needs to make progress with only $n - f$ inputs, where f out of n nodes are Byzantine. Access to the SMR service is still helpful as it already overcomes the FLP impossibility [27]. We can develop protocols for BA and DORA in a purely asynchronous manner without requiring any distributed randomness (such as common coins) [16].

The requirement of an honest super-majority for DORA can be a scalability issue as the number of oracle nodes increases. Based on our analysis of real-world data, for optimistic scenarios, we overcome this issue by making a practical assumption on the input values. In particular, if we assume that inputs from all honest nodes form a coherent cluster within a reasonably small agreement distance \mathfrak{d} , then we can solve DORA requiring only an honest majority instead of an honest super majority. We call this new problem DORA-CC which may offer a slightly weaker validity property stated below:

Definition 2 (Distributed Oracle Agreement with Coherent Cluster (DORA-CC)). A DORA-CC protocol among n nodes $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ with each node having input v_i such that these input values form a coherent cluster for a distance \mathfrak{d} guarantees the following property in addition to Termination(Property 5) and Agreement(Property 6) properties.

Property 8 (Approximate (Min-max) Validity.). *The output S is within the interval $[\mathcal{H}_{min} - \mathfrak{d}, \mathcal{H}_{max} + \mathfrak{d}]$.*

C. DORA with Coherent Cluster Protocol

DORA-CC only needs an honest majority, while we expect the tribe to offer honest nodes with a supermajority. We assume all the nodes to know \mathfrak{d} a priori, which is a parameter to the protocol. In an optimistic scenario, this allows us to only employ a subset of nodes within the tribe. We divide the tribe N_t into multiple mutually exclusive clans of size $|N_c|$, where N_c denotes the set of nodes belonging to a clan c . While the number of Byzantine nodes within N_t is restricted to f_t , we choose $|N_c|$ such that the number of Byzantine nodes are at most $f_c = \frac{|N_c|-1}{2}$ with very high probability. Each such clan of size $|N_c|$ can be given the responsibility to emit \mathcal{S} -values for different variables. For simplicity, we only focus on a single variable τ in this paper. The process, however, can be replicated for multiple variables. Note that \mathfrak{d} could be different for different variables.

There could be times when the inputs from all honest nodes may not form a coherent cluster within the distance \mathfrak{d} . For such a scenario, we aim at first identifying this volatility in a distributed fashion and then securely switching to the fallback protocol for the DORA instance over the entire tribe. Now, when we run the DORA instance over the entire tribe, we ensure that the output satisfies Definition 1 and is representative of the existing market conditions.

Additionally, we also uniformly randomly select a *family* \mathbb{A} of nodes from the tribe such that at least one of them is honest with high probability. These nodes are designated as aggregators as they are supposed to securely collect information

from the clan nodes and post it on the SMR. Note that these aggregators are employed solely to reduce the total number of interactions with the blockchain. Since the nodes sign their inputs, there are no safety issues regarding a Byzantine aggregator forging them. If there is only a single aggregator, there is almost $\frac{1}{3}$ probability of it being Byzantine, which may require an aggregator change to ensure the progress of the protocol. Our multi-aggregator model ensures progress without requiring any aggregator changes, thus reducing latency. However, this comes with added communication complexity.

Algorithm 2 *ComputeS* (p_i, N_c, \mathbb{A}, r)

```

1: input:  $r$  is the round identifier,  $N_c$  is the set of nodes in the clan,
    $\mathbb{A}$  is the set of aggregators,  $p_i$  is the ID of this node
2: Upon init do
3:    $ADS \leftarrow 2f_d + 1$  uniformly randomly assigned data-sources
   from  $DS$ 
4:    $O_{p_i} \leftarrow GetDataFeed(ADS)$ 
5:   send VALUE( $Q_{0.5}(O_{p_i}, r)$ ) $_i$  to all nodes in  $\mathbb{A}$ 
6:   start timer  $T_{fallback}$ 
7:   if  $p_i \in \mathbb{A}$  then  $\forall p_j \in N_c$   $obs[p_j] \leftarrow \perp$ 
8:
9: Upon receiving VALUE( $v, r$ ) $_j$  from a node  $p_j$  and  $p_i \in \mathbb{A}$  do
10:   $obs[p_j] \leftarrow v$ 
11:  if  $\exists CC \subseteq obs$   $|CC| \geq f_c + 1$  then
12:     $\mu \leftarrow mean(CC)$ 
13:    send VPROP( $CC, \mu, r$ ) $_i$  to all nodes in  $N_c$ 
14:
15: Upon receiving VPROP( $CC, \mu, r$ ) $_j$  from  $p_j \in \mathbb{A}$  do
16:  if  $Validate(VPROP(CC, \mu, r))_j = true$  then send
   VOTEVP( $CC, \mu, r$ ) $_i$  to  $p_j$ 
17:
18: Upon receiving VOTEVP( $CC, \mu, r$ ) $_j$  from  $p_j$  and  $p_i \in \mathbb{A}$  do
19:  if  $\mathcal{QC}$  is formed on VOTEVP( $CC, \mu, r$ ) then  $\triangleright$  Quorum
   with  $f_c + 1$  votes
20:     $posts_{SMR}(VPOST(CC, \mu, r, \mathcal{QC}))$ 
21:
22: Upon witnessing the first VPOST( $CC, \mu, r, \mathcal{QC}$ ) on SMR do
23:   $S_r \leftarrow \mu$ 
24:  return
25:
26: Upon timeout on  $T_{fallback}$  do
27:  send VOTEFT( $fallback, r$ ) $_i$  to all nodes in  $\mathbb{A}$ 
28:
29: Upon receiving VOTEFT( $fallback, r$ ) $_j$  from  $p_j \in N_c$  and  $p_i \in$ 
    $\mathbb{A}$  do
30:  if  $\mathcal{QC}$  is formed on VOTEFT( $fallback, r$ ) and  $T_{fallback}$  for
    $p_i$  has already timed out then
31:     $posts_{SMR}(FTPOST(fallback, r, \mathcal{QC}))$ 
32:
33: Upon witnessing FTPOST( $fallback, r, \mathcal{QC}$ ) on SMR do
34:  switch to Fallback protocol
35:

