

Decrypting Distributed Ledger Design - Taxonomy, Classification and Blockchain Community Evaluation

Mark C. Ballandies
Computational Social Science
ETH Zurich
Zurich, Switzerland
bmark@ethz.ch

Marcus M. Dapp
Computational Social Science
ETH Zurich
Zurich, Switzerland
mdapp@ethz.ch

Evangelos Pournaras
School of Computing
University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT UK
e.pournaras@leeds.ac.uk

Abstract—More than 1000 distributed ledger technology (DLT) systems raising \$600 billion in investment in 2016 feature the unprecedented and disruptive potential of blockchain technology. A systematic and data-driven analysis, comparison and rigorous evaluation of the different design choices of distributed ledgers and their implications is a challenge. The rapidly evolving nature of the blockchain landscape hinders reaching a common understanding of the techno-socio-economic design space of distributed ledgers and the cryptoeconomies they support. To fill this gap, this paper makes the following contributions: (i) A conceptual architecture of DLT systems with which (ii) a taxonomy is designed and (iii) a rigorous classification of DLT systems is made using real-world data and wisdom of the crowd. (iv) A DLT design guideline is the end result of applying machine learning methodologies on the classification data. Compared to related work and as defined in earlier taxonomy theory, the proposed taxonomy is highly comprehensive, robust, explanatory and extensible. The findings of this paper can provide new insights and better understanding of the key design choices evolving the modeling complexity of DLT systems, while identifying opportunities for new research contributions and business innovation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over 1000 systems have emerged in recent years from distributed ledger technology (DLT), raising \$600 billion in investment in 2016 [1]. They power a large spectrum of novel distributed applications making use of data immutability, integrity, fair access, transparency, non-repudiation of transactions [2] and cryptocurrencies. These applications include improving supply-chains [3], creating self-sovereign identities¹ [4], establishing peer-to-peer energy markets [5], securing digital voting [6], [7] and enabling international financial transactions [2]. The most well-known DLT system is Bitcoin, featuring a novel consensus mechanism² and a cryptoeconomic design³ (CED), which enables untrusted parties to reach

consensus [8]. Bitcoin is the first public DLT system, which prevents double-spending⁴ and Sybil attacks⁵ [9].

A *distributed ledger* (DL) is a distributed data structure, whose entries are written by the participants of a DLT system after reaching consensus on the validity of the entries. A *consensus mechanism* is usually an integral part of a distributed ledger system and guarantees system reliability: all written entries are validated without a trusted third party. Distributed ledgers are usually designed to support secure *cryptoeconomies*, which are capable of operating cross-border, without depending on a particular political structure or legal system. These cryptoeconomies rely on digital currencies referred to as *tokens* and cryptographic techniques to regulate how value is exchanged between the participating actors [10], [11]. The options and choices of a cryptoeconomy are referred to as *cryptoeconomic design* (CED) and this plays a key role in the stability of a DLT system in terms of convergence, liveness, and fairness [8].

Nevertheless, making system design choices in this rapidly evolving technological landscape to meet the requirements of a broad spectrum of distributed applications is complex and challenging. The lack of a common and insightful conceptual framework for DLT has been cited as a significant barrier in this regard [12]. Moreover, the system configuration space of distributed ledgers and the cryptoeconomies they support is large, which has implications on the applicability as well as cost-effectiveness of DLT systems in real-world applications [2]. To date, these configurations have not been rigorously formalized to guide researchers and practitioners on how to design DLT systems [8], [13]. In particular, the broad spectrum and complexity of key design choices have not been determined. It has been argued that this lack of a clear positioning of DLT systems leads to a fragmentation in the blockchain community and a duplication of effort [14]. The significance of this challenge is reflected in the recent

¹Decentralized identities, owned and controlled by the individual represented through the identity.

²Bitcoin uses a Nakamoto consensus, see Section IV-B.

³In particular, paying a block reward (Section IV-D) and transaction fees (Section IV-B) to its consensus participants.

⁴Faulty transactions of the same token to two different receivers.

⁵Setup of fake identities to insert faulty information into the distributed ledger.

taxonomies of distributed ledgers [2], [14], [15], [16], [17].

This paper derives a *useful*⁶ taxonomy of DLT systems from a novel conceptual architecture. This taxonomy is then utilized to classify 50 viable and actively maintained DLT systems. In contrast to earlier work, a novel evaluation methodology is employed that solicits feedback from the blockchain community and constructively uses it to validate and further improve the proposed taxonomy and classification. Moreover, the classification data are utilized to reason about key design choices in the observed DLT systems, which then, in turn, determine a design guideline for these systems.

The contributions of this paper are outlined as follows:

- 1) A *conceptual architecture* that models DLT systems with four components. The architecture (Figure II) defines minimal and insightful design elements to illustrate the inner mechanics of distributed ledgers and the interrelationships of their components.
- 2) A *taxonomy* of distributed ledgers that formalizes a set of 19 descriptive and qualitative attributes, including a set of possible values for each attribute. They illustrate the four DLT components in more detail (Figure 2) and provide deeper insight into cryptoeconomic concepts such as utility token, public blockchain, etc.
- 3) A *classification* of 50 DLT systems, including Bitcoin and Ethereum, backed by an extensive literature review.
- 4) A *taxonomy evaluation criterion* referred to as ‘expressiveness’ derived from earlier theory on taxonomies.
- 5) *Crowdsourced feedback* from the blockchain community to further assess and improve the taxonomy and classification.
- 6) *Design guideline* for DLT systems (Figure 11), which is constructed by reasoning based on empirical data of viable, actively maintained and academically referenced DLT systems. This guideline structures the modeling complexity of DLT systems by grouping similar attribute values of the taxonomy into a characteristic design choice.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section II, terminology and recent taxonomies for DLT systems are discussed. A conceptual architecture for DLT systems is introduced in Section III, while a taxonomy is outlined in Section IV. Thereafter, Section V illustrates the methodology of the conducted experiments and Section VI presents the evaluation. Section VII summarizes the findings and derives based on these a design guideline for DLT systems. Finally, in Section VIII a conclusion is drawn and an outlook on future work is given.

II. BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

DLT systems use different *types of distributed ledgers* as data structures. In particular, the literature distinguishes between distributed ledgers (DL) and blockchains [2], [13], the latter representing one way to implement the former. Another type of distributed ledger is the directed acyclic graph [15].

⁶Usefulness is defined in Nickerson et. al [18] and formerly introduced in Section V-B2.

The entries of a distributed ledger contain *transactions*. Any type of transaction can be stored, ranging from cryptographically signed financial transactions, to hashes of digital assets, and Turing-complete executable programs [2], i.e. smart contracts. DLT systems often provide *access rights to these transactions*, which determine who can initiate transactions, write them to the distributed ledger, and read them again from the ledger [2]. In addition, DLT systems utilize so-called *tokens* [16], which are defined as a unit of value issued within a DLT system and which can be used as a medium of exchange or unit of account (see Section IV-D). These tokens span a multi-dimensional incentive system via which they can promote self-organization [24] and thus lead to benefits in society [25], such as contributing solutions for the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [26]. Hence tokens are identified as another key component of DLT systems in addition to the distributed ledger [27]. These components can be modeled independently, resulting in systems that do not necessarily maintain a native distributed ledger. In such cases, a token is defined while another system is used to provide the infrastructure for a distributed ledger. For instance, the Aragon system does not maintain a natively developed distributed ledger [28].

The ability to define the type of transactions, access rights and tokens is used to regulate the behavior of users, i.e. by limiting and granting access rights to system services or by incentivizing specific actions with tokens. These socio-economic choices not only influence aspects of the system stability, such as the correctness, liveness and fairness of the consensus mechanism [8], but also determine how complex cryptoeconomies emerge [10], [11]. In other words, cryptoeconomic design (CED) plays a key role in enabling DLT systems to reach stability and underpin how the economies form.

A DLT system has to reach *consensus* before a transaction can be permanently written to its ledger [16]. This consensus mechanism is a functional element of any DLT system [13], as it enables a decentralized network to take decisions about the validity of entries in the distributed ledger [29]. In particular, in the context of DLT systems, consensus prevents token units from being spent twice [30] and Sybill attacks [9], which is where fake identities are used to inject false information into the distributed ledger.

Recent ontologies and taxonomies have been proposed to structure the design space of DLT systems. A comparative summary of earlier work is shown in Table I. Column 3 of that table depicts if the paper utilizes a conceptual architecture to construct the taxonomy. Nickerson et al. [18] suggest to conceptualize the domain of interest for which a taxonomy is developed. In such a conceptual architecture, the attributes of a taxonomy should be positioned such that these are mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive [18]. Nevertheless, only Paper 4 and 8 in Table I provide a conceptual architecture (Column 3 in Table I) that determines the choice of some of the attributes. For instance, Paper 4 distinguishes between on-chain and off-chain components [16]: attributes of the DLT system, which exist on the distributed ledger (e.g. permission

TABLE I
COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW OF EARLIER WORK OUTLINING THE LANDSCAPE OF DISTRIBUTED LEDGERS.

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
ID	Paper	Concept	Attributes	Consensus Incentivization	Diff. DL	CED	Access rights to transactions	Token properties	Classification	Community Evaluation	Quantitative Analysis
1	Tasca et. al (2017) [14]	-	30	yes	-	yes	yes	yes	-	-	-
2	Comuzzi et. al (2018) [19]	-	8	yes	-	yes	yes	-	-	-	-
3	Xu et. al (2017) [2]	-	13	-	yes	yes	yes	-	-	-	-
4	Xu et. al (2016) [16]	yes	7	-	-	yes	yes	-	-	-	-
5	Yeow et. al (2018) [15]	-	4	-	yes	-	-	-	yes	-	-
6	Okada et. al (2017) [20]	-	4	yes	-	yes	-	-	-	-	-
7	Wieninger et. al (2019) [17]	-	11	yes	-	yes	yes	yes	-	-	-
8	Dinh et. al (2018) [21]	yes	9	-	-	yes	yes	-	yes (partial)	-	-
9	De Kruijff et. al (2017) [22]	-	6 (many)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Sarkintudu et. al (2018) [23]	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	This paper	yes	19	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

management) vs. attributes, which exist outside (e.g. control, data).

Taxonomy theory identifies, that a useful taxonomy should be concise and robust [18], hence using a limited number of attributes, which differentiates the objects of interest. The number of attributes listed in the papers varies considerably, from 4 to 30 (Column 4 in Table I). One explanation is that the papers focus on different aspects of DLT systems and thus study different (sub)sets of attributes. For instance, Yeow et. al [15] (Paper 5 in Table I) focus on Internet of Things applications of DLT systems and only use four attributes, whereas Tasca et. al (Paper 1 in Table I) design a taxonomy to model all types of DLT systems and hence use 30 attributes [14]. Nevertheless, none of the papers justifies the number of selected attributes. In particular, their impact on conciseness and robustness of the taxonomy is not evaluated. Also, several of the attributes potentially overlap with each other conceptually due to the aforementioned lack of a conceptual architecture.

Consensus is identified as a core feature of DLT systems [29] and as such, it is incorporated in all papers listed in Table I. For this reason, it is omitted from this table. Nevertheless, just four papers consider schemes to incentivize participation in the consensus mechanism (Column 5 in Table I).

Moreover, only Paper 3 and 5 distinguish between different types of distributed ledgers (Column 6 in Table I). For instance, Xu. et al. differentiate between blockchains and directed acyclic graphs [2]. Nevertheless, some of the most recent contributions solely include blockchain-based DLT systems [2], [14], [17], [19].

Seven papers include cryptoeconomic design in their taxonomy (Column 7 in Table I). In particular, six papers consider access rights to transactions (Column 8 in Table I). Only Paper 1 and 7 derive a taxonomy, which includes tokens and their properties (Column 9 in Table I).

Paper 5 and 8 illustrate a classification of DLT systems based on their proposed taxonomy (Column 10 in Table I). For instance, Paper 5 illustrates the classification of 28 DLT systems. The authors rely on three attributes: data structure, scalable consensus ledger, and transaction model [15]. However, neither of the two papers introduces a formal methodol-

ogy to select the classified DLT systems, which lowers their objectivity. Also, without a formal selection methodology it is not guaranteed that the taxonomy enables a comprehensive classification of all known DLT systems, which is a quality criterion of taxonomies [18].

The *usefulness* of a taxonomy depends on qualitative criteria studied in taxonomy theory [18]. An approach to assess the usefulness of a taxonomy is to utilize crowdsourced community feedback and thus the wisdom of the crowd. This is particularly relevant in the case of DLT systems and the blockchain community. As the community shapes the blockchain landscape, soliciting their feedback can provide both, invaluable new insight into the design of DLT systems and increase the usefulness of a taxonomy. Nevertheless, such an endeavor has not been pursued until nowadays, as shown in Column 11 of Table I.

Finally, a quantitative evaluation and analysis of taxonomy and classification elements by means of statistical or machine learning methods have not been performed so far (Column 12 in Table I). This is a missed opportunity, as such an approach can provide more objective insights into the usefulness of taxonomies and identify key design choices in DLT systems that structure the modeling complexity of these systems at design phase, as demonstrated in this paper (Section VI-B).

