THE PPP(Purchase & Payment Plus) COIN

WHITE PAPER

Initial Version 3.5.0.0

PnPP Coin, a Standard Platform Offering Safe and Convenient Cryptocurrency

PPP Coin is a token developed based on the Crypto Note blockchain and was prepared fop application to real life by enabling transactions to go through with CHASH. By using the exclusive dApp of PPP Coin, it is possible to secure the convenience and unity of purchase and transaction of products, whereby it may be safely and easily used as a currency for daily life.

Hence PPP COIN not only continuously produces and sells to the public at largely, but also expands various places of use in the same manner as VASA and MASTER cards, and will claim its position as a token of increasing the value continuously by providing opportunities to keep it franchised to conduct transactions. In particular, as a coin for daily life needed for real life, when a transaction occurs through a franchised store or a place of use, an event called transaction mining occurs to ensure that assets may be maintained and expanded through the mining opportunities, as well as enable commission-free transactions.

Since PPP COIN is basically based on the premise that it is used as a means for trading goods, it is listed on the virtual currency exchange yet does not want to be the subject of speculation as a matter of principle. However, as a means of securing stable returns relative to investments made in the coin market and achieve a mutual growth with the company based on the flexible operation within the scope of not disturbing the ethics of commerce, universalization and generalization of transactions are promoted together. Accordingly, it is recommended that the contents above be read and reviewed prior to committing to a purchase.

If and where one purchases PPP COIN for the purposes of investment for unfair trading gains via a transaction that obscures the nature of the transaction, and incurs any loss thereby, any and all liability for such lies with the individual purchaser.

In developing and distributing PPP COIN, we will try to establish it as a key asset by planning and preparing various mining methods with a view to become a stable and safe asset without going against the market trends.

1. Overview of Cryptocurrency

1) Background

Blockchain was first conceptualized in Satoshi Nakamoto's paper entitled Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System" in 2008 and was implemented as the key technology of Bitcoin the subsequent year.[1] Bitcoin uses the blockchain technology as a ledger of financial transactions where the individuals publicly record their information on the currency transfers they conduct. Bitcoin is the first use of the blockchain to solve the double spending problem. Absent any centralized administrative, Bitcoin has successfully supported 180 million peer-to-peer transactions and is now achieving a market capitalization of over USD 1 billion.

Following the success of Bitcoin, numerous systems utilizing the blockchain technology have surfaced. Hundreds of cryptocurrencies are currently competing among themselves, and according to a recent report by IBM, over 90% of banks are now investing in the blockchain technology.[2] While the currency transactions are the most common application of the blockchain technology, various groups are also attempting to use the blockchain technology to manage other digital assets, such as financial products and services, logistics information, property ownership, and personal identity information.

In 2016, the cryptocurrency of Ethereum attracted much attention. Ethereum is "a blockchain[3] with a built-in full-fledged turing-complete programming language which

---

1) Satoshi Nakamoto, *Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System*, https://bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf
2) *Leading the Pack in Blockchain Banking: Trailblazers Set the Pace*, https://www-01.ibm.com/common/ssi/cgi-bin/ssialias?htmlfid=GBP03467USEN&
3) Vitalik Buterin, *Ethereum Whitepaper*, https://github.com/ethereum/wiki/wiki/White-Paper

may be create ‘contracts’ which may be used to implement the arbitrary state-transformation functions,” and aims to provide a payment and settlement system for the blockchain.

The goal is to allow the users to use any kind of program (or contract) for the blockchain. As with Bitcoin, Ethereum uses the blockchain and the consensus mechanism to ensure that, if a malicious node attempts to forge the contract, the fake contract will ultimately be removed from the blockchain. Bitcoin completely guarantees the amount of Bitcoin transferred between the accounts. Similarly, Ethereum must ensure the integrity of the contracts executed.

2) Need

The most basic infrastructure across all industries is the payment system. As the barter exchange of the past has over time evolved into a transaction using the currency with the emergence of currency, it has developed into a credit transaction system using an electronic payment method.

In this process, an outlook is made such that, as the efforts for digitization of the currency are stressed, digital currencies and cryptocurrencies, etc., have surfaced, and the decentralized cryptocurrency through the blockchain technology supports the free interpersonal transactions and effectively develops commerce.