```

Pseudocode for DORA-CC in the presence of volatile data feeds is given in Algorithm 2. It proceeds as follows:

- 1) Using Algorithm 1, every node would gather data from $2f_d + 1$ uniformly randomly assigned data sources, compute the median from all the values received and send the median to all the aggregators as a VALUE message. Each node starts a timer with $T_{fallback}$ (Line 6) .

- 2) An aggregator waits until a coherent cluster of size $f_c + 1$ is formed. Once the cluster is formed, it computes the mean (Line 12). The aggregator then sends the set of VALUE messages that formed a cluster along with the mean as a VPROP message to all the clan nodes (Line 13). This message would convey that the aggregator proposes the μ to be the \mathcal{S}_r .
- 3) Upon receiving a proposal VPROP with CC and μ from an aggregator, the node performs a validation. The node would validate that (i) CC contains signed messages from the nodes of the clan, (ii) the values in CC forms a coherent cluster within δ , and (iii) that μ is indeed the arithmetic mean of the values in CC . If the validation is successful, it sends its signed vote VOTEVP(CC, μ, r) to the aggregator (Lines 15 to 16).
- 4) In an optimistic scenario, the aggregator would receive $f_c + 1$ votes of the kind VOTEVP(CC, μ, r) approving the proposal to allow it to form a quorum, prepare quorum certificate \mathcal{QC} and post VPOST(CC, μ, r, \mathcal{QC}) on the SMR (Line 20). The nodes in turn would witness VPOST(CC, μ, r, \mathcal{QC}) on the SMR, agree on μ as \mathcal{S}_r and conclude the current round (Line 22).
- 5) In an unusual scenario, a coherent cluster of size $f_c + 1$ can not be formed by any of the aggregators. This could happen either due to extreme volatility during data feed, or due to network asynchrony and high network delays. In such a case, the nodes would timeout on $T_{fallback}$ and vote for fallback VOTEFT to all the aggregators (Line 27). This can happen due to high volatility during the data feed window T_{ds} when the honest observations can not form a coherent cluster of size $f_c + 1$. In that case, the aggregators may receive fallback votes VOTEFT from multiple nodes (Line 29). If an aggregator has gathered $f_c + 1$ votes for the fallback, it posts the fallback proposal with a quorum certificate on SMR (Line 31). In a theoretical asynchronous model with the adversary having the ability to delay messages arbitrarily, the protocol would always fallback. However, we make a practical assumption that such selective delay of all honest nodes' messages may be uncommon, therefore, allowing us to exploit the proximity of the values that honest nodes emit.
- 6) A node witnessing a fallback message FTPOST (due to timeout of $T_{fallback}$) on SMR would switch to the fallback protocol mentioned in Algorithm 3.

Theorem 2 (Approximate Validity). *The protocol defined in Algorithm 2 if it posts VPOST(CC, μ, r, \mathcal{QC}) on SMR then μ must be within the interval $(\mathcal{H}_{min} - \delta, \mathcal{H}_{max} + \delta)$.*

Proof. There is at least one honest observation within the $f_c + 1$ observations belonging to the cluster CC . By definition of a coherent cluster, all other f_c observations, even if reported by Byzantine nodes, have to agree with the honest observation mentioned earlier to form the cluster CC . Therefore, no observation can exceed $\mathcal{H}_{max} + \delta$. Similarly, one can argue that no observation can be less than $\mathcal{H}_{min} - \delta$. Therefore, the mean μ computed by an aggregator must lie within the interval

$$(\mathcal{H}_{min} - \delta, \mathcal{H}_{max} + \delta). \quad \square$$

Algorithm 3 *FallbackS* (p_i, r, N_t, \mathbb{A})

- 1: **input:** p_i is the unique id of this node, r is the round identifier, N_t is the set of nodes in the tribe, \mathbb{A} is the set of aggregators
 - 2: **Upon init do**
 - 3: $ADS \leftarrow 2f_d + 1$ uniformly randomly assigned data-sources from DS
 - 4: $O_{p_i} \leftarrow GetDataFeed(ADS)$
 - 5: **send** VALUE($\mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(O_{p_i}), r$) _{i} to all the aggregators (nodes in \mathbb{A})
 - 6: **if** $p_i \in \mathbb{A}$ **then**
 - 7: $\forall p_j \in N_c, obs[p_j] \leftarrow \perp$
 - 8:
 - 9: **Upon receiving** VALUE(v, r) _{j} from p_j **and** $p_i \in \mathbb{A}$ **do**
 - 10: $obs[p_j] \leftarrow v$
 - 11: $O \leftarrow \{obs[p_j] | p_j \in N_t \wedge obs[p_j] \neq \perp\}$
 - 12: **if** $|O| \geq 2f_t + 1$ **then**
 - 13: **send** VPROP($O, \mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(O), r$) _{i} to all nodes in N_t
 - 14:
 - 15: **Upon receiving** VPROP(O, v, r) _{j} **and** $p_j \in \mathbb{A}$ **do**
 - 16: **if** Validate(VPROP(O, v, r) _{j}) = true **then**
 - 17: **send** signed vote VOTEVP(O, v, r) _{i} to p_j
 - 18:
 - 19: **Upon receiving** VOTEVP($O, \mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(O), r$) _{j} from p_j in N_t **and** $p_i \in \mathbb{A}$ **do**
 - 20: **if** \mathcal{QC} is formed on VOTEVP($O, \mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(O), r$) **then** \triangleright
 - 21: post_{SMR}(VPOST($O, \mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(O), r, \mathcal{QC}$))
 - 22:
 - 23: **Upon witnessing the first** VPOST(O, v, r, \mathcal{QC}) on SMR **do**
 - 24: $\mathcal{S}_r \leftarrow v$
 - 25: **return**
 - 26:
-