The most comprehensive taxonomy, as defined by Nickerson et. al [18] and introduced by Tasca et al. [14], is worth a brief discussion. This taxonomy for DLT systems consists of eight components encompassing a total of 30 attributes. It includes a CED with three components: native currencies/tokenization, identity management, and charging, as well as a reward system. In particular, the access rights to transactions and the properties of tokens are discussed. Access rights to participate in the consensus mechanism and the incentivization of this mechanism are also illustrated. Despite extensively covering many relevant concepts, this taxonomy lacks a conceptual architecture to connect the various elements, i.e. no information is given about how the eight components relate to each other. Moreover, it remains unclear what explicit criteria the authors use to decide upon these eight components and 30 attributes. In particular, as the amount of attributes is four times larger than the average in the other papers (on average 7.4 attributes,

Column 3 in Table I) it is unclear if the proposed taxonomy is concise as defined in the context of taxonomy theory [18]. In addition, no distinction is explicitly made between CED and DL, or between on-chain and off-chain aspects. In particular, this taxonomy does not differentiate between different types of distributed ledgers. This limits its ability to provide a more granular differentiation of distributed ledgers, which is a quality indicator for taxonomies [18].

In summary, a few observations can be made about current DLT system taxonomies. First, they predominantly focus on the DL and consensus mechanisms, while largely missing the role of cryptoeconomics and token design, despite their significant influence on system stability [8]. Second, the inter-relationships between the different components as well as the choice of attributes are usually not based on an overarching conceptual architecture. Third, only two of the papers classify real-world DLT systems. Nevertheless, these papers neither utilize a rigorous scientific methodology nor quantitatively analyze their classification. As a result, classification is usually not formally validated and the identification of design choices is limited to qualitative criteria. Last but not least, none of the proposed taxonomies are systematically refined based on feedback from blockchain practitioners. This complementary external validation process promises to produce more unbiased taxonomies.

This paper addresses all of the aforementioned limitations identified in the literature and contributes a useful taxonomy as defined in earlier taxonomy theory [18], built on a solid conceptual architecture, assessed via classifications and validated by both, feedback from the blockchain community and machine learning methods. Moreover, the quantitative analysis of the classification is utilized to identify key design choices in observed DLT systems.

III. CONCEPTUAL ARCHITECTURE

By studying 50 DLT systems (see Table 1 in Supplementary Material for an overview of these systems), a conceptual architecture is introduced in this section. The architecture is composed of a set of four key components and shows, how they relate to each other as well as how they are positioned in the distributed ledger design space. The architecture is depicted in Figure II. The four components are illustrated in the rest of this section.

Action component. A human or machine performs an action in the real world (Arrow A in Figure II), for example planting a tree or carrying out a monetary transaction. Here, at the border between the real world and digital world, the action is represented digitally, and is referred to as claim.

Consensus component. Claims are broadcast to all nodes in the network that can participate in the consensus mechanism (Arrow B). These nodes (referred to as miners in Bitcoin or minters in Peercoin) collect these claims to write them to the distributed ledger.

Distributed ledger component. Participants in the consensus mechanism combine these claims into entries (referred to as blocks in Bitcoin) and write them to the distributed ledger

(Arrow C). This representation of the claim on the distributed ledger is called a transaction. Transactions and their containing objects (e.g. smart contracts) that exist on the distributed ledger are referred to as on-chain, in contrast to off-chain objects, which exist on the Consensus or Action component.

Token component. The way token units are created depends on whether an incentive system is part of the DLT system. If it is, there are two options: token units are given as rewards to nodes for either participating in the consensus mechanism (Arrow D) or carrying out an action (Arrow E). While the inherent properties of such tokens (e.g. whether supply is capped or not) are determined by the design of the DLT system, the value of the token units is backed by underlyings, which are cryptoeconomic assets that reside on-chain (Arrow F, for example other tokens or executable code) or off-chain (Arrow G, for example goods, services or commodities). In particular, it has been noted, that the value of cryptoeconomic tokens is important for the ecosystem to be robust [24].

Example Ethereum. In the case of Ethereum, one type of action involves deploying a piece of code (Arrow A in Figure II), such as a smart contract. These actions are collected by miners (Arrow B) and written as a block to the Ethereum distributed ledger (Arrow C). A miner who successfully writes a block obtains Ether, which refers to newly created units of a token that serves as an incentive to mine (Arrow D). The Ether token has inherent properties, e.g. it has uncapped supply. It also has value because it enables its owner to access the on-chain computational power of the Ethereum network (Arrow F).

IV. TAXONOMY

Based on the conceptual architecture of Section III, a taxonomy is designed, using the method proposed by Nickerson et al. [18]. The goal of the taxonomy is to enable a comprehensive classification of DLT systems that enable the quantitative derivation of key design choices in these systems. For this, the taxonomy illustrates both, the distributed ledger technology (DLT) and the cryptoeconomic design (CED) of academically relevant DLT systems. For this, the taxonomy positions the four components from Section III across two dimensions (Figure 2). The first dimension concerns aspects of the system design related to distributed ledger technology (DLT) – *Distributed Ledger component*, *Consensus component* –, while the second dimension concerns aspects pertaining to cryptoeconomic design (CED) – *Action component* and *Token component*.

A. Distributed Ledger

Definition 1. A distributed ledger is defined as a distributed data structure, containing entries that serve as digital records of actions.

In the Bitcoin system, an entry in the data structure is called a block. In the IOTA system, it is called a bundle. An entry contains a set of transactions (Figure II, DL component). In

Fig. 1. An overview of the conceptual architecture containing the four key concepts of DLT systems and their relationship: action, consensus, distributed ledger and token.





Fig. 2. Overview of the taxonomy, depicting the two dimensions of DLT and CED, its four components and 19 attributes.

Bitcoin, these transactions represent the exchange of cryptocurrency value. The attributes of the distributed ledger are *type*, *origin*, *address traceability* and *Turing completeness*.

1) *Type*: denotes the data structure of the distributed ledger and can be one of the following: *blockchain*, *directed acyclic graph* (DAG) or *other*.

The most well-known type is the blockchain; an immutable and append-only linked list, which has a total order of elements. Several systems use blockchains, such as Bitcoin [2], Ethereum [31] and Litecoin [32]. In contrast to these

systems, IOTA uses a directed acyclic graph [15]. This data structure is no longer a linked list, but a directed graph with no cycles, leading to a partial order of elements. Moreover, Ripple neither uses a blockchain nor a directed acyclic graph but instead operates on other consensus-based accounting mechanism [33].

2) *Origin*: refers to who maintains the distributed ledger. The attribute value can either be *native*, if the distributed ledger is maintained by and for the system itself or *external*, if the system uses a distributed ledger from another DLT system or *hybrid* if the systems maintain their own distributed ledger in combination with a distributed ledger of another DLT system.

The level of maintenance varies between different DLT systems. Bitcoin develops and maintains its distributed ledger natively, as does NXT [16]. In contrast, Aragon [28], Augur [34] [33] and Counterparty [15] does not maintain a native distributed ledger, opting to use the Ethereum or Bitcoin infrastructure instead. Systems can use a hybrid approach. Factom combines a natively developed blockchain and its own consensus mechanism with the Bitcoin blockchain [2].

3) *Address traceability*: denotes the extent to which different transactions, which originate from or arrive at the same chain identity, can be linked together. The value can either be *obfuscatable*, if the distributed ledger has mechanisms in place to hide such links or *linkable*, if these links can be inferred with some computational effort.

The level of address traceability varies between the differ-

ent DLT systems. Zcash [2] and Monero [14] are so-called privacy coins, which perform advanced measures to unlink transactions [8]. Hence, the on-chain identities of the actors remain obfuscated. Bitcoin has linkable address traceability [8]. In theory, transactions cannot be linked to a particular chain identity, but it has been shown that this can actually be achieved with some computational effort [2]. The same applies to Ripple [35].

4) *Turing completeness*: refers to whether a Turing machine can be simulated by the DL and can either be *Yes* or *No*.

Some DLs, such as Ethereum, can execute Turing machines. This allows Turing complete smart contracts to be stored and executed [16], in contrast to the Bitcoin blockchain [8].

5) *Storage*: denotes whether additional data can be stored on the distributed ledger beyond the default transaction information. The attribute value can either be *yes* if data can be stored or *no*, if additional data cannot be stored.

The distributed ledger of Bitcoin allows arbitrary data to be stored inside transactions. This allows Bitcoin to be used as a base layer for other DLT systems, such as observed in the Counterparty system [15]. In contrast to Bitcoin, IOTA does not allow additional data to be stored [36].

B. Consensus

Definition 2. *Consensus is the mechanism through which entries are written to the distributed ledger, while adhering to a set of rules that all participants enforce when an entry containing transactions is validated.*

The attributes of consensus are *finality*, *proof*, *write permission*, *validation permission* and *fee*. Due to the scope of the taxonomy to enable a comprehensive classification of all components of a DLT system (Figure II), more granular consensus attributes such as verification speed are not considered. Nevertheless, detailed consensus attributes can be found in [30], [37].

1) *Finality*: refers to the guarantee that past transactions can not be changed or reversed. Its value is *deterministic* if consensus is guaranteed to be reached in finite time, or *probabilistic* if there is some uncertainty over whether consensus can be reached.

Most DLT systems use the Nakamoto consensus [2], which is a Byzantine Fault Tolerance (BFT) algorithm. These types of algorithms tolerate a class of system failures that belong to the Byzantine Generals Problem [38]. In particular, a consensus algorithm that has this property prevents under some guarantees⁷ [8] consensus participants from writing a false transaction to the distributed ledger.

In contrast to other BFT algorithms, the Nakamoto consensus is probabilistic. This type of algorithm validates each new entry using the entire history of previous entries: An entry is accepted if there is a certain number of new entries referencing

⁷e.g. that no participant/ cartel of participants controls more than 50% of the computational capacity of the consensus network or that participants behave rationally

it [8]. For instance, in the case of Bitcoin, a writer validates a transaction by considering the whole blockchain and then including the transaction in a new block. As soon as this block is referenced by six other blocks, it is confirmed, as the probability that a second chain of six blocks referencing each other, but not referencing this block, is low [2]. Similarly, the directed acyclic graph of IOTA confirms an entry when it is referenced by a significant number of new entries [15]. On the other hand, Ripple does not use a Nakamoto consensus algorithm and it is guaranteed that consensus can be reached in a finite period of time [29].

2) *Proof*: is the evidence used to achieve consensus. The value can either be *proof-of-work* (PoW), if consensus is achieved using the processing power of computers; *proof-of-stake* (PoS), if it is achieved through voting processes linked to (economic) power in the system; *hybrid*, if it is a combination of the previous two or *other*, if another form of proof is required.

Participants in the consensus mechanism require proof before accepting the validity of an entry. Bitcoin uses a proof-of-work [16], which is the solution to a mathematical puzzle that requires computational processing power. A proof-of-stake is used by Ardor [14], which is the approval of a randomly selected consensus participant who must hold a stake in Ardor token units.

3) *Write permission*: denotes who is allowed to write entries to the distributed ledger. The value can either be *restricted*, if participation is restricted or *public*, if it is not.

The Bitcoin consensus mechanism is public [16], meaning that it allows everyone who has computing power to participate [29]. Conversely, the consensus mechanism of Ripple is restricted [16], meaning that only a few trusted institutions can participate [15].

4) *Validate permission*: signifies who is allowed to validate claims before they are written to the distributed ledger. The value can either be *restricted*, if participation is restricted or *public*, if it is not.

In the case of Bitcoin, writers validate the correctness of claims before writing them to a block: hence, the validation permission is public. In contrast, in the case of IOTA, a central entity, the coordinator, validates transactions before they are collected in an entry and written to the directed acyclic graph [15].

5) *Fee*: denotes whether participants in the consensus (writers and validators) are paid a fee for validating new entries and writing them to the distributed ledger. The value can either be *yes* or *no*.

In contrast to Bitcoin, where writers/validators are rewarded with fees [29], IOTA writers and validators receive no fees [15]. In the case of Ripple, consensus participants are not rewarded with fees, although actors need to pay a fee [39]. This system layout is captured by the fee attribute in the Action component (Section IV-C).

C. Action

Definition 3. An action is one or more real-life activities, which can be digitally represented by a DLT system as a transaction.

In this sense, a transaction represents digitally a real-life action. The attributes of action are *actor permission*, *read permission* and *fee*.

1) *Actor permission*: denotes who can perform an action. The value can either be *restricted* if actors have to fulfill special requirements before performing actions or *public*, if anyone can perform actions.

Bitcoin allows everyone to create a private key to send and receive token units [14]: hence, it has a public actor permission. Ripple uses restricted access rights. In order to comply with regulations (e.g. know-your-customer), actors need to register [14].

2) *Read permission*: refers to which actors can read the contents of transactions from the distributed ledger. The value can either be *restricted*, if preconditions need to be fulfilled before permission is granted, or *public*, if permission is not restricted.

Most DLT systems have public read access in the sense that everyone can read the content of the actions, which have occurred, e.g. the number of bitcoins transferred [14]. Systems utilizing privacy coins often restrict read access to the actors involved in a transaction (e.g. Zcash [2]), usually by making an effort to hide the number of token units transferred [8].

3) *Fee*: denotes whether an actor has to pay a fee for performing an action that is unrelated to the consensus. The values are *yes* or *no*.

Some DLT systems require actors to pay a fee, which is unrelated to the consensus before they can store an action on the distributed ledger. For instance, actors have to pay a fee in Augur, which is not distributed to consensus participants [34] but given to actors providing services in the system. In the case of Bitcoin, no additional fee is required to perform an action, except the fee paid to the consensus participants. Ripple also requires actors to pay a fee for each action, which is not paid to consensus participants but is subsequently destroyed [39].

