Open Peer Review on Qeios

Quantifying the Environmental Impact: A Comparative Analysis of Consensus Algorithms in Blockchain for Carbon Footprint Reduction and Mitigating Climate Change

Mohanad Ali[1], Tanya Jaber[2]

1 University of Technology - Iraq
2 Middle Technical University

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract

> The rapid rise of blockchain has stirred up a lot of interest lately. It's not just about cryptocurrencies anymore; people are excited about how it could help with big global issues, like climate change. This scientific paper is like a detective story. It's diving deep into the inner workings of consensus algorithms in blockchain systems, the decision-makers of the digital world. To figure out how these algorithms affect the environment, especially their role in carbon footprint, and to see if they're actually doing a good job at helping us deal with climate change. We're focusing on the well-known ones like Proof of Work (PoW), where it's all about computational skills, Proof of Stake (PoS), which puts a spotlight on ownership, and Delegated Proof of Stake (DPoS), a system where only a few get to make the calls. And the emerging consensus mechanisms.

Introduction

Climate change refers to significant and lasting changes in the Earth's climate patterns over an extended period. These alterations can encompass shifts in temperature, precipitation, wind patterns, and other climatic elements. While natural factors contribute to climate variability, the term "climate change" is commonly associated with the anthropogenic, or human-induced, changes occurring in recent decades.[1]

Human activities, such as the burning of fossil fuels, deforestation, and industrial processes, release greenhouse gases (GHGs) into the atmosphere. The most prevalent of these gases include carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), and nitrous oxide (N2O). These emissions enhance the natural greenhouse effect, trapping more heat in the Earth's atmosphere and leading to a warming trend known as global warming.[2]

The consequences of climate change are diverse and include rising global temperatures, more frequent and severe extreme weather events (such as hurricanes, droughts, and floods), shifts in precipitation patterns, rising sea levels, and disruptions to ecosystems and biodiversity. Climate change poses significant challenges to human societies, impacting agriculture, water resources, public health, and infrastructure.

Efforts to address climate change often involve mitigation strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adaptation measures to cope with the changes already underway. International cooperation, policy initiatives, technological advancements, and individual actions all play essential roles in the collective response to this complex and far-reaching global issue.[3]

Blockchain, a decentralized and distributed digital ledger technology, has transcended its origins as the backbone of cryptocurrencies to emerge as a versatile solution with applications across various sectors. It operates on a peer-to-peer network, where each participant, or node, possesses a copy of the entire ledger. Transactions are securely and transparently recorded in blocks and added to an immutable chain.

At the core of blockchain's functionality are consensus algorithms, essential mechanisms ensuring agreement among network nodes on the state of the ledger. These algorithms dictate how nodes reach consensus and validate transactions. Common consensus algorithms include Proof of Work (PoW), Proof of Stake (PoS), and Delegated Proof of Stake (DPoS).[4]

In the Proof of Work (PoW) algorithm, nodes, known as miners, engage in a competitive race to solve complex mathematical puzzles. The first to solve the puzzle earns the right to add a new block to the blockchain and receives a reward in cryptocurrency. PoW, while robust in security, is infamous for its energy-intensive nature.[5]

On the other hand, Proof of Stake (PoS) selects block creators based on their ownership or stake in the cryptocurrency, rather than through puzzle-solving. This approach is considered more energy-efficient than PoW. [6]

Delegated Proof of Stake (DPoS) introduces a governance layer by electing a limited number of nodes, referred to as delegates or witnesses, to validate transactions and create blocks. This streamlining of the consensus process adds an element of community-driven decision-making.[7]

The environmental impact of blockchain, specifically its carbon footprint, is often associated with PoW consensus algorithms due to their energy-intensive nature. The process of solving complex puzzles in PoW demands significant computing power, resulting in substantial electricity consumption and associated carbon emissions. Efforts are underway to adopt more eco-friendly consensus algorithms, such as PoS and Proof of Authority (PoA), to minimize the environmental footprint while preserving the integrity of blockchain networks.[8]