The fallback protocol where the entire tribe N_t participates is shown in Algorithm 3. Note that we assume that at most $f_t \leq \frac{|N_t| - 1}{3}$ many nodes in the tribe may exhibit Byzantine behaviour.

- 1) All the nodes gather observations from their assigned data sources and then send corresponding medians to the aggregators (Lines 2 to 7). Note that even the clan nodes that triggered the fallback gather fresh data along with the rest of the tribe.
- 2) When an aggregator receives a VALUE from a node, it checks whether it has received inputs from $2f_t + 1$ nodes (Line 12). Since at most f_t out of total $|N_t| = 3f_t + 1$ nodes may be Byzantine, by gathering inputs from $2f_t + 1$ votes, the aggregator is assured that within this set of inputs, there is an honest majority. From these inputs, it calculates its median and sends VPROP($O, \mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(O), r$)

to all the nodes in the tribe N_t for $\mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(O)$ to be considered as \mathcal{S}_r for the current round r (Line 13).

- 3) A node receiving a proposal $VPROP(O, v, r)$ from an aggregator validates that (i) observations in O are signed by nodes in N_t , (ii) the value v is indeed the median of O , and (iii) the message is indeed from an aggregator in \mathbb{A} (Line 16). It sends back its vote $VOTEVP(O, \mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(O), r)$ to the same aggregator (Line 17).
- 4) An aggregator, upon receiving $2f_t + 1$ votes, prepares the quorum certificate \mathcal{QC} and posts $VPOST(O, \mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(O), r, \mathcal{QC})$ on SMR (Line 21).
- 5) The nodes conclude round r after reaching consensus on v as \mathcal{S}_r when they witness $VPOST(O, v, r, \mathcal{QC})$ on SMR (Line 24).

It is evident from Theorem 1 that the \mathcal{S}_r reported by the fallback protocol will always be inside the interval $[\mathcal{H}_{min}, \mathcal{H}_{max}]$. Due to multiple aggregators, it is possible that an FTPOST is posted on SMR, but a VPOST by another aggregator emerging from Algorithm 2 is delayed in reaching the SMR. In this case, the nodes would switch to the fallback protocol and then witness the delayed VPOST message. In that case, the \mathcal{S} would be within $(\mathcal{H}_{min} - \vartheta, \mathcal{H}_{max} + \vartheta)$ as defined in Property 8. The nodes would only consume the \mathcal{S} from the first VPOST message on SMR for any given round.

Theorem 3 (Fallback Termination). *Algorithm 3 eventually terminates for all honest nodes if (i) N_t has an honest super majority and (ii) \mathbb{A} has at least one honest aggregator.*

Proof. $GetDataFeed()$ terminates within T_{ds} as per the design. All $2f_t + 1$ honest nodes would send their corresponding median values to all the aggregators. Since there is at least one honest aggregator, it would eventually receive values from $2f_t + 1$ nodes. It is possible that in the subset O considered by the aggregator, there are some Byzantine observations. However, the aggregator would send $VPROP(O, \mathcal{Q}_{0.5}(O), r)$ to all the nodes in N_t . An honest node can validate the aggregator's proposal, even if its own value is not in O . Therefore, an honest aggregator would eventually receive $2f_t + 1$ votes on its proposal. This would be posted on SMR by the aggregator, ensuring at least one valid proposal on SMR. Therefore, all the honest nodes would eventually witness some valid $VPOST(O, v, r, \mathcal{QC})$ on SMR and would reach a consensus on \mathcal{S}_r to be v . \square

Theorem 4 (DORA-CC-Fallback Termination). *Algorithm 2 eventually terminates for all honest nodes if (i) N_c has honest majority, (ii) N_t has honest super majority, and (iii) \mathbb{A} has at least one honest aggregator.*

Proof. All the honest nodes would finish gathering their data feed within T_{ds} . We will prove the termination of round r by all the honest nodes.

An honest node would conclude a round and move to the next round only upon witnessing a $VPOST(Obs, v, r, \mathcal{QC})$ for some set of observations Obs . There are multiple scenarios to be considered here.

- 1) If at least one of the aggregators is able to form a coherent cluster and post a value via VPOST message on SMR as the first message for round r , then all the honest nodes would witness it and conclude round r . (Line 20).
- 2) If the first message for round r that appears on SMR is an FTPOST message (Line 33). In this case, all of the honest nodes would switch to the fallback protocol (Algorithm 3). It is possible that some other aggregator in \mathbb{A} is able to post a value via a VPOST message on SMR after the FTPOST message mentioned earlier. Even in this case, all the honest nodes would witness this VPOST in Algorithm 3 (Line 23) and conclude round r . If no VPOST is posted on SMR from Algorithm 2 after an FTPOST, since all the honest nodes would have switched to the fallback protocol, we are guaranteed termination due to Theorem 3.