D. Token

Definition 4. Token is a unit of value issued within a DLT system and which can be used as a medium of exchange or unit of account.

The associated attributes are *supply property*, *burn property*, *creation condition*, *unconditional creation* and *underlying*.

1) *Supply property*: refers to the total quantity of token units made available. The value can either be *capped*, if the total supply is limited to a finite number or *uncapped* otherwise.

If demand increases for a token, a capped supply can cause the perceived token value to appreciate and corresponds to a deflation in prices nominated in this token. Moreover, it can result in an appreciated exchange rate with other tokens, which in turn, increases the stability of a DLT system [8]. Bitcoin has

a capped supply of 21 million units [14], whereas Dodgecoin does not have an upper limit [8].

2) *Burn property*: denotes whether token supply is reduced by removing token units. The values are *yes* or *no*.

Some DLT systems destroy token units in a process referred to as ‘burn’. If demand remains constant, this decrease in the money supply causes token units to appreciate and hence, results in a better exchange rate with other tokens. For example in the case of Ripple, paid fees are removed from the total supply and are not returned [39]. In contrast, Bitcoin has no inherent mechanism to destroy token units.

3) *Transferability*: refers to whether the ownership of a token unit can be changed. The value can either be *transferable*, if the token can be transferred, or *non-transferable* otherwise.

Bitcoin token units can be transferred between different actors. Akasha plans to use non-transferable reputation tokens, so-called Mana and Essence [40].

4) *Creation condition*: denotes whether the creation of new token units is linked to the incentivization of the consensus mechanism and/ or an action. The value can either be *consensus*, if creation is linked to the consensus mechanism, *action*, if creation is linked to an action, *both*, if creation is linked to the consensus mechanism as well as an action, or *none* otherwise.

In the case of Bitcoin, new tokens are created to incentivize the consensus mechanism [2]. Other systems create new tokens to incentivize an action. For instance, Steemit creates new steem to incentivize content creation on the platform (e.g. writing blog articles) [41]. Moreover, Ripple does not use its token to incentivize the consensus mechanism or an action [42]. Furthermore, hybrid versions are possible, where new tokens are created to incentivize both the consensus mechanism and an action. For instance, newly created token units in the DASH system are awarded to both the consensus participants and the master nodes, who perform actions such as mixing transactions to enable obfuscatable address traceability [43].

5) *Unconditional creation*: refers to the number of new token units that can be created, which do not serve to incentivize the consensus mechanism or an action. The value can either be *partial*, if some tokens are created unconditionally, *all*, if all tokens are created unconditionally (e.g. 100 % pre-mined tokens), or *none* otherwise.

At the genesis of the Bitcoin system, no token units had previously been mined and all tokens come into existence by incentivizing the consensus [8]. On the other hand, all Ripple tokens were created during the genesis of the system. In the case of Augur, some tokens were created during the genesis of the system [34].

6) *Underlying*: denotes the source of a token value and what it consists of.

The value can either be *token*, if the token grants access to another token; *distributed ledger* if the token grants access to the distributed ledger, e.g. if the token is needed in order to use the storage or computing capacity of the distributed ledger; *consensus*, if the token grants access to the consensus mechanism, e.g. in a proof-of-stake type system; *action*, if




Fig. 3. Identification and selection process of top 50 systems for classification ranked according to Section V-A. The final classification is provided in the Supplementary Materials.

the token grants access to perform or receive actions, goods or services in the real world; or *none*, if the token has no underlying.

The first two values (distributed ledger and token) are considered to be on-chain and the latter two are considered to be off-chain underlyings of a token unit (as depicted in Figure II).

The Ethereum token allows everyone to store data or smart contracts on-chain [2] and to access in this way the distributed ledger of the network. Hence, the source of value of Ether token units is that they grant access to the processing power of the distributed ledger. In contrast to Ether, the Golem network token units allow holders to access off-chain computations [33]. Thus, its underlying is action as the token provides access to a service in the real world (Action component). The Storj Token allows users to access off-chain storage [14], which again resides in the Action component. Siacoin allows for the storage of arbitrary data on both its distributed ledger [44] and its off-chain network [45]. Hence its underlyings reside in the DL and Action components.

V. EXPERIMENTAL METHODOLOGY

Based on the introduced taxonomy, 50 DLT systems are classified. The taxonomy and classification are evaluated by (i) the blockchain community via a survey and (ii) a quantitative analysis of real-world data. Furthermore, the quantitative analysis of the classification by the means of machine learning methods identifies key design choices in the observed DLT systems that structure modeling complexity at design phase. In the following, the methodologies of the classification (Section V-A), the blockchain community feedback (Section V-B) and the machine learning analysis (Section V-C) are illustrated.

A. Classification

The scope of the classification is to comprehensively capture the CED and DLT of viable, academically referenced and actively maintained DLT systems. Moreover, the classification aims at capturing the current state of a DLT system. In particular, features that are about to be released in the future are not considered. Finally, in the case that a system is 1st layer (utilizing a native distributed ledger, e.g. a mainchain) and 2nd layer (utilizing an external distributed ledger, e.g. sidechains), only the 1st layer is classified. Likewise, if a system utilizes more than one token, only the main token is classified.

In order to guarantee reproducibility, objectivity, and comprehensiveness, a system selection process for the classification is designed. Figure 3 depicts this process and visualizes the number of remaining systems per refinement step. Two websites are used:

- *Coinmarketcap.com*: Central point of information inquiry in the cryptoeconomics field, listing DLT systems by their market capitalization. The rationale is that the economic value of a system is a good proxy for its viability. Hence this source provides a ranked list of viable DLT systems.
- *coincodecap.com*: This site lists Github indicators of DLT systems. In particular, it contains information about the number of code commitments, Github stars, and contributors to a DLT system. These indicators capture an active development of a system.

The limitation of these data sources is that they only list systems that maintain a native cryptoeconomic token. Hence, Blockchain-as-a-Service systems⁸, such as Hyperledger Fabric are not considered. Moreover, depending on the development strategy of a system, commits might be merged externally and only pushed occasionally as major updates to Github. This may result in a lower rank of a DLT system, despite being actively maintained. This limitation is considered in the proposed ranking function (1).

Snapshots of the sources were taken on the 17th April 2019 and are merged based on the systems acronym⁹. In order to account for academic relevance, the selection of the systems is enhanced with the number of mentions of DLT systems in Elseviers ScienceDirect database¹⁰ and then filtered based on the criterion of whether systems are actually mentioned in literature ($\#mentions > 0$). For the database search, the following search string is utilized on the API field *qs*¹¹: "PROJECT NAME" AND (Blockchain OR Ledger).

The remaining systems are ranked based on the following ranking function

$$r(i) = 0.6 * m_{cap}(i) + 0.3 * c_{commit}(i) + 0.1 * c_{contr}(i) \quad (1)$$

⁸These are systems not utilizing a native distributed ledger, as defined in Table 2 of the Supplementary Material.

⁹A three-letter code identifying the token of a system.

¹⁰Database of peer-reviewed literature, enabling full-text searches: <https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/sciencedirect> (last accessed: May 2019).

¹¹Searches over all article excluding references: https://dev.elsevier.com/tecdoc_sdsearch_migration.html (last accessed: May 2019).

where m_{cap} is the rank based on the market capitalization of a system i , c_{commit} the commitment rank and c_{contr} the contributors rank. The weights are chosen to account for the limitation of the Github activity to be a proxy for active system maintenance, hence the lower weights. The top 50 systems are then classified, based on an extensive literature review performed by the first author and checked independently by the co-authors and the blockchain community. Sources for the classification are academic literature, DLT systems websites, and whitepapers. An overview of the final classified systems can be found in Table 1 of the Supplementary Material. Moreover, the actual classification of the systems is provided in Tables 3-6 of the Supplementary Material.

B. Blockchain Community Feedback

Participants were invited based on their contributions to Github¹² repositories of DLT systems and their official websites. Participants received a personalized email invitation (Figure 1 in Supplementary Material) to participate in a scientific survey to rate the classification of their DLT system and the expressiveness (as defined in Section VI-A3) of the proposed taxonomy. A total of 326 invitations were sent and 85 practitioners in the field responded (response rate 26.1%). 50 respondents completed the survey (completion rate 58.8%). Only completed surveys are considered in the analysis. The participants were recruited during two phases each lasting two months: The first beginning on the 22nd of March 2018 and the second on 24th July 2019. The feedback of the first phase resulted in improvements of the taxonomy, as illustrated in Section B of the Supplementary Material, and the feedback of both phases resulted in improvements of the classification.

1) *Classification*: In the first part of the survey, the participants were shown the classification of the four components and 19 attributes of the DLT system to which they contribute. Consult Figure 2 for an overview of the attributes and Tables 3-6 of the Supplementary Material for the classification ratings. The participants had the option to agree, disagree or state that they were uncertain about the classification. They could always comment on their decision, irrespective of their choice.

In order to calculate the consistency with which participants rated the classification of the same system, the consistency per attribute is calculated as follows: Assuming equidistance in the likert scale [46], the participant responses are represented by a linear scale whereby 0 denotes disagreement, 0.5 denotes uncertainty, and 1 denotes agreement. Then, for each DLT system from which more than one response was obtained as illustrated in Table II, the consistency of responses is calculated for each system and attribute with the mean absolute error between the responses. Then, the average consistency for each attribute over all DLT systems is obtained by calculating the weighted average value of the previously calculated mean absolute errors.

2) *Taxonomy*: In the second part of the survey, the blockchain community is asked to evaluate the taxonomy.

Nickerson et al. propose five criteria to assess the *usefulness* of a taxonomy [18]. Namely, a taxonomy is

- *concise*, if it uses a limited number of attributes,
- *robust*, if it uses enough attributes to clearly *differentiate* the objects of interest
- *comprehensive*, if it can *classify* all known objects within the domain under considerations,
- *extensible*, if it allows for inclusion of additional attributes and attribute values when new types of objects appear,
- *explanatory*, if it contains object attributes that do not model every possible detail of the objects but, rather, provide useful explanations of the nature of the objects under study or help to understand future objects.

The literature review (Section II) reveals differences regarding how many attributes should be included in a *robust* taxonomy of DLT systems. Also, the scope of the classification is to *comprehensively* classify the CED of all academically relevant systems. Thus, considering these two points, the taxonomy is evaluated using the robustness and comprehensiveness criteria of Nickerson et al. [18]. To this end, this paper introduces the concept of expressiveness:

Definition 5. *A taxonomy is expressive when it is robust and comprehensive.*

where a robust and comprehensive taxonomy are given by Nickerson et. al [18].

The perceived expressiveness of the developed taxonomy can be determined by asking the survey participants for each component and attribute:

Question 1. *"How expressive is [component/attribute] to differentiate between and classify DLT systems".*

This formulation neither exposes survey participants to the theory of expressiveness, comprehensiveness and robustness nor overloads them with a high number of questions.

The consistency calculation for the taxonomy feedback follows along the lines of the classification (Section V-B1): Despite utilizing a five-point Likert scale (from very non-expressive to very expressive) to create values ranging from zero to one, the calculation of consistency remains the same as the one for the classification.

C. Machine Learning Analysis

In order to mine the key design choices in the classified DLT systems, two unsupervised machine learning methods are applied to the classified systems:

- 1) *Multiple Correspondence Analysis* (MCA) is a statistical method that is widely used in the social sciences. It can analyze data without a priori assumptions concerning the data, such as data falling into discrete clusters or variables being independent [47] [48]. It is a generalization of the principal component analysis (PCA) for categorical data coded in the form of an indicator matrix or a Burt matrix [49], which aims at summarizing underlying structures in the fewest possible dimensions

¹²Available at <https://github.com> (last accessed: July 2019).

[50]. In particular, it identifies new latent dimensions, which are a combination of the original dimensions and hence can explain information not directly observable [51]. Moreover, similar to PCA, these dimensions are ordered by their importance to explain the amount of variance in the data [48].

- 2) *Kmeans* [52] for varying k is applied on the classification to cluster the DLT systems based on their attribute values. The optimum number of clusters is derived by both, performing a bootstrap evaluation that determines the stability of the clusters [53] and by two well-known cluster evaluation metrics: Silhouette and Calinski-Harabasz [54].

VI. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

The evaluation aims to identify key design choices that govern the modeling complexity of DLT systems at design phase. In order to base these insights on a strong footing, first, the taxonomy and classification are validated by feedback from the blockchain community (Section VI-A). Then two machine learning methods are applied on the classification to mine the design choices on a quantitative basis. (Section VI-B).

A. Blockchain Community Feedback

The taxonomy (Section IV) and classification (Table 3-6 of the Supplementary Material) are evaluated using feedback from the blockchain community.

1) *Demographics*: Table II shows the demographics of the survey participants. In particular, it shows participants specific roles for the systems and their experience. The 50 participants work in (core) technical (25 developers) and strategic (7 Project leads) positions. Moreover, 15 participants have more than three years of experience, 29 participants have worked one to three years, and 6 participants have worked for less than a year in the field of DLT systems. Moreover, Table II illustrates that the participants are involved in 33 out of the 50 classified systems.




Fig. 4. Acceptance level of the classification and expressiveness of taxonomy components as perceived by survey participants.

