

ECHO: Efficient Off-Chain Payments and Cross-Chain Swaps for Cryptocurrencies

Di Wu
Zhejiang University
wu.di@zju.edu.cn

Jian Liu✉*
Zhejiang University
jian.liu@zju.edu.cn

Zhengwei Hou
Zhejiang University
stdbay@zju.edu.cn

Wu Wen
Zhejiang University
wuwen@intl.zju.edu.cn

Kui Ren
Zhejiang University
kuiren@zju.edu.cn

Abstract

In this paper, we present ECHO, a TEE-based layer-2 solution that tackles two crucial challenges in the realm of cryptocurrencies: off-chain payments and cross-chain swaps. It offers three notable features:

- Channel-free off-chain payments: it allows a payer to make direct payments to anyone without requiring any on-chain relationship or intermediary channels.
- Real-time yet decentralized cross-chain swaps: it is the first known solution that enables real-time cross-chain swaps without relying on a central server. This novel feature is made possible through a ground-breaking fair exchange protocol.
- TEE crash-tolerance: it offers two solutions to handle TEE crashes, one of which involves an innovative application of time-lock puzzles in this context.

We evaluate ECHO on a network consists of 1 000 nodes and the evaluation results show that ECHO can achieve 7 000 TPS.

1 Introduction

Cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin and Ethereum are gaining rapid traction, with the market cap exceeding one trillion USD [1]. The use of blockchain technology in cryptocurrencies allows for transparency, immutability, and a tamper-proof record of transactions. Recently, cryptocurrencies also enable the creation and sale of non-fungible tokens (NFTs), which are unique digital assets verified and tracked on the blockchain. Still, two critical issues must be addressed to make cryptocurrencies more accessible to the general public: inefficiency in transaction processing and difficulty in cross-chain asset swapping.

Firstly, transaction processing in cryptocurrencies is typically slow, because all blockchain nodes must run an expensive consensus protocol to agree on the order of transactions. For example, Bitcoin can only process around 7 transactions per second (TPS) and it takes about one hour for a transaction to be confirmed. Ethereum is slightly better, but its throughput is still lower than 15 TPS and it takes about 12

seconds to confirm a transaction. By comparison, credit card transaction processing systems, such as VISA, can achieve a peak throughput of 24 000 TPS and confirm a transaction in milliseconds [23]. The state-of-the-art solution for speeding up cryptocurrency transactions is to leverage *off-chain payments* [10, 19], where users can pay each other off-chain and only settle the final transaction on-chain. However, all current off-chain payment methods rely on *payment channels*, which restrict payments to users who share a channel. An expedient way is to establish a *payment channel network* (PCN) [4, 5, 34] by interconnecting the payment channels, allowing for payments between any two users to be routed through a path of connected channels. Nevertheless, PCNs also exhibit certain limitations, including the presence of multi-hop time delays and transaction fees.

Secondly, cross-chain asset swapping presents a significant challenge due to the lack of interoperability among various blockchains. In the heterogeneous landscape of today’s blockchain ecosystem, the presence of a multitude of distinct blockchains necessitates the use of cross-chain swaps as a fundamental building block for asset circulation. *Centralized exchanges* are currently the most prevalent method for cross-chain swaps, with users depositing their assets with a central server that facilitates the exchange. This method enables real-time swaps, but presents a security risk for users as their assets are vulnerable to loss in the event of a central server breach or compromise by an attacker [35, 36]. *Atomic cross-chain swaps* (ACCS) offer a more secure alternative for cross-chain swaps, ensuring an all-or-nothing settlement without relying on any central authority. However, it requires a longer waiting period for each swap, with four transactions needed (two on each respective blockchain). This waiting period can take several minutes or even hours, during which users are unable to respond promptly to price fluctuations and adjust their positions. This non-real-time nature limits users’ ability to react to market changes in a timely manner.

1.1 Our contributions

In this paper, we propose ECHO, a layer-2 solution that securely supports both off-chain payments and cross-chain

*✉Jian Liu is the corresponding author.

swaps. Given that each on-chain asset is associated with a secret key that serves as proof-of-ownership, our intuition for designing ECHO is to transfer the secret key off-chain rather than transferring the asset on-chain. This approach circumvents on-chain transfers but introduces two security risks: a payer could continue to use the key after sending it to someone else; and the payer could send the key to multiple payees resulting in double-spending. To this end, we leverage Trusted Execution Environments (TEEs) to both keep the keys invisible to its host and ensure that a key can only be sent to a single entity. This leads to an off-chain payment method that is significantly more efficient than previous methods:

- Compared with PCNs, it enables channel-free payments, allowing a payer to pay anyone directly without requiring any on-chain relationship or intermediary channels.
- Compared with state-of-the-art TEE-based off-chain payment method [27], it requires a significantly smaller TEE codebase and eliminates the need for off-chain consensus.

On the other hand, in the presence of TEE crashes, users in ECHO will lose their assets. To this end, we propose two solutions to handle TEE crashes, one of which involves an innovative application of *time-lock puzzles* (TLPs) in this context. Specifically, we have the TEE encrypt the secret key using a TLP and give it to its host, who can only retrieve the key after a certain time period. This means that even if the TEE crashes, the host can still reclaim the on-chain asset. Additionally, to avoid double-spending, payments must occur within this time period.

To enable cross-chain swaps, we can simply have two parties exchange their secret keys as if they were making off-chain payments to each other. However, this raises a fairness issue: the party who receives the key first can unilaterally abort the protocol, causing the other party to lose their assets. To this end, we design a novel *fair exchange* protocol, enabling the two parties to exchange their keys in an atomic way, ensuring *all-or-nothing settlement*. The proposed protocol is *optimistic*: when both parties behave correctly and their communication is synchronous, they can complete the exchange with three off-chain messages; when one party misbehaves (or the communication is asynchronous), the other party can complete the protocol via an on-chain transaction. Based on this fair exchange protocol, we propose the first solution for real-time cross-chain swaps that operates without a central server.

We emphasize that our fair exchange protocol breaks a previous impossibility result, which states:

In the absence of a trusted third party (TTP) facilitation, an asynchronous optimistic fair exchange requires at least four messages; in the presence of TTP facilitation, it requires at least three messages (cf. Theorem 3.4 and 3.6 in [38]).

Our optimistic protocol requires three messages, but it does not require any TTP facilitation. Instead, it leverages TEEs,

the assumption of which is weaker than that of TTP, because a TEE’s communication can be intercepted by its host.

We provide a full-fledged implementation and a systematic evaluation for ECHO. Our implementation (for both off-chain payments and cross-chain swaps) only consists of 1 443 lines of code inside TEE, and 4 219 lines of code outside TEE. We evaluate ECHO on a network consists of 1 000 nodes and the evaluation results show that ECHO can achieve 7 000 TPS. We plan to make our source code publicly available to facilitate reproducibility¹.

We summarize our contributions as follows:

- A channel-free off-chain payment scheme (Section 5);
- A mechanism for handling TEE crashes (Section 6);
- A ground-breaking fair exchange protocol (Section 7.1);
- A cross-chain swap scheme that is characterized by both decentralization and real-time operation. (Section 7.2).
- A full-fledged implementation with a comprehensive evaluation (Section 8).
- An extension to cross-border CBDC payments (Section 9).

Table 1 provides a summary of the frequently used notations in this paper.

Notation	Description
tx	a transaction
Δ	time bound for a tx to be committed
$(\widetilde{pk}^{\text{TEE}}, \widetilde{sk}^{\text{TEE}})$	TEE-controlled key-pair for signing
$\text{Sign}()$	signing function
$\text{Verify}()$	verification function
$(\widehat{pk}^{\text{TEE}}, \widehat{sk}^{\text{TEE}})$	TEE-controlled key-pair for encryption
$\text{Enc}()$	encryption function
$\text{Dec}()$	decryption function
$(pk^{\text{TEE}}, sk^{\text{TEE}})$	TEE-controlled key-pair for an on-chain asset
$\text{GenTX}()$	transaction generation
c	a ciphertext
σ	a signature
t	a time point

Table 1: A table of frequent notations.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Blockchains and cryptocurrencies

A Blockchain is a ledger shared among disparate parties to record *transactions*. It provides the following properties:

- *safety*: all parties agree on the order of transactions;
- *liveness*: a transaction is guaranteed to appear on the ledger in a predictable amount of time.

Blockchain technology has fueled a number of innovations such as cryptocurrencies [31] and smart contracts [16].

For example, Bitcoin [31] is a cryptocurrency that allows users to make payments by issuing transactions. Bitcoin transactions follow the UTXO model: each transaction tx consumes some existing UTXOs and generates some new

¹We can provide (anonymized) source code to reviewers on request.