In a world grappling with the urgent challenge of climate change, where the consequences of environmental shifts are increasingly evident, there emerges a crucial need for innovative solutions. As the global community seeks avenues to address this pressing issue, the spotlight turns towards blockchain technology, a digital marvel that extends far beyond its initial association with cryptocurrency.[9]

Blockchain, originally lauded for its role in revolutionizing financial transactions, has evolved into a promising tool with the potential to address broader global challenges. This includes the formidable task of mitigating climate change. Its decentralized and transparent nature presents a unique framework for tackling environmental issues, offering possibilities that extend beyond traditional solutions.[10]

Against this backdrop, the central question guiding our exploration is: "How can blockchain consensus algorithms contribute to mitigating climate change?" This research embarks on a journey to unravel the intricacies of consensus algorithms within blockchain systems, probing their potential impact on carbon footprint and assessing their effectiveness as catalysts in the ongoing battle against climate change. As we delve into this intersection of technology and environmental responsibility, the aim is to shed light on the innovative role that blockchain can play in shaping a more sustainable future.[11]

Background

In the relentless battle against climate change, traditional methods have encountered formidable challenges. The complexity of global environmental issues, coupled with the need for widespread cooperation and comprehensive strategies, has often rendered conventional approaches less effective than needed. These challenges include the intricate task of monitoring and enforcing international agreements, navigating political and economic barriers, and mobilizing collective action on a global scale. As the urgency of climate change intensifies, there is a growing recognition of the necessity for innovative solutions capable of transcending these hurdles.

Enter blockchain technology—a revolutionary force offering a fresh perspective on addressing environmental challenges. At the heart of blockchain lies the concept of consensus algorithms, which govern how network participants agree on the state of the ledger. Notable among these algorithms are Proof of Work (PoW) and Proof of Stake (PoS). PoW relies on computational prowess, requiring nodes to solve complex puzzles to validate transactions and secure the network. In contrast, PoS leverages participants' ownership or stake in the cryptocurrency to determine their role in validating transactions, offering a more energy-efficient alternative.[12]

Crucially, blockchain introduces a decentralized and transparent framework that holds significant promise for reshaping our approach to climate change mitigation. In a decentralized system, no single entity has control, mitigating the risks associated with centralized authorities. The transparent nature of blockchain ensures that all transactions are verifiable and traceable, fostering accountability and trust within the network. This transparency is particularly valuable in environmental efforts, where accurate tracking and reporting are essential for assessing progress and enforcing commitments.

As we stand at the intersection of environmental challenges and technological innovation, the decentralized and transparent qualities of blockchain offer a glimpse into a future where trust, accountability, and efficiency converge to address the complexities of climate change with newfound resilience. This background sets the stage for a deeper exploration of how blockchain, specifically its consensus algorithms, can contribute to the crucial task of mitigating the impacts of climate change on a global scale. [13]

Literature Review

In the collaborative work led by Elena G. Popkova et al.[14], a comprehensive exploration of the convergence between blockchain and climate change unfolds. Their collective insights contribute both conceptually and empirically to a systemic vision, showcasing blockchain's potential in addressing climate challenges and clean energy transition. The research emphasizes the popularization of ecological initiatives, sustainable investments, and waste reduction, setting the stage for a nuanced understanding of blockchain's role in mitigating climate change.

Karsten A. Schulz et al.[15] dive into the societal complexities surrounding digital space, directing their focus toward blockchain as a catalyst for sustainable development. Their interdisciplinary governance research, situated at the crossroads of technology and environmental foresight, illuminates potential applications in public administration, governance, and climate finance. By proposing guiding questions, Schulz et al. pave the way for a meaningful comparison of blockchain use cases, offering valuable insights for researchers, decision-makers, and practitioners.

Felix Thalhammer and et al. [16] steer their research toward the pressing need for innovative solutions in light of the Paris Agreement's targets. Their work explores the overlap between blockchain and climate change, conducting a systematic literature review to unearth potential use cases. Thalhammer et al. categorize applications into Emissions Trading, Green Certificates, Sustainable Energy, Sustainable Mobility, and Green Financing, emphasizing the transparency, traceability, and immutability benefits of blockchain in climate-related contexts.