2) *Classification*: Figure 4(a) depicts the aggregate acceptance level for each of the components. The Distributed Ledger component received the highest acceptance level with 88.0%,

TABLE II
SURVEY PARTICIPANTS PER DLT SYSTEM, THEIR SPECIFIC ROLES, AND EXPERIENCE

DLT system	Total
Aragon	2
Ark	1
Bitcoin	1
Bitcoin Cash	2
BitShares	2
Byteball	1
Cardano	3
Dash	6
Decred	1
DigiByte	1
Ethereum	1
Factom	1
Golem	1
IOTA	2
Komodo	1
MOAC-MotherChain	1
Monacoin	1
Monero	4
NEM	1
NEO	1
Nexus	2
PIVX	1
ReddCoin	1
Siacoin	1
Skycoin	1
Steem	1
Stellar	1
Storj	1
Stratis	1
TRON	2
Verge	1
Waves	1
Zcash	2
Total	50

Role in Project	Total
Project Lead	7
Core/Team Developer	21
Team Member	8
Advisor	1
Community Developer	4
Community Member	2
Other	7
Total	50

Experience	Total
> 3 years	15
1-3 years	29
< 1 year	6
Total	50

followed by the Token component (86.8%), Action component (82.0%) and Consensus component (77.8%).

Figure 5 illustrates the acceptance level for each attribute of the four components. It is noteworthy that the average approval rating over all components is 83.7%. Five attributes are above 90%: transferability (96.2%), origin (92.0%), DL type (97.8%), creation condition (90.0%) and unconditional creation (90.0%).

The figure shows that the highest disagreements relate to the validate permission (17.4%), underlying (15.4%) and storage (15.4%). The highest degree of uncertainty is expressed regarding the action fee (18.0%), consensus finality (17.4%) and consensus proof (13.0%) attributes.

In order to investigate the consistency of the responses, the weighted consistency averages for each attribute are depicted in Figure 7. The overall consistency is on average 89.9%. The lowest consistency measured relates to the consensus type (79.2%) and action fee (82.4%), correlating with the higher degree of disagreement observed earlier. The highest consistencies are observed for the DL type (100.0%), origin (97.3%), actor permission (96.4%), supply property (95.8%), creation condition (95.6%) and unconditional creation (95.6%) attributes.

In a nutshell, the acceptance level of 83.7% over all com-




Fig. 5. Classification evaluation of the attributes, grouped component-wise.




Fig. 6. Expressiveness evaluation of the attributes, grouped component-wise (N=50).




Fig. 7. Weighted average of consistency calculation per attribute, using DLT systems consistency values of which more than one response is obtained.

ponents and the average consistency of 89.9% indicates the acceptance of the classification by the community.

3) *Taxonomy*: Figure 4(b) depicts the expressiveness of the four components as perceived by the survey participants. The Consensus component is seen as the most expressive (92.0%), followed by Distributed Ledger (90.0%), Token (70.0%) and Action component (64.0%). The highest uncertainty relates to the Action (24.0%) and Token (22.0%) components. The Action component consists of the lowest number of attributes, which may decrease its perceived expressiveness. In particular,

the reduced number of attributes seems to hinder differentiation between DLT systems. Moreover, the literature review reveals, that Consensus is included in all taxonomies (Section II). Thus this component might have been the most familiar to the participants resulting in higher expressiveness.

15 participants commented on the expressiveness of the components. They stated that a component depicting the governance of a system should be illustrated by the taxonomy (26.6%)¹³, including the funding of a DLT system. Three participants (20%) mention that the Action component is not expressive enough to illustrate specific features of a system, such as the distribution of actors. Similar statements were made about the Token component (20.0%). In particular, it has been stated, that inter-token dynamics should be covered and that further attributes are required to illustrate the creation conditions and 1st and 2nd layer tokens (20.0%). Moreover, the quality of code implementation, type of programming language, strategy of code development and scalability of the system has been mentioned (26.6%) as expressive attributes missing in the taxonomy. One participant stated, that the underlying attribute should be more sharply defined¹⁴, and another used the opportunity to further elaborate on the sys-

¹³In brackets are depicted the percentage for which this responds type accounts for the overall received comments. Please note, that the percentages do not add up to 100% as a survey participants comments can account for more than one responds type.

¹⁴Since the participant's feedback the definition of the underlying has been revised. Please refer to Section B of the Supplementary Material

tem functioning. Finally, some participants made statements endorsing the construction of the taxonomy (13.3%).

Figure 6 depicts the perceived expressiveness of the 19 attributes. The five most expressive attributes are deemed to be transferability (88.5%), read permission (86.0%), origin (84.0%), actor permission (82.0%), write permission (82.0%) and DL type (82.0%). Action fee (26.0%), storage (23.1%), consensus type (22.0%) and burn property (22%) raise the highest degree of uncertainty. The least expressive attributes are deemed to be the consensus proof (14.0%), burn property (14.0%) and Turing completeness/ unconditional creation (each 12.0%) attributes. Despite the Action component being the least expressive component, two of its attributes are amongst the top five most expressive attributes. This supports the consideration to extend the action component by adding further attributes. A similar observation is made for the Token component: transferability is the most expressive attribute, but the perceived expressiveness of its component is lower than for the DL and Consensus components, which suggests extending the attributes of the Token component.

The assessment of the feedback regarding the attributes provided by the survey participants during the first recruitment phase lead to an inclusion of further attributes into the taxonomy. The nature and reasoning of these adjustments can be found in Section B of the Supplementary Material. This inclusion of new attributes indicates that the taxonomy is extensible [18].

Figure 7(b) depicts the consistency with which the participants evaluated the expressiveness of the taxonomy attributes. The average consistency over all attributes is 85.5%, meaning that survey respondents from the same DLT systems rated the expressiveness of the taxonomy similarly to each other. In particular, they diverge from each other just 14.5% on average, that is less than one choice difference on the aforementioned Likert scale.

In a nutshell, the average expressiveness rating of 79% over all components and the average consistency of 85.5% indicates that the taxonomy is expressive.

B. Machine Learning Analysis

The multiple correspondence analysis is utilized to identify underlying design choices in the classified systems. In particular, the method identifies new latent dimensions, which are a combination of the original attributes of the taxonomy. In Table III these twelve latent dimensions and their contribution to the explained variance in the data after applying Benzceri (optimistic) and Greenacre (pessimistic) corrections are depicted in decreasing order of importance. The first four dimensions account for 96.2% of total variation (for the Benzceri correction) and thus are considered significant to explain the variance in the data.

Figure 8 depicts how these four dimensions are determined by both, the original attribute values of the taxonomy and the classified 50 systems. The four significant dimensions in the new vector space are in descending order of explained variance:

TABLE III
EIGENVALUES AND CORRESPONDING EXPLAINED VARIANCES OF MCA DIMENSIONS AFTER APPLYING BENZCERI AND GREENACRE CORRECTION

Dim	Description	Eigenvalue	Corrected Variances	
			Benzceri	Greenacre
1	Layering	0.311	0.764	0.679
2	Participation	0.060	0.148	0.132
3	Staking capability	0.013	0.032	0.029
4	Cryptoec. complexity	0.007	0.018	0.016
5		0.006	0.014	0.012
6		0.003	0.008	0.007
7		0.002	0.006	0.005
8		0.002	0.004	0.004
9		0.001	0.003	0.002
10		0.001	0.002	0.001
11		0.001	0.001	0.001
12		0	0.001	0.000
13		0	0	0

- *Dimension 1*: Illustrates if a system is layered. In particular, if the system uses a native distributed ledger or an external one and thus corresponds to the origin attribute of the taxonomy.
- *Dimension 2*: Illustrates the participation level in a system. In particular, the degree of openness is represented ranging from *permissioned* (e.g. restricted Actor permission) to *permissionless* systems.
- *Dimension 3*: Illustrates the capability to stake, e.g., if the system utilizes a PoS typical layout such as a token providing access to participate in the consensus.
- *Dimension 4*: Illustrates the level of cryptoeconomic complexity. The values range from complex (e.g. token interactions) to simple (e.g. tokens not burnable).

The second, third and fourth dimensions are not trivially determined by studying the classified systems visually, as the determining attribute values span over several components. Moreover, the differentiation between permissioned and permissionless systems [55] [56] and the degree of staking capability [57] [58] reflect ongoing discussion of the community on the effective design of DLT systems. The actor permission attribute contributes significantly to the construction of the permissionless dimensions, as depicted in Figure VI-B, and hence this dimension extends the permissionless concept from the consensus to the Action component. Neither Bitcoin nor Ethereum contributes significantly to the construction of the new dimensions, despite being studied the most in academic literature (588, respectively 296 citations in Elsevier's ScienceDirect database). This might be due to other systems adopting the design of these well-known DLT systems and hence their design does not contribute significantly to the variance in the data. Additionally, observing the systems, which contribute the most to the 4th dimension (level of cryptoeconomic complexity), one notices that these are systems, which address a specific domain, respectively address a particular challenge and hence require an elaborated CED: PVIX and Zcoin are privacy chains; Komodo and Bancor use token interactions and a creation condition requiring actions;




Fig. 8. Absolute Contribution (flow’s thickness) of attribute values (left) and systems (right) to value of new dimension (middle/ italics underneath the figures). The color code depicts if attribute value/ system contributes negatively (red/ dark) or positively (green/ light).




Fig. 9. DLT systems in the latent dimensions, as identified by MCA. The labels are determined by the k-means clustering algorithm. The translation of the identifiers to DLT systems can be found in Table 1 of the Supplementary Material. Moreover, Figure 3 in the Supplementary Material illustrates other combinations of dimensions.

Factom and Komodo utilize a hybrid system layout consisting of a natively maintained distributed ledger and an external one.

Figure 9 depicts the 50 DLT systems in the new dimensions. A strong clustering of systems can be observed for the first two dimensions (Figure 9(a)), and a weaker for the 2nd and 3rd dimensions (Figure 9(b)), which is explained due to the lower explained variance in the data by the latter dimension.

Table IV outlines the cluster stability and the number of dissolved clusters when applying k-means for various k on the classified attribute values of the 50 DLT systems. Comparing the bootmean¹⁵ (cluster-wise average Jaccard similarity) and bootbrd (cluster-wise number of times a cluster is dissolved) identifies three clusters as the most stable separation of the classification. This is further validated by the Silhouette and Calinski-Harabasz score, which identify two or three clusters to be optimal, as depicted in Figure 4 of the Supplementary Material.

In Figure 9, the DLT systems are labeled based on these clusters. One notices, considering the distribution of labels

¹⁵“Highly stable” clusters should yield values of 0.85 and above: <https://rdrr.io/cran/fpc/man/clusterboot.html> (Accessed: 2020-01-08).

TABLE IV
BOOTSTRAP STATISTICS OF IDENTIFIED CLUSTERS WHEN APPLYING KMEANS WITH VARYING k ON CLASSIFICATION: $k = 3$ RESULTS IN THE MOST STABLE CLUSTERS

k	Boot	Cluster					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
2	mean	0.91	0.95	-	-	-	-
	brd	12	1	-	-	-	-
3	mean	0.96	0.97	1	-	-	-
	brd	0	0	0	-	-	-
4	mean	0.75	0.91	0.99	0.75	-	-
	brd	19	1	1	21	-	-
5	mean	0.71	0.64	0.43	0.62	1	-
	brd	25	32	80	25	0	-
6	mean	0.82	1	0.70	0.65	0.5	0.64
	brd	19	0	23	33	68	44




Fig. 10. Number of Github repository creations of classified DLT systems for the clusters identified by k-means.

in Figure 9(a), that the three clusters can be identified as 2nd layer systems, permissionless systems, and permissioned systems. Likewise, utilizing the same labeling in Figure 9(b), it is noticed that these three clusters form distinct groups: 2nd layer systems being in the center, followed by permissionless and permissioned systems.

Figure 10 depicts the number of new systems per year and cluster. The number of newly introduced systems peaked in 2014, when in total 15 of the 50 systems were intro-

duced. This high number is mainly due to the introduction of permissionless systems. In recent years, the probability of introducing a permissioned or permissionless system is equal, while introducing a 2nd layer system has been lower.

The analysis concludes, that two key design choices in DLT systems are identified method-independently: *layering* and *participation level*. Moreover, *staking capability* and *cryptoeconomic complexity* are identified by MCA. The key design choices are not apparent in the taxonomy but are still captured by a combination of attribute values, which is an indication of the rich information the taxonomy can encode and explain. Hence, those findings support the explanatory capacity of the taxonomy as defined in earlier taxonomy theory [18]. Moreover, the combination of attribute values into key design choices identified by the analysis limits the system configuration options and as a result reduces modeling complexity of DLT systems at design phase.

VII. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: A DESIGN GUIDELINE FOR DISTRIBUTED LEDGERS

The key findings of the performed experiments are summarized as follows:

- The proposed taxonomy is *useful*, as defined in earlier taxonomy literature [18]. In particular, the blockchain community validates the taxonomy as robust and comprehensive (on average 79% expressiveness, Section VI-A). Moreover, the taxonomy is extensible (Section VI-A) and explanatory (Section VI-B), as found by analyzing the blockchain community feedback and applying machine learning methods on the classification.
- The classification of 50 viable and actively maintained DLT systems is accepted by the blockchain community (on average 83.7% acceptance over all components, Section VI-A2).
- The quantitative analysis of the classification identifies four key design choices that structure the modeling complexity of DLT systems at design phase (Section VI-B). Each of these choices combines several attribute values and thus reduces the configuration complexity of DLT systems.