Therefore, we need to prove that from Algorithm 2 either VPOST or FTPOST will definitely be posted.

- 1) If an honest aggregator is able to form a coherence cluster, due to an honest majority in the clan, it would be able to get $f_c + 1$ votes approving the cluster and its mean and would be able to send a VPOST to SMR.
- 2) If no aggregator is able to form a coherent cluster, all the honest nodes would timeout on their $T_{fallback}$ eventually. Therefore, there will be $f_c + 1$ VOTEFT votes will be sent to all the aggregators eventually and some honest aggregator would post FTPOST on SMR. \square

SMR safety (Property 3) ensures that all the nodes eventually observe messages in the exact same total order. The agreement property (Property 6) follows directly from this SMR safety property. Notice that for $n > 2f$ with $(n, n - f)$ threshold signature setup, an aggregator may create multiple signed quorums; however, the SMR safety again helps as the nodes pick the first published quorum.

1) Analysis of Communication Complexity : Let us analyze how many messages and bits need to be transmitted by Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3. We shall use $n_c = |N_c|$ to denote the size of the clan, $n_a = |\mathbb{A}|$ to denote the size of the family of aggregators, and $n_t = |N_t|$ to denote the size of the tribe.

To obtain data from the data sources, we need $(2f_d + 1)n_c$ messages. Nodes would then send $n_a n_c$ VALUE messages to aggregators. After aggregation, the aggregators would send $n_c n_a$ VPROP messages. The nodes would generate $n_c n_a$ VOTEVP messages to be sent to aggregators which would subsequently send at most n_a messages to the SMR. This would result in the total number of messages being transmitted by Algorithm 2 to $(2f_d + 1)n_c + 3n_c n_a + n_a$ when a coherent cluster is formed. Considering $n_c n_a$ to be the dominating term, the message complexity would be $O(n_c n_a)$ in the optimistic scenario. Let the total number of variables for which we need to run DORA be denoted as n_τ . If we run DORA for different τ independently, then the message complexity would increase to $O(n_c n_a n_\tau)$. However, one can batch DORA messages for

different τ together in which case the message complexity would again reduce to $O(n_c n_a)$.

In the case when $T_{fallback}$ times out, the nodes directly send votes to initiate the fallback. This would require $O(n_c n_a)$ messages at the most. Though each aggregator may try to post FTPOST to SMR, only one can succeed and the other will be discarded as a duplicate by SMR. However, it should be counted since each aggregator may transmit this message, thus requiring a total of $O(n_a)$ messages. When the nodes switch to the fallback protocol, the data feed now requires $O((2f_d + 1)n_t)$ messages. There would be $O(n_t n_a)$ VALUE messages by the nodes, $O(n_t n_a)$ VPROP messages by the aggregators and $O(n_t n_a)$ VOTEVP messages by the nodes. The aggregators would at most transmit $O(n_a)$ messages to the SMR. Therefore, the total number of messages in a given round is $O(n_t n_a)$, since $n_t > n_c$.

For analyzing complexity in terms of the number of bits transmitted, we need to take into account the size of each message. Let the length of the data-feed message and VALUE message and hash of any messages be upper-bounded by k . We assume that within this length we can store all the information needed for the protocol such as a round identifier, a node identifier, a data-source identifier, a τ value etc. The data feed stage would require $O(k(2f_d + 1)n_c)$ bits. Let us assume λ to be the length of a signature. There would be $O((k + \lambda)n_c n_a)$ bits required for the nodes to send VALUE messages to aggregators. Since the aggregator sends back not only the μ but also the set of original VALUE messages forming a coherent cluster, the number of bits required for VPROP messages would be $O(((k + \lambda)n_c + k + \lambda)n_c n_a)$. The nodes send their votes on a value proposal, thus requiring $O((k + \lambda)n_c n_a)$ bits for VOTEVP messages. We assume that the nodes would sign the hash of the VPROP message received earlier and return it as an approval. The aggregators then form a \mathcal{QC} and send it to the SMR, which would require $O((k + \lambda n_c)n_a)$ bits of transmission since each \mathcal{QC} would have its size in proportion to n_c . Therefore, the communication complexity in bits would be $O((k + \lambda)n_c^2 n_a)$ for DORA-CC. For n_τ many variables it would be $O((k + \lambda)n_c^2 n_a n_\tau)$.

In case the fallback happens, the communication complexity in terms of bits would be similar to the one described above, but now the messages would be transmitted at a tribe level. Thus the number of bits required for a given round would be $O((k + \lambda)n_c^2 n_a)$ for a single τ and $O((k + \lambda)n_c^2 n_a n_\tau)$ for n_τ variables.

2) *Error analysis:* We define error of the protocol as the deviation that a presence of Byzantine nodes may cause in the output of the protocol. When the number of Byzantine observations is f and we consider $2f + 1$ observations, then we know that as per Theorem 1 the median value will fall within the bounds defined by \mathcal{H}_{min} and \mathcal{H}_{max} . However, this is not the case when we only consider $f + 1$ observations. A Byzantine aggregator could find \mathcal{H}_{max} and insert f_c Byzantine observations with value $\mathcal{H}_{max} + \delta$ to form a cluster. It is possible that all the other f_c honest observations have the value \mathcal{H}_{min} . Had only the honest observations been considered to

form a cluster, the value of μ would have been $\frac{f_c \mathcal{H}_{min} + \mathcal{H}_{max}}{f_c + 1}$ but instead, we would end up with $\mu = \frac{\mathcal{H}_{max} + f_c(\mathcal{H}_{max} + \delta)}{f_c + 1}$. Therefore, we would have an error upper bound of $\|\mathcal{H}_{min} - \mathcal{H}_{max}\|_1 + \delta$ when Algorithm 2 emits \mathcal{S}_r via the DORA-CC protocol.