However, in this process, we believe that far more important than the development of currency are protecting the property of each individual by preserving the ’value’ of PPP COIN used when trading good and maintaining and supplementing the stable order of all transactions. We also propose to apply the blockchain technology and SECURITY SOLUTION for any and all payment-enabled ’systems’.

02. Characteristics of the Coin

2.1 What is CryptoNote?

"Bitcoin" [1] has been a successful implementation of the concept of p2p electronic cash. Both professionals and the general public have come to appreciate the convenient combination of public transactions and proof-of-work as a trust model. Today, the user base of electronic cash is growing at a steady pace; customers are attracted to low fees and the anonymity provided by electronic cash and merchants value its predicted and decentralized emission. Bitcoin has effectively proved that electronic cash can be as simple as paper money and as convenient as credit cards.

Unfortunately, Bitcoin suffers from several deficiencies. For example, the system's distributed nature is inflexible, preventing the implementation of new features until almost all of the network users update their clients. Some critical flaws that cannot be fixed rapidly deter Bitcoin's widespread propagation. In such inflexible models, it is more efficient to roll-out a new project rather than perpetually fix the original project.

In this paper, we study and propose solutions to the main deficiencies of Bitcoin. We believe that a system taking into account the solutions we propose will lead to a healthy competition among different electronic cash systems. We also propose our own electronic cash, "CryptoNote", a name emphasizing the next breakthrough in electronic cash.

2.2. Bitcoin drawbacks and some possible solutions

2.2.1. Traceability of transactions

Privacy and anonymity are the most important aspects of electronic cash. Peer-to-peer payments seek to be concealed from third party's view, a distinct difference when compared with traditional banking. In particular, T. Okamoto and K. Ohta described six criteria of ideal electronic cash, which included "privacy: relationship between the user and his purchases must be untraceable by anyone" [30]. From their description, we derived two properties which a fully anonymous electronic cash model must satisfy in order to comply with the requirements outlined by Okamoto and Ohta:

Untraceability: for each incoming transaction all possible senders are equiprobable.

Unlinkability: for any two outgoing transactions it is impossible to prove they were sent to the same person.

Unfortunately, Bitcoin does not satisfy the untraceability requirement. Since all the transactions that take place between the network's participants are public, any transaction can be unambiguously traced to a unique origin and final recipient. Even if two participants exchange funds in an indirect way, a properly engineered path-finding method will reveal the origin and final recipient.

It is also suspected that Bitcoin does not satisfy the second property. Some researchers stated ([33, 35, 29, 31]) that a careful blockchain analysis may reveal a connection between the users of the Bitcoin network and their transactions. Although a number of methods are disputed [25], it is suspected that a lot of hidden personal information can be extracted from the public database.

Bitcoin's failure to satisfy the two properties outlined above leads us to conclude that it is not an anonymous but a pseudo-anonymous electronic cash system. Users were quick to develop solutions to circumvent this shortcoming. Two direct solutions were "laundering services" [2] and the development of distributed methods [3, 4]. Both solutions are based on the idea of mixing several public transactions and sending them through some intermediary address; which in turn suffers the drawback of requiring a trusted third party.

Recently, a more creative scheme was proposed by I. Miers et al. [28]: "Zerocoin". Zerocoin utilizes a cryptographic one-way accumulators and zero-knoweldge proofs which permit users to "convert" bitcoins to zerocoins and spend them using anonymous proof of ownership instead of explicit public-key based digital signatures. However, such knowledge proofs have a constant but inconvenient size - about 30kb (based on today's Bitcoin limits), which makes the proposal impractical. Authors admit that the protocol is unlikely to ever be accepted by the majority of Bitcoin users [5].

2.2.2. The proof-of-work function

Bitcoin creator Satoshi Nakamoto described the majority decision making algorithm as "one-CPU-one-vote" and used a CPU-bound pricing function (double SHA-256) for his proof-of-work scheme. Since users vote for the single history of transactions order [1], the reasonableness and consistency of this process are critical conditions for the whole system.

The security of this model suffers from two drawbacks. First, it requires 51% of the network's mining power to be under the control of honest users. Secondly, the system's progress (bug fixes, security fixes, etc...) require the overwhelming majority of users to support and agree to the changes (this occurs when the users update their wallet software) [6].Finally this same voting mechanism is also used for collective polls about implementation of some features [7].