Based on these findings, a design guideline is derived, which is depicted in Figure 11. The key design choices are determined quantitatively by applying machine learning algorithms on empirical data. The order is determined by the level of explained variance, as calculated by MCA. Each question corresponds to a binary design decision. For each decision, the six attribute values, which contribute the most to this design choice are illustrated. Moreover, for each choice, the systems, which match best the attribute value configuration are depicted. The significance of this approach lies in the fact, that the design guideline is derived quantitatively by reasoning based on validated empirical data: the viable and actively maintained DTL systems classified according to the taxonomy.

The findings demonstrate that the contributions of this paper support system designers to research and design DLT systems: The conceptual architecture and taxonomy map the space of

possible design configurations and thus assist researchers to position a system in the DLT landscape. Finally, the quantitatively derived guideline determines which design choices are key for a DLT system. Therefore such a guide can provide a more tailored understanding of the DLT architectural elements and limit the modeling complexity of DLT systems at design phase. The identified key design choices are the ones with the impact of having been derived from existing viable and actively maintained DLT systems.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper concludes that the evolving complexity of distributed ledgers can be better understood via a proposed taxonomy of DLT systems of high *usefulness* [18]. This is feasible by validating the classification of DLT systems into the taxonomy using wisdom of the crowd and machine learning methods fed with real-world data. Ultimately, data from the classification encode information with which a novel design guideline is derived that identifies key design choices that govern the complexity of distributed ledgers. This guideline can explain and provide new insights for researcher, practitioners and entrepreneurs about which possible design choices have the highest impact, where there is space for innovation and which systems have competitive features or shared functionality.

The results point to various avenues for future research. Firstly, the findings of this paper suggest that the taxonomy can be further extended with additional Action and Token attributes. Also, a component modeling the governance of the systems may become critical in deciding if a system has a decentralized organization (e.g. no trusted party).

Secondly, although the taxonomy represents the current state of viable and actively maintained DLT systems, the proposed methods to evaluate its usefulness are general. Hence, future research can quantify with the introduced methodology the extent to which the suggested extensions affect the usefulness of the proposed taxonomy.

Thirdly, the initial cluster analysis demonstrates that key design choices can be derived quantitatively by analyzing empirical data of viable and actively maintained DLT systems. This suggests to extend the classification in future work (e.g. with Blockchain-as-a-Service systems) or to apply different statistical methods to the data in order to validate and further identify key design choices.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant no. 170226) for the European FLAG ERA project 'FuturICT 2.0 - Large scale experiments and simulations for the second generation of FuturICT' (<https://futurict2.eu/>) and the European Communitys H2020 Program under the scheme 'ICT-10-2015 RIA', grant agreement #688364 'ASSET: Instant Gratification for Collective Awareness & Sustainable Consumerism' (<http://www.asset-consumerism.eu>).

In addition, the authors would like to thank Michael Noack, Qusai Jouda and Max Roessner for their support in the




Fig. 11. A design guideline of the key design choices in DLT systems, suggesting an order with which a designer may determine system configuration. The questions, attribute values, example systems, and order are a result of analysis conducted using real-world data and machine learning methods (Section VI-B). For each design decision, based on the MCA analysis, attribute values and the corresponding example systems are stated, which match best the respective design decision.

questionnaire development and the proofreading of the classification. Moreover, the authors would like to thank Coinmonks and CoinCodeCap.com for access to their data and code.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alex Tapscott and Don Tapscott. How blockchain is changing finance. volume 1. Harvard Business Review, 2017.
- [2] Xiwei Xu, Ingo Weber, Mark Staples, Liming Zhu, Jan Bosch, Len Bass, Cesare Pautasso, and Paul Rimba. A taxonomy of blockchain-based systems for architecture design. In *Software Architecture (ICSA), 2017 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 243–252. IEEE, 2017.
- [3] Kari Korpela, Jukka Hallikas, and Tomi Dahlberg. Digital supply chain transformation toward blockchain integration. In *proceedings of the 50th Hawaii international conference on system sciences*, 2017.
- [4] Arthi Manohar and Jo Briggs. Identity management in the age of blockchain 3.0. Association for Computing Machinery, 2018.
- [5] Jiawen Kang, Rong Yu, Xumin Huang, Sabita Maharjan, Yan Zhang, and Ekram Hossain. Enabling localized peer-to-peer electricity trading among plug-in hybrid electric vehicles using consortium blockchains. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 13(6):3154–3164, 2017.
- [6] Nir Kshetri and Jeffrey Voas. Blockchain-enabled e-voting. volume 35, pages 95–99. IEEE Software, 2018.
- [7] Evangelos Pournaras. Proof of witness presence: Blockchain con-

- sensus for augmented democracy in smart cities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.00498*, 2019.
- [8] Joseph Bonneau, Andrew Miller, Jeremy Clark, Arvind Narayanan, Joshua A Kroll, and Edward W Felten. Sok: Research perspectives and challenges for bitcoin and cryptocurrencies. In *2015 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 104–121. IEEE, 2015.
 - [9] Florian Tschorsch and Björn Scheuermann. Bitcoin and beyond: A technical survey on decentralized digital currencies. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 18(3):2084–2123, 2016.
 - [10] Dave Babbitt and Joel Dietz. Crypto-economic design: A proposed agent-based modeling effort. In *English. Conference Talk. University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA*, 2014.
 - [11] Sinclair Davidson, Primavera De Filippi, and Jason Potts. Economics of blockchain. SSRN Working Paper No 2744751, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2744751>, 2016.
 - [12] Benedikt Notheisen, Florian Hawlitschek, and Christof Weinhardt. Breaking down the blockchain hype—towards a blockchain market engineering approach. In: *Proceedings Americas Conference on Information Systems*, 2017.
 - [13] Robert E Samuel. A layered architectural approach to understanding distributed cryptographic ledgers. volume 17. *Issues in Information Systems*, 2016.
 - [14] Paolo Tasca and Claudio Tessone. Taxonomy of blockchain technologies. principles of identification and classification. SSRN Working Paper No 2977811, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2977811>, 2017.
 - [15] Kimchai Yeow, Abdullah Gani, Raja Wasim Ahmad, Joel JPC Rodrigues, and Kwangman Ko. Decentralized consensus for edge-centric internet of things: A review, taxonomy, and research issues. *IEEE Access*, 6:1513–1524, 2018.
 - [16] Xiwei Xu, Cesare Pautasso, Liming Zhu, Vincent Gramoli, Alexander Ponomarev, An Binh Tran, and Shiping Chen. The blockchain as a software connector. In *Software Architecture (WICSA), 2016 13th Working IEEE/IFIP Conference on*, pages 182–191. IEEE, 2016.
 - [17] Simon Wieninger, Günther Schuh, and Vincent Fischer. Development of a blockchain taxonomy. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC)*, pages 1–9. IEEE, 2019.
 - [18] Robert C Nickerson, Upkar Varshney, and Jan Muntermann. A method for taxonomy development and its application in information systems. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 22(3):336–359, 2013.
 - [19] Marco Comuzzi, Erdenekhuu Unurjargal, and Chiehyeon Lim. Towards a design space for blockchain-based system reengineering. In *International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering*, pages 138–143. Springer, 2018.
 - [20] Hitoshi Okada, Shigeichiro Yamasaki, and Vanessa Bracamonte. Proposed classification of blockchains based on authority and incentive dimensions. In *Advanced Communication Technology (ICACT), 2017 19th International Conference on*, pages 593–597. IEEE, 2017.
 - [21] Tien Tuan Anh Dinh, Rui Liu, Meihui Zhang, Gang Chen, Beng Chin Ooi, and Ji Wang. Untangling blockchain: A data processing view of blockchain systems. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 30(7):1366–1385, 2018.
 - [22] Joost De Kruijff and Hans Weigand. Towards a blockchain ontology. Research report Tillburg University, 2017.
 - [23] Shehu M Sarkintudu, Huda H Ibrahim, and Alawiyah Bt Abdwahab. Taxonomy development of blockchain platforms: Information systems perspectives. In *AIP Conference Proceedings*, volume 2016, page 020130. AIP Publishing, 2018.
 - [24] Kaj-Kolja Kleineberg and Dirk Helbing. A social bitcoin could sustain a democratic digital world. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 225(17-18):3231–3241, 2016.
 - [25] Beth Kewell, Richard Adams, and Glenn Parry. Blockchain for good? *Strategic Change*, 26(5):429–437, 2017.
 - [26] Claus Dierksmeier and Peter Seele. Cryptocurrencies and business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 152(1):1–14, 2018.
 - [27] Marcel Morisse. Cryptocurrencies and bitcoin: Charting the research landscape. In: *Proceedings Americas Conference on Information Systems*, 2015.
 - [28] Vikram Dhillion, David Metcalf, and Max Hooper. Decentralized organizations. In *Blockchain Enabled Applications*, pages 47–66. Apress, Berkeley, CA, 2017.
 - [29] Lakshmi Siva Sankar, M Sindhu, and M Sethumadhavan. Survey of consensus protocols on blockchain applications. In *Advanced Computing and Communication Systems (ICACCS), 2017 4th International Conference on*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2017.
 - [30] Du Mingxiao, Ma Xiaofeng, Zhang Zhe, Wang Xiangwei, and Chen Qijun. A review on consensus algorithm of blockchain. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*, pages 2567–2572. IEEE, 2017.
 - [31] Josep Lluís de la Rosa, Victor Torres-Padrosa, Andrés el Fakdi, Denisa Gibovic, O Hornyák, Lutz Maicher, and Francesc Miralles. A survey of blockchain technologies for open innovation. In *4rd Annual World Open Innovation Conf. WOIC*, pages 14–15, 2017.
 - [32] Kirill P Kalinin and Natalia G Berloff. Blockchain platform with proof-of-work based on analog hamiltonian optimisers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.10091*, 2018.
 - [33] Zura Kakushadze and Ronald P Russo. Blockchain: Data malls, coin economies, and keyless payments. *The Journal of Alternative Investments*, 21(1):8–16, 2018.
 - [34] Jack Peterson, Joseph Micah, Micah Zoltu, Austin K Williams, and Stephanie Alexander. Augur: a decentralized oracle and prediction market platform, 2018.
 - [35] Pedro Moreno-Sanchez, Tim Ruffing, and Aniket Kate. Pathshuffle: Credit mixing and anonymous payments for ripple. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2017(3):110–129, 2017.
 - [36] The Anatomy of a Transaction. <https://domschiener.gitbooks.io/iota-guide/content/chapter1/transactions-and-bundles.html>. (Accessed: 2018-09-06).
 - [37] Christian Cachin and Marko Vukolić. Blockchain consensus protocols in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.01873*, 2017.
 - [38] Leslie Lamport, Robert Shostak, and Marshall Pease. The byzantine generals problem. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)*, 4(3):382–401, 1982.
 - [39] Ripple transacton cost. <https://developers.ripple.com/transaction-cost.html>. (Accessed: 2018-09-06).
 - [40] Feed AKASHA Blog Thoughts and Project Updates. New horizons. <http://blog.akasha.world/2017/11/14/new-horizons/>. (Accessed: 2018-09-05).
 - [41] Steemit whitepaper. <https://steem.io/steem-whitepaper.pdf>. (Accessed: 2018-09-06).
 - [42] Xrp ledger overview. <https://developers.ripple.com/transaction-cost.html>. (Accessed: 2018-09-06).
 - [43] Dash whitepaper. <https://github.com/dashpay/dash/wiki/Whitepaper>. (Accessed: 2018-09-06).
 - [44] SiaHub. <https://siahub.readme.io/reference>. (Accessed: 2018-09-06).
 - [45] Lijun Wu, Kun Meng, Shuo Xu, Shuqin Li, Meng Ding, and Yanfeng Suo. Democratic centralism: A hybrid blockchain architecture and its applications in energy internet. In *Energy Internet (ICEI), IEEE International Conference on*, pages 176–181. IEEE, 2017.
 - [46] Geoff Norman. Likert scales, levels of measurement and the laws of statistics. *Advances in health sciences education*, 15(5):625–632, 2010.
 - [47] Michael J Greenacre. *Correspondence analysis*. London: Academic Press, 1984.
 - [48] Hervé Abdi and Dominique Valentin. Multiple correspondence analysis. *Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics*, 2:651–66, 2007.
 - [49] Michael Greenacre and Rafael Pardo. Multiple correspondence analysis of a subset of response categories. 2005.
 - [50] Tengke Xiong, Shengrui Wang, André Mayers, and Ernest Monga. Dhcc: Divisive hierarchical clustering of categorical data. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 24(1):103–135, 2012.
 - [51] Michael Greenacre and Jorg Blasius. *Multiple correspondence analysis and related methods*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2006.
 - [52] Anil K Jain. Data clustering: 50 years beyond k-means. *Pattern recognition letters*, 31(8):651–666, 2010.
 - [53] Christian Hennig. Cluster-wise assessment of cluster stability. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52(1):258–271, 2007.
 - [54] Eréndira Rendón, Itzel Abundez, Alejandra Arizmendi, and Elvia M Quiroz. Internal versus external cluster validation indexes. *International Journal of computers and communications*, 5(1):27–34, 2011.
 - [55] Karl Wüst and Arthur Gervais. Do you need a blockchain? In *2018 Crypto Valley Conference on Blockchain Technology (CVCBT)*, pages 45–54. IEEE, 2018.
 - [56] Marko Vukolić. Rethinking permissioned blockchains. In *Proceedings of the ACM Workshop on Blockchain, Cryptocurrencies and Contracts*, pages 3–7. ACM, 2017.
 - [57] Iddo Bentov, Ariel Gabizon, and Alex Mizrahi. Cryptocurrencies without proof of work. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 142–157. Springer, 2016.