UTXOs. A transaction also specifies a payer and a payee. To spend a UTXO, the payer must present a signature matching a certain Bitcoin address (represented by the payer’s public key) to prove ownership of the UTXO. The payee will then be the owner of the new UTXO.

Ethereum [16] is a decentralized blockchain platform that supports smart contracts. Unlike Bitcoin’s UTXO model, Ethereum operates on an account model, where each account is associated with a unique address, represented by the account holder’s public key. To make a payment, the payer needs to sign a transaction using her private key, proving ownership of the account. Once the transaction is confirmed on-chain, the payee’s account balance is updated.

2.2 Time-lock puzzles

Time-lock puzzles (TLPs) [37] enable the encryption of secrets for a specific duration, or equivalently, for future decryption. Namely, they force the decrypter to perform a long computation before being able to recover the secret. Given a secret s and a hardness parameter T , the puzzle generation algorithm computes a puzzle c :

$$c \leftarrow \text{PGen}(T, s).$$

Recovering s is only possible by solving the puzzle for a duration of T :

$$s \leftarrow \text{PSolve}(c).$$

TLPs are characterized by the following properties.

- *Fast puzzle generation*: The time required to generate a puzzle is much shorter than T .
- *Security against parallel algorithms*: The secret s is hidden for circuits of depth less than T , regardless of their size.

TLPs were initially introduced in the seminal work by Rivest, Shamir, and Wagner [37], relying on the inherent sequentiality of repeated squaring in RSA groups. Bitanski et al. [14] proposed an alternative approach for constructing TLPs, assuming the existence of succinct randomized encodings and non-parallelizable languages. Malavolta et al. [29] introduce the concept of homomorphic TLPs, enabling function evaluation over puzzles without the need to solve them. Recently, verifiable delay functions (VDFs) [15] were proposed, which enables a prover to convince a verifier that a certain amount of sequential computation has been performed. VDFs and TLPs are related but incomparable, as VDFs do not generally allow encapsulating secrets, and TLPs are not efficiently verifiable in general.

2.3 Fair exchange

Fair exchange [39] is a cryptographic protocol that allows two parties, an originator and a responder, to exchange their items fairly. It is characterized by the following properties.

- **Fairness**. At the time of protocol termination or completion, either both parties obtain their desired items or neither of them does.
- **Effectiveness**. If both parties behave correctly and the network is synchronous, the exchange will complete.

- **Timeliness**. The exchange can be terminated by any party at any time, without infinite waiting.

An *optimistic* fair exchange [8] protocol facilitates a *quick* completion of the exchange between two parties when both parties behave correctly and their communication is synchronous. It has been proved that an optimistic fair exchange protocol requires at least three messages in an asynchronous network [38]. A message-optimal fair exchange protocol [38] is described below (we leave out some details for the ease of presentation).

Suppose Alice and Bob want to exchange σ_A and σ_B and get a signed “completed” from TTP, they run as follows:

1. Alice sends σ_A to Bob.
 - If Alice receives no response from Bob, she sends $(\sigma_A, \text{Abort}_A)$ to TTP, which checks the status of the exchange.
 - If the status is “completed”, TTP returns σ_B and a signed “completed”.
 - Otherwise, TTP sets the status to “aborted” and returns a signed “aborted”.
2. Upon receiving σ_A , Bob sends σ_B to Alice.
 - If Bob receives no response from Alice, he sends (σ_A, σ_B) to TTP, which checks the status of this exchange.
 - If the status is “aborted”, TTP returns a signed “aborted”.
 - Otherwise, TTP sets the status to “completed” and returns a signed “completed”.
3. Upon receiving σ_B , Alice sends a signed ACK_A to Bob and TTP. TTP checks the status of this exchange.
 - If the status is “aborted”, TTP returns a signed “aborted”.
 - Otherwise, TTP sets the status to “completed” and returns a signed “completed”.
4. Upon receiving ACK_A , Bob sends ACK_A to TTP, which checks the status of this exchange.
 - If the status is “aborted”, TTP returns a signed “aborted”.
 - Otherwise, TTP sets the status to “completed” and returns a signed “completed”.

Notice that the signed “completed” is part of the items being exchanged. In their scenario, for example, Alice needs to present σ_B and the signed “completed” to get Bob’s real digital goods. The protocol ensures that as long as Alice gets σ_B and a signed “completed” from TTP, Bob can get σ_A and a signed “completed”, and vice versa. However, this protocol requires TTP intervention during the exchange process.

2.4 Trusted execution environments (TEEs)

TEEs provide protected memory and isolated execution so that the attackers can neither control nor observe the data being stored or processed inside it. Some TEEs such as Intel SGX [25] and ARM TrustZone [6], provide attestation services [43] enabling a remote verifier to ascertain that they are interacting with a functioning TEE.

Notice that the assumption of TEE is weaker than the TTP assumption in Section 2.3. The optimistic fair exchange protocols requires the communication between a party and TTP to be synchronous and cannot be intercepted. This is not the case for TEEs, because a message sent from/to a TEE can be easily intercepted by its host.

3 Problem statement

3.1 System setting and assumptions

We target a permissionless setting where multiple distrustful users want to make payments or swap assets among each other. We aim to propose an off-chain solution that can be built on top of *any* existing blockchain that provides safety and liveness. Even though the consensus layer of a blockchain can be probabilistic and forks are possible, there is still a time bound Δ for a transaction tx to be included into such blockchains. The existence of such bound is a crucial assumption for security in our solution. This is a common assumption for many off-chain solutions, such as payment channels.

We do not require users to be full nodes of the underlying blockchain, but only require them to be able to submit transactions and be notified by the related transactions as lightweight clients.

Each user has a TEE with a key pair $(\tilde{pk}^{\text{TEE}}, \tilde{sk}^{\text{TEE}})$ for signing and $(\hat{pk}^{\text{TEE}}, \hat{sk}^{\text{TEE}})$ for encryption, where \tilde{sk}^{TEE} and \hat{sk}^{TEE} is only known and controlled by the TEE. However, in our solution for off-chain payments, a user does not require to have a TEE if they only receive payments (but never send payments).

Each user trusts the underlying blockchain, its own environment, the local and remote TEEs. The rest of the system, including the network channels and the other users' software stacks (outside the TEE) and hardware are untrusted. Malicious users may attempt to steal funds, double-spend their payments, and arbitrarily deviate from the protocol. We assume that a TEE can crash (e.g., being lost or broken), but it rarely happens.

3.2 Design goals

Common goals for both off-chain payments and cross-chain swaps:

- **Against TEE crashes:** a user will not lose her money when her TEE device crashes.
- **Fully decentralized:** It is enough for all users to have equal power in terms of computational resources and network connectivity. Anyone can participate without any registration process.

Off-chain payments:

- **Against double-spending.** A malicious payer has no way to double-spend her assets.
- **Direct payment.** A payer can finish a payment as long as she knows the payee's pk and IP address. There is no need to route the payment over multiple hops.
- **Zero-confirmation latency.** It is safe for a payee to accept a payment immediately upon receiving it.

- **High throughput.** It should be able to provide a Visa-level throughput.

We remark that anonymity is not included in our design goals. In fact, most of existing payment channel networks are not anonymous either [9, 28].

Cross-chain swaps:

- **Atomic.** Either both parties receive what they want (or have certainty of receiving it), or neither of them does.
- **Asynchronous.** The atomic property holds even if the communication between the two parties is asynchronous, meaning that there is no bound on the message delay.
- **Optimistic.** If both parties behave correctly and the network is synchronous, the swap will be completed off-chain in real-time.

4 ECHO Overview

4.1 Intuition

Consider the scenario in which a payer, Alice, seeks to make a payment to a payee, Bob, through a shared bank. In such a situation, Alice typically generates a signed transaction, and transmits it to the bank. The bank, in turn, updates its ledger to reflect the transaction and subsequently notifies Bob of the payment.

We aim to propose a way to mimic the use of physical cash in digital transactions, which enables Alice to pay Bob without involving the bank during the payment. Our approach involves the creation of a temporary bank account by Alice, which she funds with a predetermined balance in advance. The bank would then issue a corresponding statement to validate the balance of the temporary account. To make a payment to Bob, Alice would provide him with the login credentials of the temporary account along with the corresponding bank statement. Bob would then have the option to either make payments to others by further transferring the login credentials, or withdraw the funds from the temporary account (whenever he wants). To emulate the flexibility and versatility of physical cash, Alice could create numerous such accounts, each with varying balances that correspond to different face values.