In the case of Algorithm 2, it may be possible that $\|\mathcal{H}_{min} - \mathcal{H}_{max}\|_1 \leq \delta$ does not hold and an honest aggregator would have proposed a fallback. However, a Byzantine aggregator may be successful in preventing the fallback by forming a cluster of one honest observation \mathcal{H}_{max} with f_c Byzantine observations with value $\mathcal{H}_{max} + \delta$. Had the protocol switched to the fallback protocol, the smallest value of the median produced by Algorithm 3 would have been \mathcal{H}_{min} . Therefore, even in this case, the upper bound for the error would be $\|\mathcal{H}_{min} - \mathcal{H}_{max}\|_1 + \delta$. The arguments with respect to Byzantine observations forming a cluster with \mathcal{H}_{min} would be symmetric and do not result in any change in the error upper bound.

Theorem 5 (Least error upper bound). *A protocol for agreeing on a \mathcal{S} , where $3f_t + 1$ nodes participate out of which f_t of these nodes could be Byzantine, and a median of values from non-deterministically chosen³ $2f_t + 1$ nodes is proposed as the \mathcal{S} , would have an error upper bound of at least $\|\mathcal{H}_{min} - \mathcal{H}_{max}\|$.*

Proof. Out of the total $3f_t + 1$ nodes, f_t could be Byzantine. Out of $2f_t + 1$ honest observations, let $2f_t$ of them have the value \mathcal{H}_{min} with one honest observation having the value \mathcal{H}_{max} . Let all the Byzantine observations have the value $\mathcal{H}_{max} + c$, where $c > 0$. Out of these $3f_t + 1$ observations, if the median is calculated from only $2f_t + 1$ honest observations, the median would be \mathcal{H}_{min} . Instead, if the median is calculated from $2f_t + 1$ values where f_t honest values are \mathcal{H}_{min} , one honest value is \mathcal{H}_{max} and all the Byzantine observations have the value $\mathcal{H}_{max} + c$ then the median would be \mathcal{H}_{max} . Therefore, for any such protocol, the largest possible error can not be less than $\|\mathcal{H}_{min} - \mathcal{H}_{max}\|_1$. \square

Note that Theorem 5 would hold for any protocol, that computes a median of only $2f_t + 1$ values out of the total $3f_t + 1$ values that may be available.

It is evident from Theorem 5 that Algorithm 2 may increase the error upper bound by only δ .

3) *Error compounding:* Since it is possible that Byzantine actors may introduce an error of $\|\mathcal{H}_{min} - \mathcal{H}_{max}\|_1 + \delta$, one can wonder if a Byzantine aggregator across several successive rounds can compound the error. This is not possible because an \mathcal{S}_r is bounded by \mathcal{H}_{min} and \mathcal{H}_{max} of honest observations from the round r only. Therefore, the protocols in Algorithm 2 or Algorithm 3 do not allow the error to be compounded in successive rounds.

IV. ANALYSIS

A. Empirical Analysis of Agreement Distance

We would describe some empirical analysis and simulations of our protocol done on real-world data.

³The non-determinism choice is introduced due to the non-determinism in network delay

We obtained data for BTC price in USD from 7 different exchanges, namely, Binance, Coinbase, crypto.com, FTX, Huobi, OKCoin, and OKEx from 1-Oct-2022 to 10-Nov-2022. We divided this data into two parts. The first part consists of the data from 1-Oct-2022 to 10-Oct-2022 which was used in determining various values for ϑ . The second part consists of the data from 11-Oct-2022 to 10-Nov-2022 including the turbulent FTX collapse period, which was used to simulate the protocol with various values of ϑ .

The data from 1-Oct-2022 to 10-Oct-2022 was divided into (i) 30 second windows, and (ii) 60 second windows. For each window, the median and the mean were calculated from all the values/observations available within that window. We observed that the mean of these means and the mean of these medians are less than \$0.02 away from one another. For 30 second and 60 second windows, the mean of means was around \$19605 and \$19606 respectively. Therefore, we used \$19605.5 as the representative price of BTC for the duration of 1-Oct-2022 and 10-Oct-2022.

The simulations were done with ϑ set to various values from 0.02% to 0.55% of \$19605.5, the mean value of BTC calculated as described above.

For simulation also, we used 30 and 60 seconds as two different values for T_{ds} . The simulation data from 11-Oct-2022 and 10-Nov-2022 was divided into (i) 30 second windows, and (ii) 60 second windows. Therefore, every node obtained its data from data sources from the same window for a given round of oracle agreement. We assume that the nodes of the oracle network have clock-drift within a few hundred milliseconds. [17] We simulated the behavior of 7 nodes. Each node was randomly assigned 5 out of the 7 exchanges. Data from each window was used to simulate one round of agreement.

Availability of data from various exchanges is shown in Table I. Note that 4 out of 7 exchanges did not provide any value more than 50% of the time for the simulation duration of 11-Oct-2022 to 10-Nov-2022. Therefore, our design choice of using multiple data sources per node is justified to improve the reliability of our protocol. Notice that OKCoin produces a value almost at every minute, therefore, while for 30 second windows, it provides values for almost every alternate window, for 60 second window its availability is very high.