This permits us to conjecture the properties that must be satisfied by the proof-of-work pricing function. Such function must not enable a network participant to have a *significant* advantage over another participant; it requires a parity between common hardware and high cost of custom devices. From recent examples [8], we can see that the SHA-256 function used in the Bitcoin architecture does not posses this property as mining becomes more efficient on GPUs and ASIC devices when compared to high-end CPUs.

Therefore, Bitcoin creates favourable conditions for a large gap between the voting power of participants as it violates the "one-CPU-one-vote" principle since GPU and ASIC owners posses a much larger voting power when compared with CPU owners. It is a classical example of the Pareto principle where 20% of a system's participants control more than 80% of the votes.

One could argue that such inequality is not relevant to the network's security since it is not the small number of participants controlling the majority of the votes but the honesty of these participants that matters. However, such argument is somewhat flawed since it is rather the possibility of cheap specialized hardware appearing rather than the participants' honesty which poses a threat. To demonstrate this, let us take the following example. Suppose a malevolent individual gains significant mining power by creating his own mining farm through the cheap hardware described previously. Suppose that the global hashrate decreases significantly, even for a moment, he can now use his mining power to fork the chain and double-spend. As we shall see later in this article, it is not unlikely for the previously described event to take place.

2.2.3. Irregular emission

Bitcoin has a predetermined emission rate: each solved block produces a fixed amount of coins. Approximately every four years this reward is halved. The original intention was to create a limited smooth emission with exponential decay, but in fact we have a piecewise linear emission function whose breakpoints may cause problems to the Bitcoin infrastructure.

When the breakpoint occurs, miners start to receive only half of the value of their previous reward. The absolute difference between 12.5 and 6.25 BTC (projected for the year 2020) may seem tolerable. However, when examining the 50 to 25 BTC drop that took place on November 28 2012, felt inappropriate for a significant number of members of the mining community. Figure 1 shows a dramatic decrease in the network's hashrate in the end of November, exactly when the halving took place. This event could have been the perfect moment for the malevolent individual described in the proof-of-work function section to carry-out a double spending attack [36].




Fig. 1. Bitcoin hashrate chart
(source: http://bitcoin.sipa.be)

2.2.4. Hardcoded constants

Bitcoin has many hard-coded limits, where some are natural elements of the original design (e.g. block frequency, maximum amount of money supply, number of confirmations) whereas other seem to be artificial constraints. It is not so much the limits, as the inability of quickly changing them if necessary that causes the main drawbacks. Unfortunately, it is hard to predict when the constants may need to be changed and replacing them may lead to terrible consequences.

A good example of a hardcoded limit change leading to disastrous consequences is the block size limit set to 250kb[1]. This limit was sufficient to hold about 10000 standard transactions. In early 2013, this limit had almost been reached and an agreement was reached to increase the limit. The change was implemented in wallet version 0.8 and ended with a 24-blocks chain split and a successful double-spend attack [9]. While the bug was not in the Bitcoin protocol, but rather in the database engine it could have been easily caught by a simple stress test if there was no artificially introduced block size limit.

Constants also act as a form of centralization point. Despite the peer-to-peer nature of Bitcoin, an overwhelming majority of nodes use the official reference client [10] developed by a small group of people. This group makes the decision to implement changes to the protocol and most people accept these changes irrespective of their "correctness". Some decisions caused heated discussions and even calls for boycott [11], which indicates that the community and the developers may disagree on some important points. It therefore seems logical to have a protocol with user-configurable and self-adjusting variables as a possible way to avoid these problems.

2.2.5. Bulky scripts

The scripting system in Bitcoin is a heavy and complex feature. It *potentially* allows one to create sophisticated transactions [12], but some of its features are disabled due to security concerns and some have never even been used [13]. The script (including both senders' and receivers' parts) for the most popular transaction in Bitcoin looks like this:

```
<sig> <pubKey> OP DUP OP HASH160 <pubKeyHash> OP EQUALVERIFY OP CHECKSIG.
```

The script is 164 bytes long whereas its only purpose is to check if the receiver possess the secret key required to verify his signature.

2.3. The CryptoNote Technology

Now that we have covered the limitations of the Bitcoin technology, we will concentrate on presenting the features of CryptoNote.