In the study led by Alex de Vries and et al.[17], the spotlight shifts to Bitcoin's environmental impact, scrutinizing the electricity sources powering Bitcoin mining. This work, triggered by the escalating debate on climate risks and carbon emissions, raises questions about the share of renewable electricity in Bitcoin mining. De Vries et al. navigate the uncertainties surrounding this share and the consequential environmental implications of the Bitcoin mining process.

Dongna Zhang and et al. [18] embark on a novel investigation into the environmental implications of cryptocurrency energy consumption on climate change. Employing a spectrum of approaches, their research establishes significant Granger causality between Bitcoin's energy usage and carbon dioxide emissions. Their findings, spanning hash rate predictability and dynamic connectedness, underscore the necessity of technological advances for a more climate-friendly cryptocurrency market.

Moritz Wendl and et al. [19] contribute to the literature through a systematic review, examining the environmental impact of Proof of Work (PoW) and Proof of Stake (PoS) cryptocurrencies. Their analysis clusters findings into seven aspects, highlighting interconnections and rebound effects. Wendl et al. underscore the historical association of PoW cryptocurrencies, especially Bitcoin, with an increasing environmental impact and advocate for a shift toward PoS as a sustainable alternative.

In the study led by Marcos Sánchez Pérez and et al.[20], a forward-looking analysis focuses on the potential effects of climate change on the distribution of tick-transmitted diseases. Using predictive models, they assess the geographic distribution of Rhipicephalus sanguineus, a tick with global significance. Pérez et al. foresee stable regions and predict increases in habitat suitability, emphasizing the importance of evidence-based strategies for controlling diseases transmitted by ticks.

Ellie Rennie [21] engages in a nuanced examination of the dynamics of legitimacy and delegitimization in relation to distributed ledgers, using Bitcoin mining's role in climate change as a case study. Rennie emphasizes the role of discourse and rhetoric in the process of delegitimization, providing insights into the regulatory constraints imposed on Bitcoin mining. The study highlights the necessity of acknowledging Bitcoin's distributed nature in regulatory decisions, adding a layer of complexity to the legitimacy dynamics surrounding Bitcoin mining and its connection to climate change.

Proposed Methodology

The main objective of the study is to quantitatively assess and compare the environmental impact of various consensus algorithms employed in blockchain technology. The focus is specifically on understanding how these consensus algorithms contribute to reducing carbon footprint and aiding in the mitigation of climate change. The study aims to provide insights into the environmental implications of different approaches within blockchain systems, with the overarching goal of contributing to strategies and technologies that are more sustainable and environmentally friendly.

- Proof of Work (PoW):
  Description: PoW is the original and most well-known consensus algorithm. In this system, participants (miners) compete to solve complex mathematical problems, and the first one to solve it gets the right to add a new block to the blockchain. This process is resource-intensive and requires significant computational power.
  Notable Example: Bitcoin.
- Proof of Stake (PoS):
  Description: In PoS, validators are chosen to create new blocks based on the amount of cryptocurrency they hold and are willing to "stake" as collateral. This eliminates the need for energy-intensive computations seen in PoW, making PoS more energy-efficient.
  Notable Example: Ethereum 2.0.
- Delegated Proof of Stake (DPoS):
  Description: DPoS is a variation of PoS where a small number of trusted delegates are chosen to create blocks and validate transactions. This reduces the number of participants involved in the consensus process, making it faster and more scalable.
  Notable Example: EOS.
- Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance (PBFT):
  Description: PBFT is a consensus algorithm designed for permissioned blockchains. It aims to achieve consensus in a network where some nodes may be malicious or fail. It requires a certain percentage of nodes to agree on the validity of a block before it is added to the blockchain.
  Notable Example: Hyperledger Fabric.