For every round, every node would compute the median from the values it obtained from its 5 assigned exchanges. If an exchange had multiple values within the given window, only the latest would be considered by the node. Once every node has computed its median, these medians would be sorted to see if any 4 of the 7 nodes form a coherent cluster for a given value of ϑ . Figure 3 shows the results from our simulation. As the size of the observation window increases, one would naturally expect to see more deviation in values among values of various exchanges. Therefore, one would expect that for a given ϑ , the nodes would be able to form coherent clusters more often for 30 second windows as compared to 60 second windows. With ϑ of \$16, coherent cluster is achieved 90% and 88% for 30 and 60 seconds window respectively. However, note




Fig. 3: Percentage of times coherent cluster was formed as agreement distance increases. Agreement distance is specified as percentage of 19605, the average BTC price

TABLE I: Percentage of times various exchanges did not produce any value for a time window.


Exchange	Null value percentage for 30 sec	Null value percentage for 60 sec
Binance	51.65	52.66
crypto.com	78.88	75.71
Coinbase	97.02	96.31
FTX	73.87	74.12
Huobi	44.45	45.51
OKCoin	46.66	0.5
OKEx	26.84	28.33

the drastic increase in data availability from OKCoin from 30 second to 60 second observation period. This has contributed to the increased percentage of coherent cluster formation for a 60 second window for larger ϑ . For example with ϑ being \$53, cluster formation is achieved for 99% of the time for 60 second window.

Note that the choice of ϑ has a bearing on both the safety and the performance of the protocol. Smaller values of ϑ would result in the protocol having to fall back more often, whereas higher values of ϑ potentially allow higher deviation of S from the ideal representative value of the mean of honest values.

If the value of a τ increases or decreases significantly, for safety and performance reasons, ϑ should be increased and decreased accordingly.

Increasing $T_{fallback}$ may have two effects. When prices are not fluctuating too much, a large $T_{fallback}$ allows the round to complete and S to appear on SMR. However, large value of $T_{fallback}$ increases round completion time when coherent cluster can not be formed and a fallback is required. Reducing $T_{fallback}$ to a very small value results in much higher percentage of rounds resulting in a fallback, thus, degrading the performance. Therefore, $T_{fallback}$ should be set after measuring average time to complete a round of DORA-



(a) Probability of having no honest aggregators in the family of aggregators as the size of the family increases. Here total nodes are 100 and Byzantine nodes are 33

(b) Probability of having at least one clan with a Byzantine majority as the size of the tribe increases. Here number of clans are 5 and Byzantine nodes are 33%

Fig. 4: Probabilistic Safety Analysis

CC.

B. Theoretical Analysis of Probabilistic Safety

We mention in Section III-C that we employ multiple aggregators. Figure 4a shows a logarithmic plot on how the probability of having an entire family consisting of Byzantine aggregators reduces as we increase the size of the family of aggregators. Since 1 in 3 nodes in the tribe is Byzantine, it is evident that as we increase the size of the family of aggregators, the probability of not having a single honest aggregator drops exponentially fast. Figure 4b shows how the probability of having at least one clan with a Byzantine majority changes as we increase the size of the tribe. In the logarithmic plot, we can observe that increasing the size of the tribe to a few hundred nodes would ensure that none of the 5 clans randomly drawn from the tribe would have a Byzantine majority with a very high probability. To fully exploit the ability to tolerate up to 49% Byzantine nodes, we propose to employ probabilistic safety guarantees. Figure 4b provides guidelines on how many total nodes would be required to achieve the safety property with a very high probability.

Note that, if the adversary is fully adaptive and can compromise nodes after families and clans are formed, the above probabilistic safety analysis is not applicable. We expect clans and families to be updated regularly in practice.

V. RELATED WORK

In this section, we compare our approach to relevant prominent industrial as well as academic solutions to the oracle problem.

As we describe earlier, Chainlink’s Off-Chain Reporting Protocol (OCR) [40] is the most employed oracle solution today. Under partial synchrony, OCR requires Byzantine nodes to be less than $\frac{1}{3}$ fraction of the total population. Our unique ideas of defining agreement between nodes based on *agreement distance* and better leveraging SMR allow our protocol to tolerate up to $\frac{1}{2}$ Byzantine nodes.

Note that the OCR approach inherently will not be able to tolerate more than $\frac{1}{3}$ Byzantine nodes even if we make the coherent cluster assumption on its input and update the OCR protocol: this approach uses the blockchain (smart contract) purely for broadcasting a report/result and not for ordering and subsequently preventing equivocation. As a result, it will require more than $\frac{2}{3}$ honest nodes for broadcast itself [5] While the OCR approach is indeed more self-sufficient, we argue that if one has an access to SMR (even via a smart contract), there is an advantage and merit in leveraging it in order to be able to tolerate a higher fraction of Byzantine nodes.

Moreover, our DORA protocol is asynchronous by design; thus, if the underlying blockchain is secure under asynchrony, our DORA protocol also becomes secure under the asynchronous setting. Our timer $T_{fallback}$ does not depend on the transmission time, the adversary can only trigger the fallback protocol using asynchrony.

In the Pyth network [39], sources directly post their signed values to a smart contract. While we do not have to worry about Byzantine oracle nodes in that case and the oracle problem becomes purely an availability problem there, most data sources do not employ the digital signature infrastructure today. Even if some data sources start to employ data authentication primitives in the future, there will be compatibility issues as different blockchains employ different signature mechanisms.