While the proposed approach holds great promise for enabling payments without intermediaries, it also introduces two potential security risks. Firstly, Alice could reuse the login credential of the temporary account after transferring it to Bob. Secondly, Alice could send the same credential to multiple payees, leading to the risk of double-spending. To address these challenges, we propose leveraging TEEs to both keep the login credentials invisible to its host and ensure that a login credential can only be sent to a single entity.

Next, we show how we apply this idea to both off-chain payments and cross-chain swaps.

4.2 Off-chain payments

In the context of cryptocurrency, the login credential (in Section 4.1) can be considered as the secret keys used to access on-chain assets. To enable off-chain payments, Alice could have her local TEE (denoted by TEE_A) create a key-pair $(pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, sk_A^{\text{TEE}})$ and reveal the public key pk_A^{TEE} to Alice.

- In a UTXO-based blockchain, Alice spends some of her existing UTXOs and generate a new UTXO locked to pk_A^{TEE} , which can only be spent by presenting a valid transaction signed by sk_A^{TEE} .
- In an account-based blockchain, Alice creates an account associated with pk_A^{TEE} and transfers a predefined balance to it.

Since Alice does not know sk_A^{TEE} , she can no longer spend these assets. The TEE is programmed to only reveal sk_A^{TEE} once; this happens when it receives a public encryption key pk and returns $\text{Enc}(pk, sk_A^{\text{TEE}})$, after which it deletes $(pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, sk_A^{\text{TEE}})$.

To make an off-chain payment to Bob, Alice asks Bob to provide a public key pk , which can either belong to Bob himself or Bob’s TEE. Then, Alice inputs pk to TEE_A and gets $c := \text{Enc}(pk, sk_A^{\text{TEE}})$, after which Alice forwards c to Bob.

- If pk belongs to Bob himself, he can decrypt c and obtain sk_A^{TEE} . At this point, Bob becomes the owner of the asset associated with this key. Notice that he cannot make any further off-chain payments using this asset, unless he makes an on-chain transaction to transfer this asset to sk_B^{TEE} as Alice did.
- If pk belongs to TEE_B , he inputs c to TEE_B ; TEE_B first verifies that c was indeed generated by a TEE, and if so, it decrypts c and obtains sk_A^{TEE} . In this case, Bob can continue to make off-chain payments using sk_A^{TEE} just as Alice did.

We further remark that if Alice decides not to make any off-chain payment using sk_A^{TEE} , she can obtain sk_A^{TEE} by invoking TEE_A with her own pk . Then, she becomes the owner of this asset again.

4.3 Handling TEE crashes

A TEE device could become lost or damaged, leading to the loss of asset associated with the TEE secret key. We mitigate such risks by empowering the TEE owner to reclaim the asset using her own key *after a time period*.

This strategy can be easily implemented if the underlying blockchain platform supports *time-locked transactions*, e.g., the `nTimeLock` field in Bitcoin [41]. Specifically, after generating a new UTXO locked to pk_A^{TEE} , Alice instructs TEE_A to generate a transaction tx_A that spends this UTXO, with the `nTimeLock` field of tx_A being set to t_A , i.e., the Bitcoin miners will process tx_A only after the time point t_A . Then, Alice can create backups of this transaction and store them in multiple locations; once her TEE device crashes, she can simply wait until t_A and reclaim her asset using this transaction. Notice that the asset can still be reclaimed before t_A via a normal transaction generated by sk_A^{TEE} (with no `nTimeLock`).

If Bob is a potential receiver for this asset in a payment at time t' , he needs to receive tx_A along with $\text{Enc}(pk, sk_A^{\text{TEE}})$, and verify whether the remaining time $(t_A - t')$ is sufficient for him to have an on-chain transaction confirmed. If the remaining time is insufficient, Bob must decline the payment. Furthermore, Bob will also instruct TEE_B to generate a trans-

action with the `nTimeLock` field being set to t_B , which satisfies $t_A - t_B > \Delta$, which makes sure that, if TEE_B crashes, Bob can reclaim the asset before Alice.

If smart contracts are supported by the underlying blockchain platforms e.g., Ethereum, time-locked transactions can be easily emulated.

For blockchain platforms where time-locked transactions are not supported, we use TLPs as a means to handle TEE crashes. Specifically, after creating $(pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, sk_A^{\text{TEE}})$, TEE_A encrypts sk_A^{TEE} using a TLP (say at time t_0) and gives the ciphertext to Alice; to retrieve sk_A^{TEE} from the ciphertext, Alice needs to perform a computation for a specific period of time, denoted by T_A . Once TEE crashes (say at time t_1), Alice can wait until $t_A = t_1 + T_A$ to reclaim her asset. To make a payment to Bob, Alice needs to send Bob a TEE_A -signed $(t_0 + T_A)$, bound with pk_A^{TEE} . Then, Bob can determine if the remaining time is sufficient in the same way as for time-locked transactions.

4.4 Cross-chain swaps

To enable a cross-chain swap between Alice and Bob, we can simply have their TEEs exchange sk_A^{TEE} and sk_B^{TEE} . However, this raises a fairness issue due to the possibility of message interception by the host of the TEE. Namely, the party who receives the key first can unilaterally abort the protocol, causing the other party to lose their assets. To this end, we design a novel fair exchange protocol by leveraging our mechanism of handling TEE crashes. Roughly, it runs as follows:

1. TEE_A sends sk_A^{TEE} to TEE_B (via a secure channel)² and deletes sk_A^{TEE} .
 - If Alice receives no response after this step, she can wait until t_A to get her asset back via the mechanism of handling TEE crashes.
2. Upon receiving sk_A^{TEE} , TEE_B sends sk_B^{TEE} to TEE_A (via a secure channel), deletes sk_B^{TEE} and locks sk_A^{TEE} .
 - TEE_B generates tx_A (a transaction that transfers Alice’s asset to Bob) and tx_B (a transaction that transfers Bob’s asset to Alice), with tx_B being hard-coded as a payload inside tx_A . TEE_B uses the crash handling mechanism to ensure that Bob can get tx_A only after t'_A ,³ with $t_A - t'_A > \Delta$.
 - If Bob receives no response after this step, he can wait until t'_A to get Alice’s asset by committing tx_A on-chain. Once tx_A made public, Alice can get tx_B .
3. Upon receiving sk_B^{TEE} , TEE_A sends ACK_A to TEE_B (via a secure channel).
4. Upon receiving ACK_A , TEE_B unlocks sk_A^{TEE} and deletes sk_B^{TEE} .

Alice can maliciously abort the protocol at Step (3) by intercepting ACK_A . In this case, she can get sk_B and reclaim Bob’s asset at any time afterwards. Therefore, it is crucial for Bob to backup tx_A in Step (2), hence he can reclaim Alice’s asset (after waiting until t'_A) in return. Furthermore, t'_A must

²The secure channel can be implemented using public-key encryption, where Alice or Bob cannot see the plaintext, but can terminate the channel.

³The `nTimeLock` field of tx_A is t'_A or tx_A is encrypted via TLP.

be at least Δ smaller than t_A , otherwise, Alice can first reclaim Bob’s asset and then wait until t_A to reclaim her own asset.

On the other hand, if Bob is malicious, he can maliciously abort the protocol at Step (2) by intercepting sk_B . In this case, he can wait until t'_A to reclaim Alice’s asset and then wait until t_B to reclaim his own asset. We avoid this by hardcoding tx_B inside tx_A : once Bob reclaims Alice’s asset by committing tx_A on-chain, Alice can get tx_B and reclaim Bob’s asset in return. However, if $t_A > t_B$, Bob can first wait until t_B to reclaim his asset and then reveal tx_A to reclaim Alice’s asset. To this end, we need an extra assumption: $t_B - t_A > 2\Delta$,⁴ which ensures that even if Bob waits until t_A to commit tx_A , Alice still has enough time to commit tx_B .

We will show the detailed protocol and its proof in Section 7.1.