2.4. Untraceable Transactions

In this section we propose a scheme of fully anonymous transactions satisfying both untraceability and unlinkability conditions. An important feature of our solution is its autonomy: the sender is not required to cooperate with other users or a trusted third party to make his transactions; hence each participant produces a cover traffic independently.

2.4.1. Literature review

Our scheme relies on the cryptographic primitive called a *group signature*. First presented by D. Chaum and E. van Heyst [19], it allows a user to sign his message on behalf of the group. After signing the message the user provides (for verification purposes) not his own single public key, but the keys of all the users of his group. A verifier is convinced that the real signer is a member of the group, but cannot exclusively identify the signer.

The original protocol required a trusted third party (called the Group Manager), and he was the only one who could trace the signer. The next version called a *ring signature*, introduced by Rivest et al. in [34], was an autonomous scheme without Group Manager and anonymity revocation. Various modifications of this scheme appeared later: *linkable ring signature* [26, 27, 17] allowed to determine if two signatures were produced by the same group member, *traceable ring signature* [24, 23] limited excessive anonymity by providing possibility to trace the signer of two messages with respect to the same metainformation (or "tag" in terms of [24]).

A similar cryptographic construction is also known as a *ad-hoc group signature* [16, 38]. It emphasizes the arbitrary group formation, whereas group/ring signature schemes rather imply a fixed set of members.

For the most part, our solution is based on the work "Traceable ring signature" by E. Fujisaki and K. Suzuki [24]. In order to distinguish the original algorithm and our modification we will call the latter a *one-time ring signature*, stressing the user's capability to produce only one valid signature under his private key. We weakened the traceability property and kept the linkability only to provide one-timeness: the public key may appear in many foreign verifying sets and the private key can be used for generating a unique anonymous signature. In case of a double spend attempt these two signatures will be linked together, but revealing the signer is not necessary for our purposes.

2.4.2. Definitions

2.4.2.1. Elliptic curve parameters

As our base signature algorithm we chose to use the fast scheme EdDSA, which is developed and implemented by D.J. Bernstein et al. [18]. Like Bitcoin's ECDSA it is based on the elliptic curve discrete logarithm problem, so our scheme could also be applied to Bitcoin in future.

Common parameters are:

q: a prime number; $q = 2^{255} - 19$;

d: an element of $\mathbb{F}_q$; $d = -121665/121666$;

E: an elliptic curve equation; $-x^2 + y^2 = 1 + dx^2y^2$;

G: a base point; $G = (x, -4/5)$;

l: a prime order of the base point; $l = 2^{252} + 27742317777372353535851937790883648493$;

$\mathcal{H}_s$: a cryptographic hash function $\{0,1\}^* \to \mathbb{F}_q$;

$\mathcal{H}_p$: a deterministic hash function $E(\mathbb{F}_q) \to E(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

2.4.2.2. Terminology

Enhanced privacy requires a new terminology which should not be confused with Bitcoin entities.

private ec-key is a standard elliptic curve private key: a number $a \in [1, l-1]$;

public ec-key is a standard elliptic curve public key: a point $A = aG$;

one-time keypair is a pair of private and public ec-keys;

private user key is a pair (a, b) of two different private ec-keys;

tracking key is a pair (a, B) of private and public ec-key (where $B = bG$ and $a \neq b$);

public user key is a pair (A, B) of two public ec-keys derived from (a, b);

standard address is a representation of a public user key given into human friendly string with error correction;

truncated address is a representation of the second half (point B) of a public user key given into human friendly string with error correction.

The transaction structure remains similar to the structure in Bitcoin: every user can choose several independent incoming payments (transactions outputs), sign them with the corresponding private keys and send them to different destinations.

Contrary to Bitcoin's model, where a user possesses unique private and public key, in the proposed model a sender generates a one-time public key based on the recipient's address and some random data. In this sense, an incoming transaction for the same recipient is sent to a one-time public key (not directly to a unique address) and only the recipient can recover the corresponding private part to redeem his funds (using his unique private key). The recipient can spend the funds using a ring signature, keeping his ownership and actual spending anonymous. The details of the protocol are explained in the next subsections.