Provable [14] and Town Crier [10] are earlier approaches that utilize trusted-execution environments (TEEs) to furnish data to the blockchains. However, TEEs have proven to be notoriously hard to secure and the security provided by TEEs has been broken by a wide variety of attacks. As a result, TEE-based oracles did not get enough traction yet.

As TLS becomes the de facto standard for (secure) communication over the internet, TLS-N [20], DECO [11], and recently ROSEN [13] allow oracle nodes to prove facts about their TLS sessions to data sources. However, there remain several challenges. TLS-N and ROSEN enable a data source to sign its TLS session with the oracle node; however, they need non-trivial updates to the TLS protocol and thus suffer from high adoption costs. DECO ensures that the only TLS client has to be modified but no server-side modifications are required, which makes it better suited as only the oracle nodes’ TLS code has to be updated. However, the proposed custom three-party handshake mechanism allows the creation of proofs that are acceptable only by a pre-specified, actively participating verifier, which may not be applicable to most blockchain nodes.

We refer the reader to the blockchain oracle surveys [12], [19] for discussion about several other informal blockchain oracle designs.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We present a novel distributed oracle agreement protocol that allows the oracle network to function with only $2f + 1$ nodes when the prices of a commodity are not fluctuating

wildly, by leveraging SMR as an ordering primitive and updating the notion of agreement among nodes.

We have shown that data sources do pose a data availability risk and therefore it is wise to mandate nodes to gather data from multiple data sources. We have also shown the trade-off that the agreement distance parameter offers in terms of safety and performance.

We show that it is possible to build safe and efficient oracle networks with high probability with appropriate choices on the size of the network and the size of the family of aggregators.

In the future, it can be interesting to explore how \mathfrak{d} can be adjusted in an algorithmic fashion without allowing any room for the compounding of errors by a malicious entity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank anonymous reviewers and Akhil Bandarupalli for their helpful comments. We thank Luying Yeo for assisting with creative figures.

REFERENCES

[1] A. R. Choudhuri, M. Green, A. Jain, G. Kaptchuk, and I. Miers, “Fairness in an unfair world: Fair multiparty computation from public bulletin boards,” in *ACM CCS*, 2017, pp. 719–728.

[2] Y. Marcus, E. Heilman, and S. Goldberg, “Low-resource eclipse attacks on ethereum’s peer-to-peer network,” *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, p. 236, 2018.

[3] C. F. Torres, R. Camino, and R. State, “Frontrunner jones and the raiders of the dark forest: An empirical study of frontrunning on the ethereum blockchain,” in *USENIX Security*, 2021, pp. 1343–1359.

[4] L. Aumayr, P. Moreno-Sanchez, A. Kate, and M. Maffei, “Breaking and fixing virtual channels: Domino attack and donner,” in *NDSS*, 2023.

[5] A. Clement, F. Junqueira, A. Kate, and R. Rodrigues, “On the (limited) power of non-equivocation,” in *PODC*, D. Kowalski and A. Panconesi, Eds., 2012, pp. 301–308.

[6] R. Goyal and V. Goyal, “Overcoming cryptographic impossibility results using blockchains,” in *TCC*, 2017, pp. 529–561.

[7] C. Dwork, N. Lynch, and L. Stockmeyer, “Consensus in the presence of partial synchrony,” *J. ACM*, vol. 35, no. 2, p. 288–323, apr 1988.

[8] L. Lamport, R. Shostak, and M. Pease, “The Byzantine generals problem,” *Transactions on Programming Language and Systems*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 382–401, Jul. 1982.

[9] R. Bacho and J. Loss, “On the adaptive security of the threshold BLS signature scheme,” in *ACMCCS*, H. Yin, A. Stavrou, C. Cremers, and E. Shi, Eds., 2022, pp. 193–207.

[10] F. Zhang, E. Cecchetti, K. Croman, A. Juels, and E. Shi, “Town crier: An authenticated data feed for smart contracts,” in *ACMCCS*, 2016, pp. 270–282.

[11] F. Zhang, D. Maram, H. Malvai, S. Goldfeder, and A. Juels, “DECO: liberating web data using decentralized oracles for TLS,” in *ACMCCS*, 2020, pp. 1919–1938.

[12] A. Pasdar, Y. C. Lee, and Z. Dong, “Connect api with blockchain: A survey on blockchain oracle implementation,” *ACM Comput. Surv.*, oct 2022.

[13] S. Capkun, E. Ozturk, G. Tsudik, and K. Wüst, “Rosen: Robust and selective non-repudiation (for tls),” in *Cloud Computing Security Workshop (CCSW)*, 2021, p. 97–109.

[14] “Provable blockchain oracle,” <https://provable.xyz>, 2022.

[15] Coin Telegraph, “Defi protocols declare losses as attackers exploit luna price feed discrepancy,” cointelegraph.com/news Link, 2022.

[16] C. Cachin, K. Kursawe, and V. Shoup, “Random oracles in constantinople: Practical asynchronous byzantine agreement using cryptography,” *J. Cryptol.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 219–246, 2005.

[17] Engineering at Meta, “Building a more accurate time service at facebook scale,” <https://engineering.fb.com/2020/03/18/production-engineering/ntp-service/>, 2020.

[18] Business Insider, “Coinmarketcap glitch lists bitcoin at \$799 billion,” markets.businessinsider.com link, 2022.

[19] H. Al-Breiki, M. H. U. Rehman, K. Salah, and D. Svetinovic, “Trustworthy blockchain oracles: Review, comparison, and open research challenges,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 85 675–85 685, 2020.