5 Details of Off-Chain Payment

Algorithm 1: TEE-hosted functions for off-chain payments

```

1  $\tilde{pk}^{TEE}, \tilde{sk}^{TEE}$  // a permanent signing key-pair
2  $\widehat{pk}^{TEE}, \widehat{sk}^{TEE}$  // a permanent encryption key-pair
3 fn GetPK () // Alice
4    $(pk_A^{TEE}, sk_A^{TEE}) \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}()$  // a temporary account
5    $\sigma_A \leftarrow \text{Sign}(\tilde{sk}_A^{TEE}, pk_A^{TEE})$ 
6   return  $(pk_A^{TEE}, \sigma_A)$ 
7 fn GetSK  $(pk_A^{TEE}, \widehat{pk}_B^{TEE})$  // Alice
8   Find  $sk_A^{TEE}$  that corresponds to  $pk_A^{TEE}$ 
9    $c_A \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\widehat{pk}_B^{TEE}, sk_A^{TEE})$ 
10  Delete  $(pk_A^{TEE}, sk_A^{TEE})$ 
11   $\sigma_{c_A} \leftarrow \text{Sign}(\tilde{sk}_A^{TEE}, c_A)$ 
12  return  $(c_A, \sigma_{c_A})$ 
13 fn Receive  $(c_A, \sigma_{c_A}, pk_A^{TEE}, \sigma_A)$  // Bob
14  if  $\text{Verify}(\widehat{pk}_A^{TEE}, \sigma_{c_A}) \neq \text{true} \vee \text{Verify}(\widehat{pk}_A^{TEE}, \sigma_A) \neq \text{true}$  then
15    | terminate // invalid signature
16  end
17   $sk_A^{TEE} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\widehat{pk}_B^{TEE}, c_A)$ 
18  if  $sk_A^{TEE}$  does not correspond to  $pk_A^{TEE}$  then
19    | terminate // invalid  $sk_A^{TEE}$ 
20  end
21   $\sigma'_A \leftarrow \text{Sign}(sk_B^{TEE}, pk_A^{TEE})$ 
22  return  $(pk_A^{TEE}, \sigma'_A)$ 

```

Algorithm 1 lists the TEE-hosted functions for off-chain payments, and Figure 1, 2 show how to make an off-chain payment using these functions. Suppose Alice wants to make a payment to Bob, they run as follows (depicted in Figure 1):

1. Alice calls GetPK (Line 3-6 in Algorithm 1) to generate a temporary account represented by (pk_A^{TEE}, sk_A^{TEE}) . This function returns (pk_A^{TEE}, σ_A) , where σ_A is a signature proving that pk_A^{TEE} was indeed generated by Alice’s TEE.

⁴We can let the one who has smaller t be “Alice”. Then, we only need to assume $|t_B - t_A| > 2\Delta$. If TLP is used, t_B needs to count when the TLP of sk_B^{TEE} is generated, and t_A needs to count when the swap starts (when the swap starts, Alice needs to start computing the TLP).




Figure 1: Workflow of an off-chain payment.

2. Alice makes an on-chain transaction to transfer her on-chain assets to pk_A^{TEE} . Notice that Step (1) and (2) can be preprocessed without knowing the payee.
3. Bob sends \widehat{pk}_B^{TEE} to Alice.
4. Alice calls GetSK (Line 7-11 in Algorithm 1) to get c_A (i.e., sk_A^{TEE} encrypted by \widehat{pk}_B^{TEE}) and σ_{c_A} , after which (pk_A^{TEE}, sk_A^{TEE}) no longer exist in Alice’s TEE.
5. Alice sends $(c_A, \sigma_{c_A}), (pk_A^{TEE}, \sigma_A)$ to Bob.
6. Bob calls Receive (Line 12-21 in Algorithm 1) to hand over sk_A^{TEE} to his TEE. Notice that Bob’s TEE will use remote attestation to verify that σ_A is indeed signed by a TEE.

At this point, Bob can continue to make off-chain payments using sk_A^{TEE} just as Alice did, or withdraw the assets associated with sk_A^{TEE} . The latter is depicted in Figure 2:

- (7) Bob calls GetSK (Line 7-11 in Algorithm 1) with pk_A^{TEE} and its own public key so that he can get sk_A^{TEE} .
- (8) Bob uses sk_A^{TEE} to make a on-chain transaction that transfers the assets to his own account.




Figure 2: Workflow of a withdrawal.

In Step (3), Bob can also send his own public key to Alice, in which case, Bob can get sk_A^{TEE} and withdraw the assets directly, but cannot make any off-chain payments.

ECHO satisfies the following design goals for off-chain payments.

- **Against double-spending.** We defer the security proof

to the end of Section 6.

- **Direct payment.** To make a payment, Alice only needs to receive a public key from Bob in Step (3) and return a message in Step (5). Therefore, Alice can finish the payment as long as she knows Bob’s IP address. There is no need to route the payment over multiple hops.
- **Zero-confirmation latency.** Bob can accept the payment in Step (6), immediately upon receiving the message from Alice.
- **High throughput.** The payment only requires a two-message delay, similar to credit card payments, such as Visa. Additionally, our scheme eliminates the server bottleneck that is present in credit card payments, resulting in an increased throughput as the number of users increases. Our benchmarks have validated this claim (Figure 5).

6 Details of Handling TEE Crashes

Algorithm 2 describes the TEE-hosted Backup function for handling TEE crashes. It allows a user Alice to choose any t_A as the time point after which she can reclaim her assets. However, it is the user’s responsibility to ensure that t_A is sufficiently late, otherwise the potential payees might decline the payment. As we discussed in Section 4.3, the Backup function returns a recovery object, which could be either a time-locked transaction (Line 7) or a TLP-ciphertext (Line 11). In particular, the TLP difficulty is set to $(t_A - t)$, ensuring that Alice can get sk_A^{TEE} no earlier than t_A even if she starts the TLP computation at the current time t ; TEE_A also includes a signed t_A (Line 12) in recovery allowing the potential payee to learn t_A .

Algorithm 2: TEE-hosted functions for TEE crash

```

1 fn Backup( $pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, t_A, \text{type}$ )
2   Find  $sk_A^{\text{TEE}}$  that corresponds to  $pk_A^{\text{TEE}}$ 
3   if ( $pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, sk_A^{\text{TEE}}$ ) have been backed up then
4     terminate
5   end
6   if  $\text{type} = \text{TimeLock}$  then
7      $\text{recovery}_A \leftarrow \text{GenTX}(sk_A^{\text{TEE}}, n\text{TimeLock} := t_A)$ 
8   end
9   if  $\text{type} = \text{TLP}$  then
10    Let  $t$  be the current time
11     $c \leftarrow \text{TLP.PGen}(t_A - t, sk_A^{\text{TEE}})$ 
12     $\sigma \leftarrow \text{Sign}(pk_A^{\text{TEE}} || t_A)$ 
13     $\text{recovery}_A := (c, \sigma)$ 
14  end
15  return  $\text{recovery}_A$ 

```

To make pay a payment, Alice needs to send Bob recovery_A along with $(c_A, pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_A)$ (Step 5 in Figure 1). Before calling Receive (Step 6 in Figure 1), Bob needs to check:

- the signature inside recovery_A is a valid one from TEE_A ;
- the remaining time $(t_A - t')$ is sufficient for him to have an on-chain transaction confirmed (t' is the current time).

After Step 6 in Figure 1, Bob could call Backup with pk_A^{TEE} and t_B . The value of t_B should satisfy $t_A - t_B > \Delta$, otherwise,

Alice can still reclaim the asset after payment. Similarly, after each hop of payment, the recovery time needs to be set Δ earlier than previous one. When Bob wants make a payment using sk_A^{TEE} , he needs to include recovery_B in his payment.

At Line 10 of Algorithm 2, TEE_A needs to learn the current time t . It is worth mentioning that we do not need to assume a trusted clock inside TEE_A . We only need to assume that TEE_A obtained a trusted time during initialization, e.g., by connecting to a trusted time-server. Notice that the TEE host can only slow down the clock inside TEE_A , cannot accelerate it. Therefore, the TEE host can only make t smaller (instead of larger), resulting in a longer recovery time for sk_A^{TEE} .

Next, we provide a formal proof for the security of our off-chain payment scheme, incorporating the TEE crash handling mechanism, against double spending.

Theorem 1. If Bob confirms the payment in Step (6), Alice has no way to double-spend her assets.

Proof. Once Bob confirms the payment in Step (6), the following statements hold true:

1. Alice has transferred her on-chain assets to pk_A^{TEE} in Step (2), which is publicly verifiable.
2. pk_A^{TEE} is generated by TEE_A , which was verified at Line 13 of Algorithm 1. Namely, it verifies that σ_A is a signature of pk_A^{TEE} signed by TEE_A , and the verification key $\tilde{pk}_A^{\text{TEE}}$ was obtained through remote attestation.
3. sk_A^{TEE} corresponds to pk_A^{TEE} , which was verified at Line 17 of Algorithm 1.
4. t_A is a valid recovery time and $t_A - t'$ is sufficiently large.

Notice that once Alice has transferred her on-chain assets to pk_A^{TEE} , she only has two ways to spend them:

- Calling GetSK. This can only be done once and Alice has already performed this, due to statement (2) and (3).
- Waiting until t_A . Someone else will reclaim the asset before t_A .