2.4.3. Unlinkable payments

Classic Bitcoin addresses, once being published, become unambiguous identifier for incoming payments, linking them together and tying to the recipient's pseudonyms. If someone wants to receive an "untied" transaction, he should convey his address to the sender by a private channel. If he wants to receive different transactions which cannot be proven to belong to the same owner he should generate all the different addresses and never publish them in his own pseudonym.




Fig. 2. Traditional Bitcoin keys/transactions model.

We propose a solution allowing a user to publish **a single address** and receive unconditional unlinkable payments. The destination of each CryptoNote output (by default) is a public key, derived from recipient's address and sender's random data. The main advantage against Bitcoin is that every destination key is unique by default (unless the sender uses the same data for each of his transactions to the same recipient). Hence, there is no such issue as "address reuse" by design and no observer can determine if any transactions were sent to a specific address or link two addresses together.




Fig. 3. CryptoNote keys/transactions model.

First, the sender performs a Diffie-Hellman exchange to get a shared secret from his data and half of the recipient's address. Then he computes a one-time destination key, using the shared secret and the second half of the address. Two different ec-keys are required from the recipient for these two steps, so a standard CryptoNote address is nearly twice as large as a Bitcoin wallet address. The receiver also performs a Diffie-Hellman exchange to recover the corresponding secret key.

A standard transaction sequence goes as follows:

1. Alice wants to send a payment to Bob, who has published his standard address. She unpacks the address and gets Bob's public key (A, B).

2. Alice generates a random $r \in [1, l-1]$ and computes a one-time public key $P = \mathcal{H}_s(rA)G + B$.

3. Alice uses P as a destination key for the output and also packs value $R = rG$ (as a part of the Diffie-Hellman exchange) somewhere into the transaction. Note that she can create other outputs with unique public keys: different recipients' keys (A_i, B_i) imply different P_i even with the same r.




Fig. 4. Standard transaction structure.

4. Alice sends the transaction.

5. Bob checks every passing transaction with his private key (a, b), and computes $P' = \mathcal{H}_s(aR)G + B$. If Alice's transaction for with Bob as the recipient was among them, then $aR = arG = rA$ and $P' = P$.

6. Bob can recover the corresponding one-time private key: $x = \mathcal{H}_s(aR) + b$, so as $P = xG$. He can spend this output at any time by signing a transaction with x.




Fig. 5. Incoming transaction check.

As a result Bob gets incoming payments, associated with one-time public keys which are **unlinkable** for a spectator. Some additional notes:

- When Bob "recognizes" his transactions (see step 5) he practically uses only half of his private information: (a, B). This pair, also known as the **tracking key**, can be passed to a third party (Carol). Bob can delegate her the processing of new transactions. Bob doesn't need to explicitly trust Carol, because she can't recover the one-time secret key p without Bob's full private key (a, b). This approach is useful when Bob lacks bandwidth or computation power (smartphones, hardware wallets etc.).
- In case Alice wants to prove she sent a transaction to Bob's address she can either disclose r or use any kind of zero-knowledge protocol to prove she knows r (for example by signing the transaction with r).
- If Bob wants to have an audit compatible address where all incoming transaction are linkable, he can either publish his tracking key or use a **truncated address**. That address represent only one public ec-key B, and the remaining part required by the protocol is derived from it as follows: $a = \mathcal{H}_s(B)$ and $A = \mathcal{H}_s(B)G$. In both cases every person is able to "recognize" all of Bob's incoming transaction, but, of course, none can spend the funds enclosed within them without the secret key b.

2.4.4. One-time ring signatures

A protocol based on one-time ring signatures allows users to achieve unconditional unlinkability. Unfortunately, ordinary types of cryptographic signatures permit to trace transactions to their respective senders and receivers. Our solution to this deficiency lies in using a different signature type than those currently used in electronic cash systems.

We will first provide a general description of our algorithm with no explicit reference to electronic cash.

A one-time ring signature contains four algorithms: (**GEN**, **SIG**, **VER**, **LNK**):

GEN: takes public parameters and outputs an ec-pair (P, x) and a public key I.

SIG: takes a message m, a set $\mathcal{S}'$ of public keys $\{P_i\}_{i \neq s}$, a pair (P_s, x_s) and outputs a signature σ and a set $\mathcal{S} = S' \cup \{P_s\}$.