[20] H. Ritzdorf, K. Wüst, A. Gervais, G. Felley, and S. Capkun, “TLS-N: non-repudiation over TLS enablign ubiquitous content signing,” in *NDSS*, 2018.

[21] A. Momose and L. Ren, “Multi-threshold byzantine fault tolerance,” in *ACM CCS*, 2021, pp. 1686–1699.

[22] F. B. Schneider, “Implementing fault-tolerant services using the state machine approach: A tutorial,” *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 299–319, 1990.

[23] M. C. Pease, R. E. Shostak, and L. Lamport, “Reaching agreement in the presence of faults,” *J. ACM*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 228–234, 1980.

[24] <https://www.investopedia.com/what-went-wrong-with-ftx-6828447>.

[25] A. Pasdar, Y. C. Lee, and Z. Dong, “Connect api with blockchain: A survey on blockchain oracle implementation,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, September 2022.

[26] S. Eskandari, M. Salehi, W. C. Gu, and J. Clark, “Sok: Oracles from the ground truth to market manipulation,” in *ACM AFT*, 2021, p. 127–141.

[27] M. J. Fischer, N. A. Lynch, and M. S. Paterson, “Impossibility of distributed consensus with one faulty process,” *The Journal of ACM*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 374–382, Apr. 1985.

[28] D. Boneh, B. Lynn, and H. Shacham, “Short signatures from the weil pairing,” in *Advances in Cryptology - ASIACRYPT 2001*, C. Boyd, Ed., vol. 2248, 2001, pp. 514–532.

[29] N. Neves, M. Correia, and P. Verissimo, “Solving vector consensus with a wormhole,” *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 16, no. 12, pp. 1120–1131, 2005.

[30] C. Cachin, D. Collins, T. Crain, and V. Gramoli, “Anonymity preserving byzantine vector consensus,” in *ESORICS*, 2020, p. 133–152.

[31] A. Doudou and A. Schiper, “Muteness detectors for consensus with byzantine processes,” in *PODC*, 1998, p. 315.

[32] G. Bracha, “Asynchronous byzantine agreement protocols,” *Information and Computation*, vol. 75, no. 2, pp. 130–143, 1987.

[33] I. Abraham, D. Malkhi, and A. Spiegelman, “Asymptotically optimal validated asynchronous byzantine agreement,” in *ACM PODC*, 2019, p. 337–346.

[34] D. Dolev, N. A. Lynch, S. S. Pinter, E. W. Stark, and W. E. Weihl, “Reaching approximate agreement in the presence of faults,” *J. ACM*, vol. 33, no. 3, p. 499–516, may 1986.

[35] H. Mendes and M. Herlihy, “Multidimensional approximate agreement in byzantine asynchronous systems,” in *ACM STOC*, 2013, pp. 391–400.

[36] Anonymized Extended Version, https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1e1qBFjiLaop4-l2cbdKIkafDFJ73r27?usp=share_link, 2023, [Online: accessed on 21-Jan-2023].

[37] L. Varshney, <https://slate.com/technology/2019/10/round-floor-software-errors-stock-market-battlefield.html>, October 2019, [Online: accessed on 16-Nov-2022].

[38] D. J. Bohnet, <https://www.seerene.com/news-research/software-errors-destroy-millions-of-dollars-every-second-0>, 2015, [Online: accessed on 21-Sep-2022].

[39] Pyth Data Association, “Pyth network: A first-party financial oracle,” <https://pyth.network/whitepaper.pdf>, Pyth Data Association, Tech. Rep., 2022, [Online: accessed on 21-Jan-2023].

[40] L. Breidenbach, C. Cachin, A. Coventry, A. Juels, and A. Miller, “Chainlink off-chain reporting protocol,” Chainlink Labs, Tech. Rep., 2021.

APPENDIX A EXTENSIONS

A. Assigning weights to the data sources

In Algorithm 1, we mandate the nodes listen to $2f_d + 1$ data sources, since f_d of these data sources can turn Byzantine. Each node computes the median of all the observations it makes from these $2f_d + 1$ data sources. This algorithm, however, treats every data source equally. Different data sources, however, may have different reliability guarantees, trading volumes, downtime statistics and security practices, etc. It makes sense that when we look at these aspects, different data sources are treated differently. For example, a data source

that provides better reliability guarantees and follows the best security practices should be given more weight when compared to some other data sources which may be inferior in these parameters.

To accommodate the differing traits of different data sources, we can define a weight function $w : DS \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$, which assigns different positive integer weights to different data sources. The weight can be determined by considering parameters like historical reliability, volume/scale, and security practices followed by the data source etc., and a suitable value can be assigned through data governance. It is important to note that while we assign weight to the data sources, a data source crash or malfunction would affect any function that takes its inputs in proportion to its weight. Therefore, we now must discuss the total weight of the data sources that may turn Byzantine. In this modified setting, we can think of f_d as the sum of the weights of the data sources that can turn Byzantine. To accommodate this change, Algorithm 1 can be modified where every node listens to data sources such that their total weight is $2f_d + 1$. In this case, whenever a value v is received from a data-source ds , we would store as many as $w(ds)$ copies in the multi-set obs (Line 7). The size of Obs would still be between $f_d + 1$ and $2f_d + 1$, the lower bound on the number of observations in obs from honest data sources would still be $f_d + 1$ and the number of observations from Byzantine data sources would be upper-bounded by f_d . Theorem 1 would still hold in this case. The rest of the protocol for DORA would remain the same.