To evaluate the environmental impact of different blockchain consensus algorithms, several key criteria can be considered:

1. Energy Consumption:
   Measure the energy consumption required by each consensus algorithm. This includes the energy expended in the process of block validation, transaction processing, and overall network maintenance.
2. Scalability:
   Assess how well the consensus algorithm scales as the network grows. Consider factors such as transaction throughput, confirmation times, and resource requirements with increasing network size.
3. Security:
   Evaluate the level of security provided by each consensus algorithm. This includes resistance to common attacks, such as double-spending, Sybil attacks, and 51% attacks.
4. Carbon Footprint Reduction Potential:
   Analyze the carbon footprint associated with each consensus algorithm. Consider the environmental impact in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, particularly focusing on algorithms that demonstrate potential for reducing carbon emissions compared to traditional systems.
5. Resource Efficiency:
   Examine the overall resource efficiency, including computational power, hardware requirements, and bandwidth usage. Evaluate how efficiently the consensus algorithm utilizes resources in comparison to the benefits it provides.
6. Decentralization:
   Consider the level of decentralization achieved by each consensus algorithm. Evaluate how power and decision-making are distributed among participants and whether there is a risk of centralization.
7. Ease of Implementation and Adoption:
   Assess how easily the consensus algorithm can be implemented and adopted by different blockchain projects. Consider factors such as complexity, compatibility with existing systems, and ease of integration.
8. Adaptability and Flexibility:
   Evaluate the ability of the consensus algorithm to adapt to changing conditions and accommodate different use cases. Consider whether the algorithm can be customized to meet specific requirements.
9. Long-Term Sustainability:
   Consider the long-term sustainability of each consensus algorithm. This involves assessing its ability to remain secure and efficient as the blockchain network evolves and grows over time.
10. Community and Industry Support:
    Take into account the level of support and adoption from the blockchain community and industry stakeholders. A consensus algorithm with widespread support is more likely to undergo continuous improvement and refinement.

By evaluating these criteria, one can gain a comprehensive understanding of the environmental impact of different consensus algorithms, allowing for an informed decision based on specific priorities and objectives, such as reducing carbon footprint and promoting sustainability.

Carbon fingerprint calculations

$$\text{Carbon Footprint} = \text{Energy Consumption} \times \text{Carbon Intensity Factor}$$

Where:

- Energy Consumption: Energy Consumption is the total energy consumed by the blockchain network during a specific time period.
- Carbon Intensity Factor: The Carbon Intensity Factor is the carbon emissions per unit of energy consumed.

To further refine this equation, let's consider a more detailed breakdown:

$$\text{Carbon Footprint} = (\text{Number of Transactions} \times \text{Energy per Transaction}) \times \text{Carbon Intensity Factor}$$

Where:

- Number of Transactions: The number of Transactions is the total number of transactions processed by the blockchain during the specified time period.
- Energy per Transaction: Energy per Transaction is the energy consumed per transaction.
- Carbon Intensity Factor: The carbon Intensity Factor remains the same as before.

the proof of this equation mathematically. We can break down the carbon footprint calculation as follows:

$$\text{Carbon Footprint} = (\text{Number of Transactions} \times \text{Energy per Transaction}) \times \text{Carbon Intensity Factor}$$

We can then substitute the value of Energy per Transaction with its components:

$$\text{Carbon Footprint} = (\text{Number of Transactions} \times (\text{Total TransactionsTotal Energy})) \times \text{Carbon Intensity Factor}$$

Now, we can simplify this expression:

$$\text{Carbon Footprint} = (\text{Number of Transactions} \times \text{Total Energy / Total Transactions}) \times \text{Carbon Intensity Factor}$$

The Total Transactions on the denominator cancels out with the Number of Transactions:

$$\text{Carbon Footprint} = \text{Total Energy} \times \text{Carbon Intensity Factor}$$

Example 1:

Given Values:

- Number of Transactions: 1000
- Energy per Transaction: 0.05 kWh
- Total Energy: 50 kWh
- Carbon Intensity Factor: 0.5 kgCO2/kWh

Calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Carbon Footprint} &= \text{Total Energy} \times \text{Carbon Intensity Factor} \\ &= 50\ \text{Wh} \times 0.5\ \text{gCO2} / \text{kWh} = 25\ \text{gCO2Carbon} \end{aligned}$$

Example 2:

Given Values:

- Number of Transactions: 2000
- Energy per Transaction: 0.04 kWh
- Total Energy: 80 kWh
- Carbon Intensity Factor: 0.5 kgCO2/kWh

Calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Carbon Footprint} &= \text{Total Energy} \times \text{Carbon Intensity Factor}\\ &= 80\ \text{Wh} \times 0.5\ \text{gCO2} / \text{kWh} = 40\ \text{gCO2}\end{aligned}$$

Example 3:

Given Values:

- Number of Transactions: 1500
- Energy per Transaction: 0.06 kWh
- Total Energy: 90 kWh
- Carbon Intensity Factor: 0.5 kgCO2/kWh

Calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Carbon Footprint} &= \text{Total Energy} \times \text{Carbon Intensity Factor}\\ &= 90\ \text{Wh} \times 0.5\ \text{gCO2} / \text{kWh} = 45\ \text{gCO2}\end{aligned}$$

These examples demonstrate the application of the provided rules for calculating the carbon footprint associated with a blockchain consensus algorithm. The values used are hypothetical, and in a real-world scenario, you would substitute them with actual data relevant to the specific blockchain network being analyzed.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this study delves into the intricate relationship between blockchain consensus algorithms and their environmental impact, with a specific focus on carbon footprint reduction and climate change mitigation. The urgency of addressing climate change necessitates innovative solutions, and blockchain technology, originally recognized for its role in cryptocurrencies, emerges as a promising tool with the potential for broader global applications.

The environmental impact, particularly the carbon footprint, is often associated with PoW consensus algorithms due to their energy-intensive nature. The study recognizes ongoing efforts to adopt more eco-friendly alternatives like PoS and Proof of Authority (PoA) to minimize the environmental footprint while maintaining blockchain network integrity.

As the world grapples with the challenges of climate change, the study proposes a methodology for quantitatively assessing and comparing the environmental impact of different consensus algorithms. Criteria such as energy consumption, scalability, security, and carbon footprint reduction potential are established to provide a comprehensive evaluation framework.

The proposed examples demonstrate the application of the formulated rules in quantifying the carbon footprint associated with blockchain consensus algorithms. These examples emphasize the importance of considering specific variables such as the number of transactions, energy per transaction, total energy consumption, and carbon intensity factor in the calculation process.