VER: takes a message m, a set $\mathcal{S}$, a signature σ and outputs "true" or "false".

LNK: takes a set $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}$, a signature σ and outputs "linked" or "indep".

The idea behind the protocol is fairly simple: a user produces a signature which can be checked by a set of public keys rather than a unique public key. The identity of the signer is indistinguishable from the other users whose public keys are in the set until the owner produces a second signature using the same keypair.




Fig. 6. Ring signature anonymity.

GEN: The signer picks a random secret key $x \in [1, l-1]$ and computes the corresponding public key $P = xG$. Additionally he computes another public key $I = x\mathcal{H}_p(P)$ which we will call the "key image".

SIG: The signer generates a one-time ring signature with a non-interactive zero-knowledge proof using the techniques from [21]. He selects a random subset $\mathcal{S}'$ of n from the other users' public keys P_i, his own keypair (x, P) and key image I. Let $0 \le s \le n$ be signer's secret index in $\mathcal{S}$ (so that his public key is P_s).

He picks a random $\{q_i \mid i = 0 \dots n\}$ and $\{w_i \mid i = 0 \dots n, i \neq s\}$ from $(1 \dots l)$ and applies the following *transformations*:

$$L_i = \begin{cases} q_i G, & \text{if } i = s \\ q_i G + w_i P_i, & \text{if } i \neq s \end{cases}$$

$$R_i = \begin{cases} q_i \mathcal{H}_p(P_i), & \text{if } i = s \\ q_i \mathcal{H}_p(P_i) + w_i I, & \text{if } i \neq s \end{cases}$$

The next step is getting the non-interactive *challenge*:

$$c = \mathcal{H}_s(m, L_1, \dots, L_n, R_1, \dots, R_n)$$

Finally the signer computes the *response*:

$$c_i = \begin{cases} w_i, & \text{if } i \neq s \\ c - \sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i \mod l, & \text{if } i = s \end{cases}$$

$$r_i = \begin{cases} q_i, & \text{if } i \neq s \\ q_s - c_s x \mod l, & \text{if } i = s \end{cases}$$

The resulting signature is $\sigma = (I, c_1, \dots, c_n, r_1, \dots, r_n)$.

VER: The verifier checks the signature by applying the inverse transformations:

$$\begin{cases} L'_i = r_i G + c_i P_i \\ R'_i = r_i \mathcal{H}_p(P_i) + c_i I \end{cases}$$

Finally, the verifier checks if $\sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i \stackrel{?}{=} \mathcal{H}_s(m, L'_0, \ldots, L'_n, R'_0, \ldots, R'_n) \mod l$

If this equality is correct, the verifier runs the algorithm **LNK**. Otherwise the verifier rejects the signature.

LNK: The verifier checks if I has been used in past signatures (these values are stored in the set $\mathcal{I}$). Multiple uses imply that two signatures were produced under the same secret key.

The meaning of the protocol: by applying L-transformations the signer proves that he knows such x that at least one $P_i = xG$. To make this proof non-repeatable we introduce the key image as $I = x\mathcal{H}_p(P)$. The signer uses the same coefficients (r_i, c_i) to prove almost the same statement: he knows such x that at least one $\mathcal{H}_p(P_i) = I \cdot x^{-1}$.

If the mapping $x \to I$ is an injection:

1. Nobody can recover the public key from the key image and identify the signer;
2. The signer cannot make two signatures with different I's and the same x.

A full security analysis is provided in Appendix A.

2.4.5. Standard CryptoNote transaction

By combining both methods (unlinkable public keys and untraceable ring signature) Bob achieves new level of privacy in comparison with the original Bitcoin scheme. It requires him to store only one private key (a, b) and publish (A, B) to start receiving and sending anonymous transactions.

While validating each transaction Bob additionally performs only two elliptic curve multiplications and one addition per output to check if a transaction belongs to him. For his every output Bob recovers a one-time keypair (p_i, P_i) and stores it in his wallet. Any inputs can be *circumstantially proved* to have the same owner only if they appear in a single transaction. In fact this relationship is much harder to establish due to the one-time ring signature.

With a ring signature Bob can effectively hide every input among somebody else's; all possible spenders will be equiprobable, even the previous owner (Alice) has no more information than any observer.