- [58] Aggelos Kiayias, Alexander Russell, Bernardo David, and Roman Oliynykov. Ouroboros: A provably secure proof-of-stake blockchain protocol. In *Annual International Cryptology Conference*, pages 357–388. Springer, 2017.

Supplementary Material to Decrypting Distributed Ledger Design - Taxonomy, Classification and Blockchain Community Evaluation

Mark C. Ballandies
Computational Social Science
ETH Zurich
Zurich, Switzerland
bmark@ethz.ch

Marcus M. Dapp
Computational Social Science
ETH Zurich
Zurich, Switzerland
mdapp@ethz.ch

Evangelos Pournaras
School of Computing
University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT UK
e.pournaras@leeds.ac.uk

A. Survey Participants Invitation Email

Figure 1 depicts the email inviting participants to the survey.

B. Incorporating Blockchain Community Feedback

In the initial taxonomy and classification in the first phase of the survey, the underlying attribute was replaced with the on-chain underlying and off-chain underlying attributes to illustrate in finer detail the source of value of a token. In particular, in this version the underlying specifies the concrete object of value (e.g. storage or computation) and where it resides (on-chain or off-chain). Nevertheless, these attributes obtained the lowest acceptance level of all attributes (Figure 2). Detailed feedback regarding the attributes is summarized in the following and illustrated in the greater detail in Section -C. Namely, the main areas of disagreement or uncertainty are:

- 1) Not distinguishing between on-chain and off-chain underlying
- 2) Not distinguishing the underlying from services which can be assessed in the DLT system
- 3) Mixing up the underlying with the possibility to use a token as a currency
- 4) Considering future or past features of the DLT systems
- 5) Rejecting on-chain storage of hashes as storage

Based on this feedback, three changes have been made to the taxonomy.

First, in order to reduce the ambiguity regarding the difference between on-chain underlying, off-chain underlying and other services in the system (and hence addressing point one and two of the previous summary), the token underlying has been more clearly mapped to the components of the conceptual framework (Figure 1 in Paper). To achieve this, the off-chain and on-chain underlyings have been merged into one attribute and their values have been abstracted to include values from the framework where the underlying resides, as described in Section IV-D-6 of the paper. For instance, in the case of the Ethereum token, instead of expressing that the token grants

access to the on-chain underlying *computation*, the token is now said to provide access to the *distributed ledger*, which in turn implies granting access to computation, because Ethereum has a Turing complete distributed ledger.

Second, to emphasize the option to store arbitrary data on distributed ledgers (e.g hashes), which, for instance, enables Bitcoin to function as the overarching infrastructure for other systems, the storage attribute has been added to the Distributed Ledger component. This addresses point number five.

Third, in order to address point number three, the transferability attribute has been added to the Token component, which emphasizes the possibility to use the token as a currency.

Finally, as the scope of the classification is to capture the current state of DLT systems and not future possible extensions or past configurations, point number four is not addressed.

The new transferability attribute is considered as the most expressive amongst all attributes by the community (Figure 6 in Paper). Moreover, the restructuring of the underlying attribute and the inclusion of the storage attribute improves the underlying assessment by the community significantly. These findings justify the modifications to the taxonomy. Also, the inclusion of new attributes into the taxonomy indicates that the taxonomy is extensible as defined in earlier taxonomy theory [?].

C. Detailed blockchain community feedback on previous underlying attributes

After the first two-month phase in which participants obtained the survey, the feedback has been analyzed which lead to changes in the taxonomy, as summarized in Section B. The detailed feedback is illustrated in the following.

When examining the comments provided by the participants who disagree with the classification of the on-chain underlying




Fig. 1. Survey participants invitation email.




Fig. 2. Acceptance level of the classification and expressiveness of the On-chain and Off-chain underlying as perceived by survey participants.

attribute¹, it is noteworthy that these respondents do not regard

¹In brackets are depicted the percentage for which this responds type accounts for the overall disagreements. Please note, that the percentages do not add up to 100% as a survey participant could state several reasons for disagreement

the on-chain storage of hashes as storage (22.2%). In some cases, respondents make contradictory comments about the on-chain value of their system token (11.1%). Some participants mix up the on-chain underlying of the token with the overall services that the DLT system provides (22.2%), which do not necessarily require to be accessed via the token. Some participants disagree with the classification because it does not consider plans to implement on-chain underlyings in the future (33.3%). Finally, some mix up the on-chain underlying with the off-chain underlying (11.1%).

Among respondents who express uncertainty, some do not distinguish between their current implementation of on-chain underlyings and possible or planned future implementations (50.0%), which are not in the scope of the classification. Other respondents mix up the possibility to use a token as a currency with its underlying (25.0%). Some state that the question is not formulated clearly enough (25.0%).

In the case of the off-chain underlying, a similar picture can be observed. In the following, the responses expressing disagreement and uncertainty are combined. Some respondents disagree with the classification because it does not consider past and future off-chain underlyings (30.0%). Some understood the off-chain underlying to be an exclusive right conferred by the token (10.0%). Moreover, as in the case of the on-chain underlying, some participants link the possibility to use the token as a currency to its underlying (20.0%). Some participants mix up on-chain and off-chain value (10.0%), others do not understand the question (10.0%) or do not respond (20.0%).

D. Machine Learning Analysis

Table I depicts the classified DLT systems in the new latent dimensions as identified by MCA (Section VI-B in Paper). The cluster associations are identified by k-means (Section VI-B in Paper).

Figure 3 illustrate the classified DLT systems in various combinations of the latent Dimensions, as identified by MCA (Section VI-B in Paper).

Figure 4 illustrates the Silhouette and Calinski-Harabasz scores when applying k-means for varying k on the classified systems (Section VI-B in Paper).

E. Cryptoeconomic Reasoning using Boolean Algebra

The taxonomy introduced in Section IV of the paper allows a number of widely used terms in the field of DLT systems to be more systematically defined by combining the values of specific attributes with operators from Boolean algebra. As demonstrated in Table II, which features an illustrative subset of these terms, this method enables the delineation of terms such as permissioned/ permissionless blockchains, as well as asset/utility tokens. In particular, the latter pair has been identified by the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority (FINMA) as important for determining whether a token should be classified as a security token. This is of interest to market participants because it has regulatory implications [?].




Fig. 3. DLT systems in the latent dimensions, as identified by MCA. The labels are determined by the k-means clustering algorithm. The translation of the identifiers to DLT systems can be found in the Appendix of the paper.

TABLE I
DLT SYSTEMS IN THE LATENT DIMENSIONS AS IDENTIFIED BY MCA.
THE CLUSTERS ARE IDENTIFIED BY K-MEANS.

id	DLT system	Cluster	Layer	Participation	Stakeability	Complexity
1	Aragon	1	0.06	0.81	0.71	0.64
2	Ark	0	0.97	0.69	0.96	0.31
3	Augur	1	0.08	0.84	0.68	0.49
4	Bancor	1	0.11	0.86	0.86	0.76
5	Bitcoin	2	0.97	0.96	0.48	0.22
6	Bitcoin Cash	2	0.97	0.96	0.48	0.22
7	Bitcoin Gold	2	0.97	0.96	0.48	0.22
8	BitShares	0	0.85	0.54	0.76	0.36
9	Byteball	0	0.93	0.52	0	0.6
10	Cardano	0	0.95	0.7	0.86	0.28
11	Dash	2	0.91	0.94	0.41	0.54
12	Decred	2	0.92	0.91	0.62	0.54
13	DigiByte	2	0.96	0.93	0.57	0.33
14	Dogecoin	2	0.99	0.95	0.58	0.24
15	EOS	0	0.97	0.43	0.89	0.5
16	Ethereum	2	0.97	0.87	0.76	0.35
17	Factom	0	0.88	0.43	0.73	0.89
18	Gnosis	1	0.01	0.74	0.63	0.57
19	Golem	1	0.03	0.76	0.55	0.24
20	IOTA	0	0.91	0.66	0.01	0.53
21	KIN	0	0.83	0.06	0.31	0.2
22	Komodo	2	0.92	0.95	0.54	0.95
23	Lisk-mainchain	0	0.94	0.65	0.96	0.36
24	Litecoin	2	0.97	0.96	0.48	0.22
25	Loopring	1	0	0.73	0.59	0.4
26	MOAC-MotherChain	2	0.96	0.93	0.57	0.33
27	Monacoin	2	0.97	0.96	0.48	0.22
28	Monero	2	1	0.96	0.42	0.47
29	Nebulas	0	0.96	0.56	1	0.34
30	NEM	0	0.93	0.63	0.76	0.16
31	NEO	0	0.84	0.35	0.71	0.46
32	Nexus	2	0.96	0.82	0.82	0.44
33	PIVX	2	0.88	0.71	0.67	0.91
34	Qtum	2	0.96	0.82	0.85	0.28
35	ReddCoin	2	0.97	0.86	0.86	0.31
36	Ripple	0	0.83	0	0.27	0.42
37	SafeNetwork	0	0.87	0.19	0.62	0.56
38	Siacoin	2	0.9	0.82	0.68	0.55
39	SingularityNET	1	0.04	0.7	0.48	0.01
40	Skycoin	2	0.86	0.45	0.42	0.72
41	Steem	0	0.93	0.56	0.81	0.6
42	Stellar	0	0.85	0.05	0.41	0.23
43	Storj	1	0.03	0.76	0.55	0.24
44	Stratis	2	0.95	0.86	0.76	0.45
45	Syscoin	2	0.89	0.9	0.49	0.64
46	TRON	0	0.89	0.39	1	0.76
47	Verge	2	0.97	1	0.39	0.37
48	Waves	0	0.91	0.47	0.77	0
49	Zcash	2	0.97	0.94	0.41	0.55
50	Zcoin	2	0.9	0.88	0.48	1




Fig. 4. Silhouette and Calinski-Harabasz score when applying kmeans for varying k on the original classification.

TABLE II
FORMAL DEFINITIONS OF CRYPTOECONOMIC TERMS BY REASONING
USING BOOLEAN ALGEBRA AND THE PROPOSED TAXONOMY.

System Term	Formal Definition
Blockchain	<i>blockchain</i> type
1 st layer	<i>native</i> ownership
2 nd layer	<i>external</i> ownership
Permissioned	<i>restricted</i> write permission OR <i>restricted</i> validator permission
Permissionless	<i>public</i> write permission AND <i>public</i> validator permission
Public	<i>(permissionless DLT system)</i> AND <i>public</i> actor permission
Private	<i>(permissioned DLT system)</i> AND <i>restricted</i> actor permission
Privacy	<i>obfuscatable</i> traceability AND <i>(public DLT System)</i>
Infrastructure	<i>yes</i> turing completeness OR <i>yes</i> storage
Blockchain-as-a-Service	\nexists Action component attribute AND \nexists Token component attribute
Cryptoeconomic Term	
Utility token	<i>distributed ledger</i> underlying OR <i>action</i> underlying
Asset token	<i>token</i> underlying OR <i>action</i> (physical good) underlying
Payment token	<i>yes</i> transferability

F. Classification

Tables III-VI illustrate the classification of the 50 DLT systems in the four components.

TABLE III
SYSTEMS CLASSIFICATION ACCORDING TO THE DISTRIBUTED-LEDGER COMPONENT

ID	DLT system	Origin	Type	Address Traceability	Turing Completeness	Storage
1	Aragon	External (Ethereum)	-	-	-	-
2	Ark	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
3	Augur	External (Ethereum)	-	-	-	-
4	Bancor	External (Ethereum and EOS)	-	-	-	-
5	Bitcoin	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
6	Bitcoin Cash	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
7	Bitcoin Gold	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
8	BitShares	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
9	Byteball	Native	DAG	Obfuscatable	No	Yes
10	Cardano	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
11	Dash	Native	Blockchain	Obfuscatable	No	Yes
12	Decred	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	No
13	DigiByte	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
14	Dogecoin	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
15	EOS	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	Yes	Yes
16	Ethereum	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	Yes	Yes
17	Factom	Hybrid (Bitcoin)	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
18	Gnosis	External (Ethereum)	-	-	-	-
19	Golem	External (Ethereum)	-	-	-	-
20	IOTA	Native	DAG	Linkable	No	No
21	KIN	Native	Other	Linkable	No	Yes
22	Komodo	Hybrid (Bitcoin)	Blockchain	Obfuscatable	No	Yes
23	Lisk (Mainchain)	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
24	Litecoin	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
25	Loopring	External (Ethereum, Qtum, NEO)	-	-	-	-
26	MOAC (MotherChain)	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
27	Monacoin	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
28	Monero	Native	Blockchain	Obfuscatable	No	Yes
29	Nebulas	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	Yes	Yes
30	NEM	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
31	NEO	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	Yes	Yes
32	Nexus	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
33	PIVX	Native	Blockchain	Obfuscatable	No	Yes
34	Qtum	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	Yes	Yes
35	ReddCoin	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
36	Ripple	Native	Other	Linkable	No	Yes
37	SafeNetwork	Native	Other	Linkable	Yes	Yes
38	Siacoin	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
39	SingularityNET	External (Ethereum)	-	-	-	-
40	Skycoin	Native	Blockchain	Obfuscatable	Yes	Yes
41	Steem	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	No	Yes
42	Stellar	Native	Other	Linkable	No	Yes
43	Storj	External (Ethereum)	-	-	-	-
44	Stratis	Native	Blockchain	Obfuscatable	No	Yes
45	Syscoin	Native	Blockchain	Obfuscatable	No	Yes
46	TRON	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	Yes	Yes
47	Verge	Native	Blockchain	Obfuscatable	No	Yes
48	Waves	Native	Blockchain	Linkable	Yes	Yes
49	Zcash	Native	Blockchain	Obfuscatable	No	Yes
50	Zcoin	Native	Blockchain	Obfuscatable	No	No