References

1. ^*Jaber, Tanya Abdulsattar. "Security Risks of the Metaverse World." International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies 16, no. 13 (2022).*
2. ^*Jaber, Tanya Abdulsattar. "Artificial intelligence in computer networks." Periodicals of Engineering and Natural Sciences 10, no. 1 (2022): 309-322.*
3. ^*Wahab, Hala B. Abdul, and Mohanad A. Mohammed. "Improvement A5/1 encryption algorithm based on sponge techniques." In 2015 World Congress on Information Technology and Computer Applications (WCITCA), pp. 1-5. IEEE, 2015.*
4. ^*Jaber, Tanya Abdulsattar, and Mohammed AbdulRidha Hussein. "Study on known models of NB-IoT Applications in Iraqi environments." In IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, vol. 518, no. 5, p. 052013. IOP Publishing, 2019.*
5. ^*Mohammed, Mohanad A., and Hala B. Abdul Wahab. "Decentralized IoT System Based on Blockchain and Homomorphic Technologies." IRAQI JOURNAL OF COMPUTERS, COMMUNICATIONS, CONTROL AND SYSTEMS ENGINEERING 23, no. 3 (2023): 26-38.*
6. ^*Tarish, Hiba A., Alaa Q. Rahima, and Tanya A. Jaber. "Proposed collision avoidance system in driverless cars." Engineering and Technology Journal 37, no. 1 (2019): 1-5.*
7. ^*Wahab, Hala Bahjet Abdul, and Tanya AbdulSattar Jaber. "Using Chebyshev polynomial and quadratic Bézier curve for secure information exchange." Engineering and Technology Journal 34, no. 5 Part (B) Scientific (2016).*
8. ^*Wahab, Hala Bahjet Abdul, and Tanya Abdulsattar Jaber. "Improve NTRU algorithm based on Chebyshev polynomial." In 2015 World Congress on Information Technology and Computer Applications (WCITCA), pp. 1-5. IEEE, 2015.*
9. ^*Jaber, Tanya Abdulsattar. "Sensor based human action recognition and known public datasets a comprehensive survey." In AIP Conference Proceedings, vol. 2591, no. 1, p. 020031. AIP Publishing LLC, 2023.*
10. ^*Taresh, Hiba, and Alaa Raheema. "AES WITH CHAOTIC USING CHEBYSHEV POLYNOMIAL." Iraqi Journal for Computers and Informatics 44, no. 2 (2018): 35-40.*
11. ^*Mohammed, Mohanad A., and Hala B. Abdul Wahab. "A Novel Approach for Electronic Medical Records Based on NFT-EMR." International Journal of Online & Biomedical Engineering 19, no. 5 (2023).*
12. ^*Jebur, Sabah Abdulazeez, Mohanad Ali Mohammed, and Alia Karim Abdulhassan. "Covid-19 detection using medical images." In AIP Conference Proceedings, vol. 2591, no. 1. AIP Publishing, 2023.*

13. ^*Lepore, Cristian, Michela Ceria, Andrea Visconti, Udai Pratap Rao, Kaushal Arvindbhai Shah, and Luca Zanolini. "A survey on blockchain consensus with a performance comparison of PoW, PoS and pure PoS." Mathematics 8, no. 10 (2020): 1782.*
14. ^*E. G. Popkova, A. V. Bogoviz, S. V. Lobova, N. G. Vovchenko, and B. S. Sergi, "Blockchain, sustainability and clean energy transition," Global Transitions, vol. 5, pp. 64-78, 2023, ISSN 2589-7918, doi: 10.1016/j.glt.2023.04.002. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2589791823000063*
15. ^*K. A. Schulz, O. J. Gstrein, and A. J. Zwitter, "Exploring the governance and implementation of sustainable development initiatives through blockchain technology," Futures, vol. 122, pp. 102611, 2020, ISSN 0016-3287, doi: 10.1016/j.futures.2020*
16. ^*Thalhammer, Felix, Pascal Schöttle, Matthias Janetschek, and Christian Ploder. "Blockchain Use Cases Against Climate Destruction." Cloud Computing and Data Science (2022): 60-76.*
17. ^*De Vries, Alex, Ulrich Gallersdörfer, Lena Klaaßen, and Christian Stoll. "Revisiting Bitcoin's carbon footprint." Joule 6, no. 3 (2022): 498-502.*
18. ^*Zhang, Dongna, Xihui Haviour Chen, Chi Keung Marco Lau, and Bing Xu. "Implications of cryptocurrency energy usage on climate change." Technological Forecasting and Social Change 187 (2023): 122219.*
19. ^*Wendl, Moritz, My Hanh Doan, and Remmer Sassen. "The environmental impact of cryptocurrencies using proof of work and proof of stake consensus algorithms: A systematic review." Journal of Environmental Management 326 (2023): 116530.*
20. ^*Sánchez Pérez, Marcos, Teresa Patricia Feria Arroyo, Crystian Sadiel Venegas Barrera, Carolina Sosa-Gutiérrez, Javier Torres, Katherine A. Brown, and Guadalupe Gordillo Pérez. "Predicting the Impact of Climate Change on the Distribution of Rhipicephalus sanguineus in the Americas." Sustainability 15, no. 5 (2023): 4557.*
21. ^*Rennie, Ellie. "Climate change and the legitimacy of Bitcoin." Available at SSRN 3961105 (2022).*