When signing his transaction Bob specifies n foreign outputs with the same amount as his output, mixing all of them without the participation of other users. Bob himself (as well as anybody else) does not know if any of these payments have been spent: an output can be used in thousands of signatures as an ambiguity factor and never as a target of hiding. The double spend check occurs in the **LNK** phase when checking against the used key images set.

Bob can choose the ambiguity degree on his own: $n = 1$ means that the probability he has spent the output is 50% probability, $n = 99$ gives 1%. The size of the resulting signature increases linearly as $O(n+1)$, so the improved anonymity costs to Bob extra transaction fees. He also can set $n = 0$ and make his ring signature to consist of only one element, however this will instantly reveal him as a spender.




Fig. 7. Ring signature generation in a standard transaction.

2.5. Egalitarian Proof-of-work

In this section we propose and ground the new proof-of-work algorithm. Our primary goal is to close the gap between CPU (majority) and GPU/FPGA/ASIC (minority) miners. It is appropriate that some users can have a certain advantage over others, but their investments should grow at least linearly with the power. More generally, producing special-purpose devices has to be as less profitable as possible.

2.5.1. Related works

The original Bitcoin proof-of-work protocol uses the CPU-intensive pricing function SHA-256. It mainly consists of basic logical operators and relies solely on the computational speed of processor, therefore is perfectly suitable for multicore/conveyer implementation.

However, modern computers are not limited by the number of operations per second alone, but also by memory size. While some processors can be substantially faster than others [8], memory sizes are less likely to vary between machines.

Memory-bound price functions were first introduced by Abadi et al and were defined as "functions whose computation time is dominated by the time spent accessing memory" [15]. The main idea is to construct an algorithm allocating a large block of data ("scratchpad") within memory that can be accessed relatively slowly (for example, RAM) and "accessing an unpredictable sequence of locations" within it. A block should be large enough to make preserving the data more advantageous than recomputing it for each access. The algorithm also should prevent internal parallelism, hence N simultaneous threads should require N times more memory at once.

Dwork et al [22] investigated and formalized this approach leading them to suggest another variant of the pricing function: "Mbound". One more work belongs to F. Coelho [20], who proposed the most effective solution: "Hokkaido".

To our knowledge the last work based on the idea of pseudo-random searches in a big array is the algorithm known as "scrypt" by C. Percival [32]. Unlike the previous functions it focuses on key derivation, and not proof-of-work systems. Despite this fact scrypt can serve our purpose: it works well as a pricing function in the partial hash conversion problem such as SHA-256 in Bitcoin.

By now scrypt has already been applied in Litecoin [14] and some other Bitcoin forks. However, its implementation is not really memory-bound: the ratio "memory access time / overall time" is not large enough because each instance uses only 128 KB. This permits GPU miners to be roughly 10 times more effective and continues to leave the possibility of creating relatively cheap but highly-efficient mining devices.

Moreover, the scrypt construction itself allows a *linear* trade-off between memory size and CPU speed due to the fact that every block in the scratchpad is derived only from the previous. For example, you can store every second block and recalculate the others in a lazy way, i.e. only when it becomes necessary. The pseudo-random indexes are assumed to be uniformly distributed, hence the expected value of the *additional* blocks' recalculations is $\frac{1}{2} \cdot N$, where N is the number of iterations. The overall computation time increases less than by half because there are also time independent (constant time) operations such as preparing the scratchpad and hashing on every iteration. Saving $^2/_3$ of the memory costs $\frac{1}{3} \cdot N + \frac{1}{3} \cdot 2 \cdot N = N$ additional recalculations; $^9/_{10}$ results in $\frac{1}{10} \cdot N + \ldots + \frac{1}{10} \cdot 9 \cdot N = 4.5N$. It is easy to show that storing only $\frac{1}{s}$ of all blocks increases the time less than by a factor of $\frac{s-1}{2}$. This in turn implies that a machine with a CPU 200 times faster than the modern chips can store only 320 bytes of the scratchpad.

2.5.2. The proposed algorithm

We propose a new memory-bound algorithm for the proof-of-work pricing function. It relies on random access to a slow memory and emphasizes latency dependence. As opposed to scrypt every new block (64 bytes in length) depends on *all* the previous blocks. As a result a hypothetical "memory-saver" should increase his calculation speed exponentially.