TABLE IV
SYSTEMS CLASSIFICATION ACCORDING TO THE CONSENSUS COMPONENT

ID	DLT system	Finality	Proof	Write Permission	Validate Permission	Fee
1	Aragon	-	-	-	-	-
2	Ark	Probabilistic	PoS	Restricted	Restricted	Yes
3	Augur	-	-	-	-	-
4	Bancor	-	-	-	-	-
5	Bitcoin	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
6	Bitcoin Cash	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
7	Bitcoin Gold	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
8	BitShares	Deterministic	PoS	Restricted	Public	Yes
9	Byteball	Deterministic	Other	Public	Restricted	Yes
10	Cardano	Probabilistic	PoS	Restricted	Restricted	Yes
11	Dash	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
12	Decred	Probabilistic	Hybrid	Public	Public	Yes
13	DigiByte	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
14	Dogecoin	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
15	EOS	Deterministic	PoS	Restricted	Restricted	No
16	Ethereum	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
17	Factom	Probabilistic	Other	Restricted	Restricted	No
18	Gnosis	-	-	-	-	-
19	Golem	-	-	-	-	-
20	IOTA	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Restricted	No
21	KIN	Deterministic	Other	Restricted	Restricted	No
22	Komodo	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
23	Lisk (Mainchain)	Probabilistic	PoS	Restricted	Restricted	Yes
24	Litecoin	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
25	Loopring	-	-	-	-	-
26	MOAC (MotherChain)	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
27	Monacoin	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
28	Monero	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
29	Nebulas	Deterministic	Pos	Restricted	Restricted	Yes
30	NEM	Probabilistic	PoS	Restricted	Restricted	Yes
31	NEO	Deterministic	Other	Restricted	Restricted	Yes
32	Nexus	Deterministic	Hybrid	Public	Public	Yes
33	PIVX	Deterministic	PoS	Public	Public	Yes
34	Qtum	Probabilistic	PoS	Public	Public	Yes
35	ReddCoin	Probabilistic	PoS	Public	Public	Yes
36	Ripple	Deterministic	Other	Restricted	Restricted	No
37	SafeNetwork	Deterministic	Other	Restricted	Restricted	No
38	Siacoin	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
39	SingularityNET	-	-	-	-	-
40	Skycoin	Deterministic	Other	Public	Public	No
41	Steem	Deterministic	PoS	Restricted	Restricted	No
42	Stellar	Deterministic	Other	Restricted	Restricted	No
43	Storj	-	-	-	-	-
44	Stratis	Probabilistic	PoS	Public	Public	Yes
45	Syscoin	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
46	TRON	Deterministic	PoS	Restricted	Restricted	No
47	Verge	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
48	Waves	Deterministic	PoS	Restricted	Public	Yes
49	Zcash	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Public	Yes
50	Zcoin	Probabilistic	PoW	Public	Restricted	Yes

TABLE V
SYSTEMS CLASSIFICATION ACCORDING TO THE ACTION COMPONENT

ID	DLT system	Actor Permission	Read Permission	Fee
1	Aragon	Public	Public	Yes
2	Ark	Public	Public	No
3	Augur	Public	Public	Yes
4	Bancor	Public	Public	No
5	Bitcoin	Public	Public	No
6	Bitcoin Cash	Public	Public	No
7	Bitcoin Gold	Public	Public	No
8	BitShares	Public	Public	Yes
9	Byteball	Public	Restricted	No
10	Cardano	Public	Public	No
11	Dash	Public	Public	Yes
12	Decred	Public	Public	No
13	DigiByte	Public	Public	No
14	Dogecoin	Public	Public	No
15	EOS	Public	Restricted	No
16	Ethereum	Public	Public	No
17	Factom	Public	Public	Yes
18	Gnosis	Public	Public	Yes
19	Golem	Public	Public	Yes
20	IOTA	Public	Public	No
21	KIN	Restricted	Public	Yes
22	Komodo	Public	Public	No
23	Lisk (Mainchain)	Public	Public	Yes
24	Litecoin	Public	Public	No
25	Loopring	Public	Public	Yes
26	MOAC (MotherChain)	Public	Public	No
27	Monacoin	Public	Public	No
28	Monero	Public	Restricted	No
29	Nebulas	Public	Public	No
30	NEM	Public	Public	No
31	NEO	Public	Public	Yes
32	Nexus	Public	Public	No
33	PIVX	Public	Restricted	Yes
34	Qtum	Public	Public	No
35	ReddCoin	Public	Public	No
36	Ripple	Restricted	Restricted	Yes
37	SafeNetwork	Public	Public	No
38	Siacoin	Public	Public	Yes
39	SingularityNET	Restricted	Public	No
40	Skycoin	Public	Public	Yes
41	Steem	Public	Public	No
42	Stellar	Restricted	Public	Yes
43	Storj	Public	Public	Yes
44	Stratis	Public	Public	No
45	Syscoin	Public	Public	Yes
46	TRON	Public	Public	Yes
47	Verge	Public	Public	No
48	Waves	Restricted	Public	No
49	Zcash	Public	Restricted	No
50	Zcoin	Public	Public	No

TABLE VI
SYSTEMS CLASSIFICATION ACCORDING TO THE TOKEN COMPONENT

ID	DLT system	Supply Property	Burn Property	Transferability	Creation Condition	Unconditional Creation	Underlying
1	Aragon	Capped	Yes	transferable	Action	Partially	Action
2	Ark	Uncapped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL, Consensus
3	Augur	Capped	No	transferable	Action	Partially	Action
4	Bancor	Uncapped	Yes	transferable	Action	Partially	Token
5	Bitcoin	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	None	DL
6	Bitcoin Cash	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	None	DL
7	Bitcoin Gold	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	None	DL
8	BitShares	Capped	Yes	transferable	None	All	DL, Consensus, Action
9	Byteball	Capped	No	transferable	None	All	DL
10	Cardano	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL, Consensus
11	Dash	Capped	No	transferable	Both	None	DL, Action
12	Decred	Capped	No	transferable	Both	Partially	Consensus, Action
13	DigiByte	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL
14	Dogecoin	Uncapped	No	transferable	Consensus	None	DL
15	EOS	Uncapped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL
16	Ethereum	Uncapped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL
17	Factom	Uncapped	Yes	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL, Action
18	Gnosis	Capped	Yes	transferable	None	All	Token
19	Golem	Capped	No	transferable	None	All	Action
20	IOTA	Capped	No	transferable	None	All	None
21	KIN	Capped	No	transferable	None	All	DL, Action
22	Komodo	Capped	No	transferable	Both	Partially	DL, Token
23	Lisk (Mainchain)	Uncapped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL, Consensus
24	Litecoin	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	None	DL
25	Loopring	Capped	Yes	transferable	None	All	Action
26	MOAC (MotherChain)	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL
27	Monacoin	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	None	DL
28	Monero	Uncapped	No	transferable	Consensus	None	DL
29	Nebulas	Uncapped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL, Consensus
30	NEM	Capped	No	transferable	None	All	DL, Consensus
31	NEO	Capped	No	transferable	None	All	Consensus, Action, Token
32	Nexus	Uncapped	No	transferable	Both	Partially	DL, Consensus
33	PIVX	Capped	Yes	transferable	Both	Partially	DL, Consensus, Action, Token
34	Qtum	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL, Consensus
35	ReddCoin	Uncapped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL, Consensus
36	Ripple	Capped	Yes	transferable	None	All	DL, Action
37	SafeNetwork	Capped	Yes	transferable	Consensus	Partially	Action
38	Siacoin	Uncapped	Yes	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL, Action
39	SingularityNET	Capped	No	transferable	None	All	Action
40	Skycoin	Capped	No	transferable	None	All	Token
41	Steem	Uncapped	No	transferable	Both	None	Token
42	Stellar	Uncapped	No	transferable	None	All	DL, Action
43	Storj	Capped	No	transferable	None	All	Action
44	Stratis	Uncapped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL, Consensus, A
45	Syscoin	Capped	No	transferable	Both	Partially	DL, Action
46	TRON	Uncapped	Yes	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL, Token
47	Verge	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	None	DL
48	Waves	Capped	No	transferable	None	All	DL, Consensus
49	Zcash	Capped	No	transferable	Consensus	Partially	DL
50	Zcoin	Capped	Yes	transferable	Both	Partially	DL, Token

G. Questionnaire

In the following the questionnaire as perceived by the survey participants of the second recruitment phase is displayed.

Intro

Dear \${e://Field/RecipientFirstName},

we, the [Chair of Computational Social Science](#) of Prof. Dirk Helbing at ETH Zürich (CH), research the inner structure of Distributed Ledger Technology (DLT) projects to find similarities/ differences and make comparisons. This research work is done as part of the EU research project [FuturICT2.0](#), where we aim to devise [new incentive systems](#) to foster sustainable behavior by communities.

The project \${e://Field/ProjectName} in which you are involved, is among the first few we have been working on.

We would like to invite you to share your expertise feedback with us:

1. on the taxonomy structure we propose
2. on how we classified the \${e://Field/ProjectName} project using this structure.

Your feedback will be anonymized before publication. Hence it will not be possible to connect your identity with the publication results. Filling in the questionnaire should not take longer than 15 minutes.

We offer all participants who completed the questionnaire a comparative analysis of your project and 3 other projects of choice. Please let us know at the end of the survey if you are interested by selecting the respective option.

Moreover, as it is all about incentives in the world of distributed ledgers, we offer a little lottery in which you can win one of three Trezor hardware wallets. Good luck! :-)

I and my team thank you for sharing your time and knowledge to make this survey a success!

Prof. Dirk Helbing, Chair COSS
Dr. Marcus M. Dapp, PostDoc
Dr. Evangelos Pournaras, PostDoc
Mark C. Ballandies, PhD student and survey contact (bmark@ethz.ch)
Michael Noack, Master student

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Demographics Block

Demographics

What is your role in the project?

- Project Lead
- Core/ Team Developer
- Team Member
- Community Developer
- Community Member
- Advisor
- other:

How many years did you work on DLT/ Blockchain projects?

- under one year
- one to three years
- more than three years

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds


Click Count: 0 clicks

Introduction Block

Introduction

We describe DLT projects using four *components*: **Distributed Ledger, Consensus, Action and Token.**

Each component contains several *attributes*. And each attribute can have several *characteristics*.



In the first part of the questionnaire we are interested in your opinion on the classification we performed for your project [\\${e://Field/ProjectName}](#).

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds
 Last Click: 0 seconds
 Page Submit: 0 seconds
 Click Count: 0 clicks

Common DL Block

Part I
1. Distributed Ledger

The first *component* is the **Distributed Ledger**.

We define a distributed ledger as a distributed data structure, containing entries which serve as digital records of actions.

The five *attributes* are: **Origin, Type, Address Traceability, Turing Completeness** and **Storage**.

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part I

1. Distributed Ledger (1/5) - Origin

Origin describes who owns the distributed ledger.

The options are:

- **Native** if it is maintained by and for the project itself
- **External** if the project uses a distributed ledger from a different project
- **Hybrid** if the project uses both, a distributed ledger from a different project and natively developed distributed ledger

We have rated the **Origin** of the **Distributed Ledger** of **#{e://Field/ProjectName}** as **#{e://Field/DL_Origin}**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Alternative DL Block

Part I

1. Distributed Ledger (2/4 - 5/5)

Because we rated the origin of your Distributed Ledger as External, the attributes **Type, Address**

Traceability, Turing Completeness and **Storage** were not classified by us for your project. For your information we explain them below.

Type describes the data structure of the distributed ledger.

The options are:

- **Blockchain**
- **Hashgraph**
- **Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG)**
- **Other**

Address Traceability describes the extent to which different transactions, which originate from or arrive at the same chain identity, can be linked together.

The options are:

- **Obfuscatable** if the distributed ledger has mechanisms in place to hide such links
- **Linkable** if links can be inferred with some computational effort.

Turing Completeness describes whether code can be executed on the distributed ledger.

The options are:

- **Yes** if it can
- **No** otherwise

Storage describes whether additional data can be stored on the distributed ledger beyond the default transaction information.

The options are:

- **Yes** if additional data can be stored
- **No** otherwise

If you disagree or want to leave a comment please do:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

[Alternative C Block](#)

Part I

2. Consensus

The second *component* is the **Consensus**.

We define Consensus as the mechanism of writing entries to the distributed ledger, adhering to a set of rules that all participants of the consensus will enforce when considering the validity of a entry and its containing actions.

The *five attributes* are: **Type, Proof, Write Permission, Validate Permission** and **Fee**.

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part I

2. Consensus (1/5 - 5/5)

The consensus is inherently linked to the utilized distributed ledger. Because your project does not utilize a native distributed ledger, the five attributes were not rated by us. For your information we explain them below.

Type describes whether the consensus is deterministic or probabilistic.

The options are:

- **Deterministic** if it is guaranteed that consensus can be reached in a finite period of time
- **Probabilistic** if consensus is found with some uncertainty

Proof describes the evidence which is used to achieve consensus.