Therefore, if Bob confirms the payment in Step (6), Alice has no way to double-spend her assets. \square

7 Details of Cross-chain Swap

Our idea to achieve cross-chain swap is to have Alice and Bob fairly exchange their sk_A^{TEE} and sk_B^{TEE} . One possible approach would have their TEEs execute an existing fair exchange protocol. However, we propose an alternative method that leverages TEEs and blockchain’s existence, offering an innovative and simplified optimistic fair exchange protocol.

7.1 Optimistic fair exchange based on TEE and blockchain

It is widely recognized that TEEs can greatly simplify cryptographic protocols [11, 21], but fair exchange cannot benefit from the same level of simplification. This is mainly due to the fact that the primary malicious behavior in fair exchange is the unilateral termination of the protocol; TEEs are unable to prevent such behaviors because the host of a TEE possesses the capability of intercepting messages.

Blockchains have been leveraged to achieve the fairness in various protocols such as multiparty computation [7, 18, 26],

Algorithm 3: TEE-hosted functions for fair exchange

```
1  $\widehat{pk}^{\text{TEE}}, \widehat{sk}^{\text{TEE}}$  // a permanent signing key-pair
2  $\widehat{pk}^{\text{TEE}}, \widehat{sk}^{\text{TEE}}$  // a permanent encryption key-pair
3 fn GetPK () // same as in Algorithm 1
4 fn GetSK () // same as in Algorithm 1
5 fn Backup () // same as in Algorithm 2
6 fn LockSK ( $c_A, \sigma_{c_A}, pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_A, pk_B^{\text{TEE}}, \widehat{pk}_A^{\text{TEE}}, t'_A$ ) // Bob
7   if Verify( $\widehat{pk}_A^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_{c_A}$ )  $\neq$  true  $\vee$  Verify( $\widehat{pk}_A^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_A$ )  $\neq$  true then
8     | terminate // invalid signature
9   end
10   $sk_A^{\text{TEE}} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\widehat{sk}_B^{\text{TEE}}, c_A)$ 
11  if  $sk_A^{\text{TEE}}$  does not correspond to  $pk_A^{\text{TEE}}$  then
12    | terminate // invalid  $sk_A^{\text{TEE}}$ 
13  end
14  Find  $sk_B^{\text{TEE}}$  that corresponds to  $pk_B^{\text{TEE}}$ 
15   $tx_B \leftarrow \text{GenTX}(sk_B^{\text{TEE}})$ 
16   $tx_A \leftarrow \text{GenTX}(sk_A^{\text{TEE}}, n\text{TimeLock} := t'_A, \text{payload} := tx_B)$ 
17   $c_B \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\widehat{pk}_A^{\text{TEE}}, sk_B^{\text{TEE}})$ 
18   $\sigma_{c_B} \leftarrow \text{Sign}(\widehat{sk}_B^{\text{TEE}}, c_B)$ 
19  Lock  $\langle pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, sk_A^{\text{TEE}} \rangle$ 
20  Delete  $\langle pk_B^{\text{TEE}}, sk_B^{\text{TEE}} \rangle$ 
21  return ( $c_B, \sigma_{c_B}$ ),  $tx_A$ 
22 fn GetACK ( $c_B, \sigma_{c_B}, pk_B^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_B, \widehat{pk}_B^{\text{TEE}}$ ) // Alice
23  if Verify( $\widehat{pk}_B^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_{c_B}$ )  $\neq$  true  $\vee$  Verify( $\widehat{pk}_B^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_B$ )  $\neq$  true then
24    | terminate // invalid signature
25  end
26   $sk_B^{\text{TEE}} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\widehat{sk}_B^{\text{TEE}}, c_B)$ 
27  if  $sk_B^{\text{TEE}}$  does not correspond to  $pk_B^{\text{TEE}}$  then
28    | terminate // invalid  $sk_B^{\text{TEE}}$ 
29  end
30   $c'_A \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\widehat{pk}_B^{\text{TEE}}, ack_A)$ 
31   $\sigma'_{c'_A} \leftarrow \text{Sign}(\widehat{sk}_A^{\text{TEE}}, c'_A)$ 
32  return ( $c'_A, \sigma'_{c'_A}$ )
33 fn Done ( $\sigma'_{c'_A}, c'_A$ ) // Bob
34  if Verify( $\widehat{pk}_B^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma'_{c'_A}$ )  $\neq$  true  $\vee$  Dec( $\widehat{sk}_B^{\text{TEE}}, c'_A$ )  $\neq$   $ack_A$  then
35    | terminate
36  end
37  Unlock  $\langle pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, sk_A^{\text{TEE}} \rangle$ 
```

contingent payment [12, 17, 22], etc. However, to the best of our knowledge, on-chain transactions are always required in such protocols. In contrast, our protocol requires on-chain transactions only when misbehaviour or asynchrony arises.

Algorithms 3 show the TEE-hosted functions for both the originator (Alice) and the responder (Bob). Algorithm 4 shows how they fairly exchange their sk_A^{TEE} and sk_B^{TEE} based on these functions.

We remark that, after Line 7 (Algorithm 4), Alice can terminate the protocol and run Line 9-12 at any time. Similarly, after Line 18, Bob can terminate the protocol and run Line 20 at any time. We use time-locked transactions to reclaim the assets; TLP can be used in a similar way. Figure 3 shows the optimistic workflow of our fair exchange protocol.

Next, we formally prove that this protocol satisfies the

Algorithm 4: Fair Exchange Protocol

```
// Before the exchange
1 Alice runs  $(pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_A) \leftarrow \text{GetPK}()$ , and transfers her on-chain asset
  to  $pk_A^{\text{TEE}}$ ; // this can also be a result of a previous
  off-chain payment or cross-chain swap.
2 Alice runs  $\text{recovery}_A \leftarrow \text{Backup}(pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, t_A, \text{TimeLock})$ 
3 Bob runs  $(pk_B^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_B) \leftarrow \text{GetPK}()$ , and transfers his on-chain asset
  to  $pk_B^{\text{TEE}}$  // this can also be a result of a previous
  off-chain payment or cross-chain swap
4 Bob runs  $\text{recovery}_B \leftarrow \text{Backup}(pk_B^{\text{TEE}}, t_B, \text{TimeLock})$ 
  // Before exchange, Alice and Bob needs to exchange
   $\text{recovery}_A$  and  $\text{recovery}_B$  to check if  $t_B - t_A > 2\Delta$ 
  // Alice
5 upon Reception of Init do
6    $(c_A, \sigma_{c_A}) \leftarrow \text{GetSK}(pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, \widehat{pk}_B^{\text{TEE}})$ 
7   sends  $(c_A, \sigma_{c_A}, pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_A, \text{recovery}_A)$  to Bob
8   if receive no response then
9     | // this can happen whenever Alice suspects
9     | that Bob is malicious
9     | terminate the exchange and wait until  $t_A$  to reclaim
10    | if  $tx_A$  appears before  $t_A$  then
11      | extract  $tx_B$  from  $tx_A$ 
12      | commit  $tx_B$  //  $t_B - t_A > 2\Delta$ 
13    | end
14  end
15 done
  // Bob
16 upon Reception of  $(c_A, \sigma_{c_A}, pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_A, \text{recovery}_A)$  do
17    $(c_B, \sigma_{c_B}), tx_A \leftarrow$ 
18   LockSK( $c_A, \sigma_{c_B}, pk_A^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_A, pk_B^{\text{TEE}}, \widehat{pk}_A^{\text{TEE}}, t'_A$ ) //  $t'_A$  was
19   chosen s.t.  $t_A - t'_A > \Delta$ , where  $t_A$  can be
19   extracted from  $\text{recovery}_A$ 
20   sends  $(c_B, \sigma_{c_B}, pk_B^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_B)$  to Alice
21   if receive no response then
22     | terminate the exchange and wait until  $t'_A$  to commit  $tx_A$ 
23   end
24 done
  // Alice
25 upon Reception of  $(c_B, \sigma_{c_B}, pk_B^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_B)$  do
26    $(c'_A, \sigma'_{c'_A}) \leftarrow \text{GetACK}(c_B, \sigma_{c_B}, pk_B^{\text{TEE}}, \sigma_B, \widehat{pk}_B^{\text{TEE}})$ 
27   sends  $(c'_A, \sigma'_{c'_A})$  to Bob
28 done
  // Bob
29 upon Reception of  $(c'_A, \sigma'_{c'_A})$  do
30   Done( $c'_A, \sigma'_{c'_A}$ )
31 done
```

properties of fair exchange.

Fairness. As mentioned in Section 2.3, the fairness property requires that either both parties obtain their desired items or neither of them does. In Algorithm 4, the items being exchanged are sk_A^{TEE} and sk_B^{TEE} , but what the parties are truly exchanging are the corresponding on-chain assets. In light of this, we have Alice and Bob invoke GetSK and reclaim the on-chain assets once Algorithm 4 is completed. Our fairness proof includes this step.

Lemma 1. If (a malicious) Alice obtains one on-chain asset, Bob is able to obtain the other one.

Proof. There are four ways for Alice to obtain an on-chain asset:




Figure 3: Optimistic workflow of fair exchange.

1. Alice runs Line 6 (of Algorithm 4) with her own public key (instead of \widehat{pk}_B^{TEE}) and obtains sk_A^{TEE} . Then, she uses sk_A^{TEE} to reclaim the corresponding asset.
 - If Alice does not send anything to Bob, the exchange fails to initiate and Bob can reclaim his asset in the usual manner.
 - If Alice still sends $(c_A, \sigma_{c_A}, pk_A^{TEE}, \sigma_A, recovery_A)$ to Bob, Bob will terminate at Line 12 of Algorithm 3, and he can reclaim his asset in the usual manner.
2. Alice waits until t_A to reclaim her asset (Line 9 of Algorithm 4). This can only happen if Bob did not receive c_A , otherwise, Bob can reclaim Alice's asset before t_A via tx_A (Line 20 of Algorithm 4). Then, same as case (1), Bob can reclaim his asset in the usual manner.
3. Alice extracts tx_B from tx_A and reclaims Bob's asset via tx_B (Line 11-12 of Algorithm 4). This can only happen if Bob broadcasts tx_A after waiting until t'_A (Line 20 of Algorithm 4). Given that $t_A - t'_A > \Delta$, tx_A will be committed before t_A , which implies that Bob will obtain Alice's asset.
4. After Line 24 of Algorithm 4, Alice gets sk_B^{TEE} via GetSK and reclaim Bob's asset. There are two cases:
 - If Alice sends (c'_A, σ'_A) before t'_A , Bob has enough time to get sk_A^{TEE} and use it to reclaim Alice's asset.
 - If Alice sends (c'_A, σ'_A) after t'_A (or does not send (c'_A, σ'_A) at all), Bob can reclaim Alice's asset via tx_A , same as case (3).

Therefore, if a malicious Alice obtains one on-chain asset, Bob is able to obtain the other one. \square

Lemma 2. If (a malicious) Bob obtains one on-chain asset, Alice is able to obtain the other one.

Proof. There are three ways for Bob to obtain an on-chain asset:

1. After Line 16 of Algorithm 4, Bob runs LockSK with his own public key (instead of \widehat{pk}_A^{TEE}) and obtains sk_B^{TEE} . Then, he uses sk_B^{TEE} to reclaim the corresponding asset. In this case, there is no way for Bob to reclaim Alice's asset, and Alice can wait until t_A to reclaim.
2. Bob obtains Alice's asset by committing tx_A (Line 20 of Algorithm 4). Notice that tx_A must be committed before

$t_A + \Delta$ (otherwise, Alice can get tx'_A via the crash handling mechanism and commit it before $t_A + \Delta$, making tx_A invalid). In this case, Alice can extract tx_B from tx_A , and given $T_B - T_A > 2\Delta$, she still has Δ to commit tx_B .

3. After Line 28 of Algorithm 4, Bob runs GetSK with his own public key and obtains sk_A^{TEE} . Then, he uses sk_A^{TEE} to reclaim Alice's asset. In this case, Alice can get sk_B^{TEE} after Line 24 and reclaim Bob's asset.

Therefore, if a malicious Bob obtains one on-chain asset, Alice is able to obtain the other one. \square

Theorem 2. At the time of protocol termination or completion, either both parties obtain their desired items or neither of them does.

Proof. Due to Lemma 1, if (a malicious) Alice obtains one on-chain asset, Bob is able to obtain the other one. Due to Lemma 2, if (a malicious) Bob obtains one on-chain asset, Alice is able to obtain the other one. So, at the time of protocol termination or completion, either both parties obtain their own assets, or one party obtains the counterparty's asset. \square

Effectiveness. The effectiveness property requires that, if both parties behave correctly and the network is synchronous, the exchange will complete. This is quite straightforward in our protocol:

1. If both parties behave correctly and the network is synchronous, Bob will receive $(c_A, \sigma_{c_A}, pk_A^{TEE}, \sigma_A, recovery_A)$ and reply with $(c_B, \sigma_{c_B}, pk_B^{TEE}, \sigma_B)$.
2. Alice will receive $(c_B, \sigma_{c_B}, pk_B^{TEE}, \sigma_B)$ before t_A and reply with (c'_A, σ'_A) .
3. Bob will receive before t'_A and complete the protocol.

Timeliness. The timeliness property requires that the exchange can be terminated by any party at any time. This is also quite straightforward in our protocol:

- Alice can terminate the protocol at any time without requiring any additional action. She can simply wait until t_A to claim her own asset or wait until t'_A to claim Bob's asset.
- Bob can terminate the protocol by not calling LockSK (Line 17 of Algorithm 4). Then, he can behave as if he did not participate in the protocol with Alice. If Bob has called LockSK, he can still terminate the protocol at any time afterwards, and wait until t'_A to claim Alice's asset.

7.2 Cross-chain swap

Cross-chain swaps can be easily accomplished based on our proposed fair exchange protocol. However, in the context of cross-chain swaps, we must consider multiple runs of the fair exchange, where Alice/Bob may further exchange their obtained items with others.

- Bob is capable to reclaim the asset associated with sk_A^{TEE} using tx_A after t'_A . Therefore, when Bob further exchanges sk_A^{TEE} , he needs to use t'_A as the new " t_A " and use tx_A as the new " $recovery_A$ ".

- Similarly, when Alice further exchanges sk_B^{TEE} , she needs to use t'_A as the new “ t_B ”. However, she has nothing that could be used as “recovery $_B$ ”. To this end, we have TEE_A generate a signed t'_A , indicating that the exchange should be sufficiently earlier than t'_A . TEE_B needs to include t'_A in c_B so that TEE_A can learn t'_A .

Clearly, ECHO satisfies the following design goals for cross-chain swaps:

- **Atomic.** At the point of protocol termination, either both parties receive what they want (or have certainty of receiving it), or neither of them does.
- **Asynchronous.** The atomic property holds even if the communication between the two parties is asynchronous.
- **Optimistic.** If both parties behave correctly and the network is synchronous, the swap will be completed off-chain with a three-message delay.

8 Evaluation

8.1 Implementation

We implemented ECHO in Golang using GRPC [2] for communication. We used Intel SGX to provide trusted execution environments and implemented the TEE-hosted functions (i.e., Algorithms 1, 2 and 3) inside an SGX enclave. For the enclave development, we leveraged the EGo⁵ framework, which can compile Golang code to run inside an enclave, and also enables remote attestation and sealing processes with Golang. Notice that whenever the TEE state changes, we need to seal it, which requires a call to a monotonic counter. However, Intel has removed monotonic counters from the Linux SGX SDK [24]. Following [27], we emulate them by adding a delay of 100ms.

We use SHA256 for hashing, 256-bit ECDSA for client signatures, and 2 048-bit RSA for encryption/decryption. To mitigate side-channel attacks, we use implementations of RSA and ECDSA that operate in constant time.

Our implementation (for both off-chain payments and cross-chain swaps) consists of 1 443 lines of code inside TEE, and 4 219 lines of code outside TEE.

We deploy our implementation on a cluster of 1 000 Alibaba Cloud ecs.g7t.2xlarge virtual machines (simulating 1 000 ECHO users) across different regions to introduce real network latency. The bandwidth between two different virtual machines ranges from 5Mbps to 100Mbps. This is consistent with real-world payment systems, where some devices have high connectivity and others are simply mobile devices. Each virtual machine contains eight Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8369B CPU @ 2.70GHz, 32GB memory and runs Ubuntu 22.04tls.

8.2 Evaluation of Off-Chain Payment

When evaluating the performance of off-chain payments, we maintain a continuous flow of payments from payers to payees, and measure latency and throughput. We first consider the case of multiple-payers-single-payee, which corresponds

to the e-commerce scenario where one seller serves multiple buyers. Figure 4 depicts the peak throughput and latency of ECHO with varying numbers of payers (accompanied by one payee). Latency is measured from the moment the payer initiates the payment until the payee confirms it, and average latencies are reported. To measure throughput, for each point on the x-axis, we run the system for 1 minute, and the throughput is calculated as the number of confirmed payments divided by 60. The throughput increases almost linearly with the number of payers. When there are 400 payers paying to one payee, the throughput reaches 2 532 TPS. The latency is somehow stable, 130-160ms.