The options are

- **Proof-of-Work (PoW) if consensus is achieved using processing power of computers**
- **Proof-of-Stake (PoS)**
- **Hybrid-PoW-PoS** is a combination of the previous two
- **Other** proving mechanisms

Write Permission describes who is allowed to write entries to the distributed ledger.

The options are:

- **Restricted** if participation is restricted
- **Public** otherwise

Validate Permission describes who is allowed to validate entries before they are written to the distributed ledger.

The options are:
- **Restricted** if participation is restricted
- **Public** otherwise

Fee describe whether participants in the consensus (i.e. writers, validators) are paid a fee for writing new entries to the dirtibuted ledger.

The options are:
- **Yes** if a fee is paid
- **No** otherwise

If you disagree or want to leave a comment please do:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Distributed Ledger Block

Part I

1. Distributed Ledger (2/5) - Type

Type describes the data structure of the distributed ledger.

The options are:
- **Blockchain**
- **Hashgraph**
- **Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG)**
- **Other**

We have rated the **Type** of the **Distributed Ledger** of **\$(e://Field/ProjectName)** as **\$(e://Field/DL_Type)**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part I

1. Distributed Ledger (3/5) - Address Traceability

Address Traceability describes the extent to which different transactions, which originate from or arrive at the same chain identity, can be linked together.

The options are:

- **Obfuscatable** if the distributed ledger has mechanisms in place to hide such links
- **Linkable** if links can be inferred with some computational effort

We rated the **Address Traceability** of the **Distributed Ledger** of **\$(e://Field/ProjectName)** as **\$(e://Field/DL_Traceability)**. **\$(e://Field/DL_Traceability)** What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part I

1. Distributed Ledger (4/5) - Turing Completeness

Turing Completeness describes whether a Turing machine can be simulated by the distributed ledger.

The options are:

- **Yes** if it can
- **No** otherwise

We rated the **Turing Completeness** of the **Distributed Ledger** of **#{e://Field/ProjectName}** as **#{e://Field/DL_Turing}**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Part I

1. Distributed Ledger (5/5) - Storage

Storage describes whether additional data can be stored on the distributed ledger beyond the default transaction information.

The options are:

- **Yes** if additional data can be stored
- **No** otherwise

We have rated the **Storage** of the **Distributed Ledger** of **#{e://Field/ProjectName}** as **#{e://Field/DL_Storage}**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Consens Block

Part I

2. Consensus

The second *component* is the **Consensus**.

We define Consensus as the mechanism through which entries are written to the distributed ledger, while adhering to a set of rules that all participants enforce when an entry containing transactions is validated.

The five *attributes* are: **Type, Proof, Write Permission, Validate Permission** and **Fee**.

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part I

2. Consensus (1/5) - Type

Type describes whether the consensus is deterministic or probabilistic.

The options are:

- **Deterministic** if it is guaranteed that consensus can be reached in a finite period of time
- **Probabilistic** if consensus is found with some uncertainty

We have rated the **Type** of the **Consensus** of $\{e://Field/ProjectName\}$ as $\{e://Field/C_Type\}$.
What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part I

2. Consensus (2/5) - Proof

Proof describes the evidence used to achieve consensus.

The options are

- **Proof-of-Work (PoW)** if consensus is achieved using the processing power of computers
- **Proof-of-Stake (PoS)** if consensus is achieved through voting processes linked to (economic) power in the system
- **Hybrid-PoW-PoS** if is a combination of the previous two
- **Other** if another form of proof is required

We rated the **Proof** of the **Consensus** of $\{e://Field/ProjectName\}$ as $\{e://Field/C_Proof\}$. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Part I

2. Consensus (3/5) - Write Permission

Write Permission describes who is allowed to write entries to the distributed ledger.

The options are:

- **Restricted** if participation is restricted
- **Public** otherwise

We have rated the **Write Permission** of the **Consensus** of **\$(e://Field/ProjectName)** as **\$(e://Field/IC_WPermission)**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Part I

2. Consensus (4/5) - Validate Permission

Validate Permission describes who is allowed to validate entries before they are written to the distributed ledger.

The options are:

- **Restricted** if participation is restricted
- **Public** otherwise

We have rated the **Validate Permission** of the **Consensus** of **#{e://Field/ProjectName}** as **#{e://Field/C_VPermission}**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Part I

2. Consensus (5/5) - Fee

Fee describes whether participants of the consensus (i.e. writers, validators) are paid a fee for writing entries to the distributed ledger.

The options are:

- **Yes** if a fee is paid
- **No** otherwise

We have rated the **Fee** of the **Consensus** of **#{e://Field/ProjectName}** as **#{e://Field/C_Fees}**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Action Block

Part I

3. Action

The third *component* is **Action**.

We define Action as one or more real-life activities, which can be digitally represented by the project as a transaction. One or more transactions form an entry on the Distributed Ledger.

The three *attributes* are: **Actor Permission, Read Permission and Fee**.

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part I

3. Action (1/3) - Actor Permission

Actor Permission describes who can perform an action.

The options are:

- **Restricted** if actors have to fulfill special requirements before performing actions (e.g. know-your-customer policies)
- **Public** if anyone can perform actions.

We have rated the **Actor Permission** of the Action of `#{e://Field/ProjectName}` as `#{e://Field/A_Permission}`. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Part I

3. Action (2/3) - Read Permission

Read Permission describes which actors can read the contents of transactions from the distributed ledger.

The options are:

- **Restricted** if permission is preconditioned (privacy coins restrict permission to the transaction participants)
- **Public** if permission is not restricted

We have rated the **Read Permission** of the Action of `#{e://Field/ProjectName}` as `#{e://Field/A_ReadPermission}`. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Part I

3. Action (3/3) - Fee

Fee describes whether an actor has to pay a fee for performing an action that is unrelated to the consensus.

The options are

- **Yes** if the actor has to pay
- **No** otherwise

We have rated the **Fee of Actions** of **#{e://Field/ProjectName}** as **#{e://Field/A_Fees}**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Alternative T Block

Part I

4. Token

The last component of the taxonomy is the **Token**.

We define Token as a unit of value issued within a distributed ledger project and which can be used as a medium of exchange or unit of account.

The six attributes are:

- **Supply Property**
- **Burn Property**
- **Creation Binding**
- **Creation Independence**
- **On-chain source of value**
- **Off-chain source of value**

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Part I

4. Token (1/6 - 6/6)

We found that your project does not use a Token, hence the six attributes are not specified. For your information we explain them below.

Supply Property describes the total quantity of tokens made available.

The options are:

- **Capped** if the total supply is bound by a finite number
- **Uncapped** otherwise

Burn Property describes whether token supply can be reduced by removing tokens..

The options are:

- **Yes** if removal is planned
- **No** otherwise

Creation Binding describes how the creation of **new** Tokens is bound to incentivize the Consensus and/or an Action.

The options are:

- **Consensus** if the creation is bound to the consensus
- **Action** if the creation is bound to an action
- **Both** if the creation is bound to the consensus and action
- **None** otherwise

Creation Independence describes the amount of **new** Tokens that are created **independent** of incentivizing the Consensus or Action.

The options are:

- **Partially** if some tokens are created independently

- **All** if all tokens are created independently (e.g. 100% pre-mined tokens)
- **None** otherwise

On-chain source of value describes to which extent the origin of value lies on the distributed ledger and out of what it constitutes.

The options are:

- **Governance** if the token gives access rights to governance mechanisms
- **Asset** if the token gives access to goods or commodities (i.e. to network fees paid in a different, project external token)
- **Consensus** if the token allows to participate in the Consensus of the project.
- **Identity** if the token gives access to an identity service (i.e. a domain name system)
- **Storage** if the token allows for storing data
- **Computation** if the token allows for the usage of computing power
- **Service** if the token gives access to another service than identity, storage or computation
- **None** if no on-chain source of value exists

Off-chain source of value describes to which extent the origin of value is independent of the distributed ledger and what it constitutes.

The options are:

- **Governance** if the token gives access rights to governance mechanisms
- **Asset** if the token gives access to a good or commodity
- **Storage** if the token allows for storing data
- **Computation** if the token allows for the usage of computing power
- **Service** if the token gives access to another service than storage or computation
- **None** if no off-chain source of value exists

If you disagree or want to leave a comment please do:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Token Block

Part I

4. Token

The last component of the taxonomy is the **Token**.

We define Token as a unit of value issued within a distributed ledger project and which can be used as a medium of exchange or unit of account.

The six attributes are: **Supply Property, Burn Property, Transferability, Conditional Creation, Unconditional Creation, Underlying**

We only focus on the **main Token** in case there are several in a project. In your case we classify the **#{e://Field/TokenName}** token.

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Part I

4. Token (1/6) - Supply Property

Supply Property describes the total quantity of tokens made available.

The options are:

- **Capped** if the total supply is bound by a finite number
- **Uncapped** otherwise

We have rated the **Supply Property** of the **Token #{e://Field/TokenName}** as **#{e://Field/T_Supply}**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Part I

4. Token (2/6) - Burn Property

Burn Property describes whether the supply of token reduces when token units are removed.

The options are:

- **Yes** if removal is planned
- **No** otherwise

We have rated the **Burn Property** of the **Token** `#{e://Field/TokenName}` as `#{e://Field/T_Burned}`.
What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part I

4. Token (3/6) - Transferability

Off-chain source of value describes whether the ownership of a token unit can be changed.

The options are:

- **Transferable** if the token can be transferred
- **Non-transferable** otherwise

We have rated the **Transferability** of the **Token** `#{e://Field/TokenName}` as `#{e://Field /T_Transferability}`. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

Part I

4. Token (4/6) - Conditional Creation

Conditional Creation describes whether the creation of **new** token units is linked to the incentivization of the consensus mechanism and/ or an action.

The options are:

- **Consensus** if the creation is linked to the consensus mechanism
- **Action** if the creation is linked to an action
- **Both** if the creation is linked to the consensus mechanisms as well as an action
- **None** otherwise

We rated the **Conditional Creation** of the Token **#{e://Field/TokenName}** as **#{e://Field/T_Creation}**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part I

4. Token (5/6) - Unconditional Creation

Unconditional Creation refers to the number of new token units that can be created which do not serve to incentivize the consensus mechanism or an action.

The options are:

- **Partial** if some tokens are created unconditionally
- **All** if all tokens are created unconditionally (e.g. 100% pre-mined tokens)
- **None** otherwise

We have rated the **Unconditional Creation** of the **Token \${e://Field/TokenName}** as **\${e://Field/T_UCreation}**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part I

4. Token (6/6) - Underlying

Underlying denotes the source of a token's value and what it consists of.

The options are:

- **Distributed Ledger** if the token grants access to the distributed ledger (e.g. if the token is required in order to use the storage or computing capacity of the distributed ledger)
- **Consensus** if the token grants access to the consensus mechanism
- **Action** if the token grants access to perform or receive actions or services
- **Token** if the token grants access to another token
- **None** if the token has no underlying

We have rated the **Underlying** of the **Token \${e://Field/TokenName}** as **\${e://Field/T_Underlying}**. What is your opinion?

agree

disagree

not sure

If you disagree or are not sure please explain why:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Taxonomy Block

Part II

1. Taxonomy

Now after you learned about the taxonomy on the concrete example of your project [\\${e://Field /ProjectName}](#), we would like you to give us some general feedback to the taxonomy.

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*


Click Count: *0 clicks*

Part II

2. Components

How expressive are the four *components* **Distributed Ledger, Consensus, Action and Token** to differentiate and classify DLT projects?

	very expressive	expressive	not sure	unexpressive	very unexpressive
Distributed Ledger	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Consensus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Token	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



If you feel something is not covered or if you would like to suggest a different set of components please elaborate:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: 0 seconds

Last Click: 0 seconds

Page Submit: 0 seconds

Click Count: 0 clicks

Part II
3. Attributes

You almost made it, this is the **last question!**

How expressive are the *attributes* to differentiate and classify DLT projects?

	very expressive	expressive	not sure	unexpressive	very unexpressive
Distributed Ledger					
Origin (in your case \${e://Field /DL_Origin})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Type (in your case \${e://Field /DL_Type})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Address Traceability (in your case \${e://Field /DL_Traceability})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Turing Completeness (in your case \${e://Field /DL_Turing})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Storage (in your case \${e://Field /DL_Storage})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Consensus					
Type (in your case \${e://Field /C_Type})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proof (in your case \${e://Field /C_Proof})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Write Permission (in your case \${e://Field /C_WPermission})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Validate Permission (in your case \${e://Field /C_VPermission})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fee (in your case \${e://Field /C_Fees})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Action					
Actor Permission (in your case \${e://Field /A_APermission})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Read Permission (in your case \${e://Field /A_RPermission})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fee (in your case \${e://Field /A_Fees})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Token					
Supply Property (in your case \${e://Field /T_Supply})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Burn Property (in your case \${e://Field /T_Burned})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transferability (in your case \${e://Field /T_Transferability})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Conditional Creation (in your case \${e://Field /T_Creation})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unconditional Creation (in your case \${e://Field /T_UCreation})	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Underlying (in your case \${e://Field	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you feel something is not covered or would like to suggest a different set of attributes please elaborate:

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*

Block 6

Thank you very much! This is the end of the questionnaire. Feel free to leave some extra comments:

Are you interested in the comparative analysis of your project and 3 other projects of your choice?

Yes

No

Please state the three projects (if a project has not been analyzed, a different project will be given to you).

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

First Click: *0 seconds*

Last Click: *0 seconds*

Page Submit: *0 seconds*

Click Count: *0 clicks*