Next, we evaluate the performance ECHO with varying numbers of users. Recall that ECHO is designed as a fully peer-to-peer payment system, i.e., payments between different users are independent. As a result, the throughput of ECHO will increase as more users are added. We group the users into sets of 200-payers-1-payee each and increase the number of such groups. When there are 5 such groups (i.e., 1 005 users), the throughput reaches 7 000 TPS (cf. Figure 5).

We compare the on-chain transaction requirements for 1 000 users making off-chain payments via ECHO and Lightning network(LN), as illustrated in Figure 6. We assume that the fund of each LN channel is sufficient, and no channel fee. We assess how the presence of depleted funds user those not withdrawing funds, a common occurrence in real-world payment scenarios. Regardless of such users, LN mandates 1 998 transactions for channel opening and closure. Conversely, ECHO needs 2 000 transactions for deposits and withdrawals with no depleted funds users. However, as the number of such users rises, ECHO’s on-chain transaction requirement diminishes linearly.

8.3 Evaluation of Cross-chain Swap


Table 2: Latency of 1 000 swaps.

	Latency (h)
ECHO	0.0342
ACCS	2 385
XClaim [42]	102


Table 2 compares ECHO with ACCS and XClaim [42] in terms of swap latency. The results of ACCS and XCLAIM were taken from Figure 4 of [42], which is the latency for 1 000 swaps. We also measure the latency of ECHO for 1 000 swaps. The performance of ECHO demonstrates clear superiority over ACCS and XCLAIM due to its elimination of on-chain transactions.

Figure 7 shows the comparison of using ECHO, XCLAIM and ACCS to finish 1 000 individual swaps. For ACCS, it needs 4 transactions for each swap. For XClaim, it requires 2 transactions to initialise, utilise 2 transaction for each swap, then uses 2 transactions in the end to redeem. For ECHO, without 2 transactions for deposit and 2 transactions for withdrawal, it does not need on-chain transaction for each swap.

⁵<https://www.edgeless.systems/products/ego/>



(a) Peak Throughput vs. # Payers.



(b) Latency vs. # Payers.

Figure 4: The peak throughput and latency of ECHO for varying numbers of payers (accompanied by one payee).




Figure 5: The peak throughput of ECHO for varying numbers of users.




Figure 7: Comparison of cross-chain atomic swaps via ECHO, XCLAIM and ACCS for 1 000 individual swaps.




Figure 6: Comparison of off-chain payments via ECHO and Lightning Network between 1000 users.

We see that the number of on-chain transactions required for ECHO to complete 1 000 individual swap is 0.1% of ACCS and 0.2% of XCLAIM.

9 Cross-border CBDC payments

Central bank digital currency (CBDC) is a digitalized representation of traditional central bank-issued currency. Its digital nature, direct liability of the central bank, and seamless integration with existing financial infrastructure make it a promising tool for enhancing economic efficiency, stability, and financial inclusion. *Cross-border CBDC payments* refer to transactions that take place between two parties residing in different countries, and at least one of these parties is using CBDC as the medium of payment. For example, when tourists or business travelers engage in cross-border transactions, they have the option to use their home country’s CBDC when abroad or acquire the CBDC of the country they are visiting.

Interestingly, ECHO has the potential to facilitate cross-border CBDC payments seamlessly. With ECHO, a traveller (say Alice) can make payments in a foreign country (say

country-B) without the need to open a CBDC account in that country. In more detail, Alice can purchase some CBDC accounts (of country-B) with different face values from an on-line or physical money exchange. When Alice purchases the accounts, the associated secret keys (or account passwords) are securely transferred from the money exchange’s TEE to Alice’s TEE. Then, to make a payment in country-B, Alice just needs to call `GetSK` (in Algorithm 1).

We remark that this solution for cross-border CBDC payments requires minimal modifications to existing CBDC systems. The only requirements are:

- Allowing a user to generate arbitrary number of temporary accounts;
- Providing bank statement to such temporary accounts.

10 Related Work

10.1 Off-chain payments

Payment channels. The concept of off-chain payments was originally introduced by the Bitcoin community [40], wherein payments are facilitated through *payment channels*. In a nutshell, a payer first deposits her funds to a payee by issuing an on-chain transaction (i.e., open a payment channel), after which *multiple* off-chain payments can be made between them as long as the deposit is sufficient. In the end, they make another on-chain transaction to close the channel, i.e., split the deposit according to the off-chain payments. This simple approach effectively reduces the load on the blockchain and improves the transaction throughput, but it is limited to direct payments between two users sharing a channel.

PCNs. Such payment channels can be linked together to form a *payment channel network* (PCN) [4, 5, 34], such that

payments between any pair of users can be routed through a path of channels connecting them. Poon and Dryja initially propose the concept of a payment network for Bitcoin [34]. It links multiple payment channels together to form a payment channel network (PCN). Thereafter, the Lightning Network [4] has emerged as the most popular PCN for Bitcoin, and other PCNs such as Thunder [33], Eclair [32] and Raiden [5] have been proposed based on the Lightning Network.

A major issue for PCNs is that they require multiple hops to commit a payment. Miller et al. [30] propose a PCN construction called Sprites that reduces the “collateral cost” (which they defined as lost opportunity value held in reserve during the locktime) from $\Theta(l \cdot \alpha)$ to $\Theta(l + \alpha)$, where l is the number of hops and α is the time to commit an on-chain transaction. However, the “collateral cost” is still $O(l)$ due to the nature of PCNs. Dziembowski et al. [20] introduce a technique called “virtual payment channels” to avoid routing in multiple hops for each individual payment. The basic idea is to apply the channel technique recursively to build a virtual channel on top of multiple real channels. Unfortunately, this technique only applies to the case where payer and payee have long term payment relationships.

Teechain. Lind et al. [27] propose a TEE-based PCN named Teechain. In more detail, Teechain establish off-chain payment channels directly between TEEs, i.e., TEEs maintain collateral funds and exchange transactions, without interacting with the underlying blockchain. To mitigate against TEE failures and to avoid having to trust all TEEs, Teechain replicates the state using committee chains, which run an off-chain consensus. Compared with Teechain, ECHO does not require any off-chain consensus, which contributes to its superior efficiency and a smaller TEE codebase.

10.2 Cross-chain swap

Centralized exchanges are currently the most prevalent method for cross-chain swaps. Traders need to deposit their funds to the server, which brings the risk that traders may lose their funds when the server is breached or compromised by the attacker [35, 36].

Atomic cross-chain swaps (ACCSs). An alternative way of achieving cryptocurrency exchange is called *atomic cross-chain swaps* (ACCSs). The core idea of ACCSs is to force one trader (Alice) to acknowledge receiving the payment by revealing a secret such that the other trader (Bob) can use the secret to reclaim Alice’s payment. If Alice does not reveal the secret prior to a timeout, the exchange fails like nothing happens (*all-or-nothing settlement*).

ACCSs incur long waiting periods between transfers and suffer the limitation that for every cross-chain swap, four transactions need to occur, two on each blockchain. This makes them expensive, slow and inefficient: each trader needs to wait many minutes (or even hours) before they can reclaim the other’s payment. This non-real-time property implies that traders cannot respond to price fluctuations and alter their

positions in a timely manner.

XClaim. XClaim [42] is a collateral-based cryptocurrency exchange that is facilitated by a third party called *vault*. The vault has collateral being locked to a smart contract on chain A. To exchange funds from chain B to Chain A, a trader (Bob) needs to send b units of funds to the vault on Chain B and get collateral-backed assets $A(b)$ on Chain A. The other trader Alice transferring the corresponding units of funds to Bob on chain A can get $A(b)$. Alice can further exchange it with other traders. She can also get the b units of funds on chain B by locking $A(b)$ to the smart contract on Chain A. Then, the *vault* can get its collateral back from the smart contract by showing the proof that b was redeemed, and the smart contract will destroy $A(b)$ in the end.

XClaimx requires fewer on-chain transactions than ACCSs (2 vs. 4), but it is still not in real-time. Furthermore, the *vault* needs to put equal amount of collateral as the funds being exchanged. Chain A needs to be able to support smart contracts, so XClaim cannot support exchange between two simple cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin and Litecoin [3].

Tesseract. Tesseract [13] is a real-time cryptocurrency exchange service built on top of Intel SGX [25]. Tesseract runs the centralized exchange inside SGX to make it behave like a trusted third party. In more detail, they have the TEE generate a keypair for each supported cryptocurrency and only publish the public keys. Traders pay deposit to the public key but specify a time limit after which they can get their remaining deposit back. In this case, the exchange operator cannot steal the deposits because it does not know the private key held by the TEE; traders can still get their deposits back even if the TEE crashes.

The exchange operator periodically conducts settlements by having the TEE generate two settlement transactions. However, a trader colluding with the exchange operator can make the settlement partially done. This again validates our statement that the assumption of TEE is weaker than the TTP assumption (cf. Section 2.4). To address this challenge, the authors of Tesseract setting up multiple exchange operators and have them run a consensus protocol. This solution works, but makes the protocol much more complex.

11 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose ECHO, a TEE-based layer-2 solution that supports both off-chain payments and cross-chain swaps. It allows a payer to make direct payments to anyone without requiring any on-chain relationship or intermediary channels. It is also the first known solution that enables real-time cross-chain swaps without relying on a central server. This novel feature is made possible through a ground-breaking fair exchange protocol. Furthermore, it offers two solutions to handle TEE crashes, one of which involves an innovative application of time-lock puzzles in this context. We provide a full-fledged implementation and a comprehensive evaluation.

References

- [1] Coinmarketcap. <https://coinmarketcap.com/>.

- [2] GRPC. <https://grpc.io/>.
- [3] Litecoin. <https://litecoin.org>.
- [4] Lightning Network, 2020. <https://github.com/lightningnetwork/lnd>.
- [5] Raiden Network, 2020. <https://raiden.network>.
- [6] AMD Secure Processor, 2021. <http://www.amd.com/en-us/innovations/software-technologies/security>.
- [7] Marcin Andrychowicz, Stefan Dziembowski, Daniel Malinowski, and Łukasz Mazurek. Secure multiparty computations on bitcoin. *Commun. ACM*, 59(4):76–84, mar 2016.
- [8] Nadarajah Asokan, Matthias Schunter, and Michael Waidner. Optimistic protocols for fair exchange. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 7–17, 1997.
- [9] Kristov Atlas. The Inevitability of Privacy in Lightning Networks, 2020. <https://www.kristovatlas.com/the-inevitability-of-privacy-in-lightning-networks/>.
- [10] Lukas Aumayr, Pedro Moreno-Sanchez, Aniket Kate, and Matteo Maffei. Blitz: Secure {Multi-Hop} payments without {Two-Phase} commits. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 4043–4060, 2021.
- [11] Raad Bahmani, Manuel Barbosa, Ferdinand Brasser, Bernardo Portela, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, Guillaume Scerri, and Bogdan Warinschi. Secure multiparty computation from sgx. In Aggelos Kiayias, editor, *Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 477–497, Cham, 2017. Springer International Publishing.
- [12] Wacław Banasik, Stefan Dziembowski, and Daniel Malinowski. Efficient zero-knowledge contingent payments in cryptocurrencies without scripts. In Ioannis Askoxylakis, Sotiris Ioannidis, Sokratis Katsikas, and Catherine Meadows, editors, *Computer Security – ESORICS 2016*, pages 261–280, Cham, 2016. Springer International Publishing.
- [13] Iddo Bentov, Yan Ji, Fan Zhang, Lorenz Breidenbach, Philip Daian, and Ari Juels. Tesseract: Real-time cryptocurrency exchange using trusted hardware. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS ’19*, page 1521–1538, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [14] Nir Bitansky, Shafi Goldwasser, Abhishek Jain, Omer Paneth, Vinod Vaikuntanathan, and Brent Waters. Time-lock puzzles from randomized encodings. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science, ITCS ’16*, page 345–356, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [15] Dan Boneh, Joseph Bonneau, Benedikt Bünz, and Ben Fisch. Verifiable delay functions. In Hovav Shacham and Alexandra Boldyreva, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2018*, pages 757–788, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing.
- [16] Vitalik Buterin. A Next-Generation Smart Contract and Decentralized Application Platform, 2020. <https://github.com/ethereum/wiki/wiki/White-Paper>.
- [17] Matteo Campanelli, Rosario Gennaro, Steven Goldfeder, and Luca Nizzardo. Zero-knowledge contingent payments revisited: Attacks and payments for services. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS ’17*, page 229–243, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [18] Arka Rai Choudhuri, Matthew Green, Abhishek Jain, Gabriel Kaptchuk, and Ian Miers. Fairness in an unfair world: Fair multiparty computation from public bulletin boards. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS ’17*, page 719–728, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [19] Stefan Dziembowski, Lisa Eockey, Sebastian Faust, and Daniel Malinowski. Perun: Virtual payment hubs over cryptocurrencies. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 106–123. IEEE, 2019.
- [20] Stefan Dziembowski, Lisa Eockey, Sebastian Faust, and Daniel Malinowski. PERUN: Virtual Payment Hubs over Cryptographic Currencies. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, 2019.
- [21] Ben Fisch, Dhinakaran Vinayagamurthy, Dan Boneh, and Sergey Gorbunov. Iron: Functional encryption using intel sgx. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS ’17*, page 765–782, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [22] Georg Fuchsbaauer. Wi is not enough: Zero-knowledge contingent (service) payments revisited. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS ’19*, page 49–62, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [23] VisaNet Inc. Small Business Retail. <https://usa.visa.com/run-your-business/small-business-tools/retail.html>.
- [24] Intel. Unable to find alternatives to monotonic counter application programming interfaces (apis) in intel® software guard extensions (intel® sgx) for linux* to prevent sealing rollback attacks. <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/support/articles/000057968/software/intel-security-products.html>.
- [25] Intel. Software Guard Extensions (Intel SGX) Programming Reference, 2020. <https://software.intel.com/sites/default/files/managed/48/88/329298-002.pdf>.
- [26] Aggelos Kiayias, Hong-Sheng Zhou, and Vassilis Zikas. Fair and robust multi-party computation using a global transaction ledger. In Marc Fischlin and Jean-Sébastien Coron, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – EURO-CRYPT 2016*, pages 705–734, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2016. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [27] Joshua Lind, Oded Naor, Ittay Eyal, Florian Kelbert, Peter Pietzuch, and Emin Gün Sirer. Teechain: Reducing Storage Costs on the Blockchain With Offline Payment Channels. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP ’19*. ACM, 2019.
- [28] Bitcoin Magazine. Does the Lightning Network Threaten Bitcoin’s Censorship Resistance?, 2020.
- [29] Giulio Malavolta and Sri Aravinda Krishnan Thyagarajan. Homomorphic time-lock puzzles and applications. In Alexandra Boldyreva and Daniele Micciancio, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2019*, pages 620–649, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.
- [30] Andrew Miller, Iddo Bentov, Ranjit Kumaresan, Christopher Cordi, and Patrick McCorry. Sprites and State Channels: Payment Networks that Go Faster than Lightning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.05812*, 2017. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1702.05812.pdf>.
- [31] Satoshi Nakamoto. Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system. *Decentralized Business Review*, page 21260, 2008.
- [32] Eclair network. Project’s website, 2020. <https://github.com/ACINQ/eclair>.
- [33] Thunder network. Project’s website, 2020. <https://github.com/blockchain/thunder>.
- [34] Joseph Poon and Thaddeus Dryja. The Bitcoin Lightning Network: Scalable Off-chain Instant Payments. 2016. <https://www.bitcoinlightning.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/lightning-network-paper.pdf>.
- [35] Reuters. Bitcoin worth \$72 million stolen from bitfinex exchange in hong kong, 2019. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-bitfinex-hacked-hongkong-idUSKCN10E0KP>.
- [36] Reuters. Mt. gox says it found 200,000 bitcoins in ‘forgotten’ wallet, 2019. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-bitcoin-mtgox-wallet-idUSBREA2K05N20140321>.
- [37] Ronald L Rivest, Adi Shamir, and David A Wagner. Time-lock puzzles and timed-release crypto. 1996.
- [38] Matthias Schunter. Optimistic fair exchange. 2000.
- [39] Matthias Schunter. *Fair Exchange*, pages 215–216. Springer US, Boston, MA, 2005.
- [40] Bitcoin wiki. Bitcoin contract, 2020. <https://en.bitcoin.it/wiki/Contract>.
- [41] Bitcoin Wiki. Timelock, 2022. <https://en.bitcoin.it/wiki/Timelock>.
- [42] Alexei Zamyatin, Dominik Harz, Joshua Lind, Panayiotis Panayiotou, Arthur Gervais, and William J Knotenbelt. Xclaim: Interoperability with cryptocurrency-backed tokens. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, May 2019.
- [43] Intel Developer Zone. Software Guard Extensions Remote Attestation End-to-End Example, 2020.