Our algorithm requires about 2 Mb per instance for the following reasons:

1. It fits in the L3 cache (per core) of modern processors, which should become mainstream in a few years;

2. A megabyte of internal memory is an almost unacceptable size for a modern ASIC pipeline;

3. GPUs may run hundreds of concurrent instances, but they are limited in other ways: GDDR5 memory is slower than the CPU L3 cache and remarkable for its bandwidth, not random access speed.

4. Significant expansion of the scratchpad would require an increase in iterations, which in turn implies an overall time increase. "Heavy" calls in a trust-less p2p network may lead to serious vulnerabilities, because nodes are obliged to check every new block's proof-of-work. If a node spends a considerable amount of time on each hash evaluation, it can be easily DDoSed by a flood of fake objects with arbitrary work data (nonce values).

2.6. Further advantages

2.6.1. Smooth emission

The upper bound for the overall amount of CryptoNote digital coins is: $\texttt{MSupply} = 2^{64} - 1$ atomic units. This is a natural restriction based only on implementation limits, not on intuition such as "N coins ought to be enough for anybody".

To ensure the smoothness of the emission process we use the following formula for block rewards:

$$BaseReward = (\texttt{MSupply} - A) \gg 18,$$

where A is amount of previously generated coins.

2.6.2. Adjustable parameters

2.6.2.1. Difficulty

CryptoNote contains a targeting algorithm which changes the difficulty of every block. This decreases the system's reaction time when the network hashrate is intensely growing or shrinking, preserving a constant block rate. The original Bitcoin method calculates the relation of actual and target time-span between the last 2016 blocks and uses it as the multiplier for the current difficulty. Obviously this is unsuitable for rapid recalculations (because of large inertia) and results in oscillations.

The general idea behind our algorithm is to sum all the work completed by the nodes and divide it by the time they have spent. The measure of work is the corresponding difficulty values in each block. But due to inaccurate and untrusted timestamps we cannot determine the exact time interval between blocks. A user can shift his timestamp into the future and the next time intervals might be improbably small or even negative. Presumably there will be few incidents of this kind, so we can just sort the timestamps and cut-off the outliers (i.e. 20%). The range of the rest values is the time which was spent for 80% of the corresponding blocks.

2.6.2.2. Size limits

Users pay for storing the blockchain and shall be entitled to vote for its size. Every miner deals with the trade-off between balancing the costs and profit from the fees and sets his own "soft-limit" for creating blocks. Also the core rule for the maximum block size is necessary for preventing the blockchain from being flooded with bogus transaction, however this value should not be hard-coded.

Let M_N be the median value of the last N blocks sizes. Then the "hard-limit" for the size of accepting blocks is $2 \cdot M_N$. It averts the blockchain from bloating but still allows the limit to slowly grow with time if necessary.

Transaction size does not need to be limited explicitly. It is bounded by the size of a block; and if somebody wants to create a huge transaction with hundreds of inputs/outputs (or with the high ambiguity degree in ring signatures), he can do so by paying sufficient fee.

2.6.2.3. Excess size penalty

A miner still has the ability to stuff a block full of his own zero-fee transactions up to its maximum size $2 \cdot M_b$. Even though only the majority of miners can shift the median value, there is still a possibility to bloat the blockchain and produce an additional load on the nodes. To discourage malevolent participants from creating large blocks we introduce a penalty function:

$$NewReward = BaseReward \cdot \left(\frac{BlkSize}{M_N} - 1 \right)^2$$

This rule is applied only when *BlkSize* is greater than minimal free block size which should be close to $\texttt{max}(10\text{kb}, M_N \cdot 110\%)$. Miners are permitted to create blocks of "usual size" and even exceed it with profit when the overall fees surpass the penalty. But fees are unlikely to grow quadratically unlike the penalty value so there will be an equilibrium.

2.6.3. Transaction scripts

CryptoNote has a very minimalistic scripting subsystem. A sender specifies an expression $\Phi = f(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$, where n is the number of destination public keys $\{P_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Only five binary operators are supported: `min`, `max`, `sum`, `mul` and `cmp`. When the receiver spends this payment, he produces $0 \leq k \leq n$ signatures and passes them to transaction input. The verification process simply evaluates Φ with $x_i = 1$ to check for a valid signature for the public key P_i, and $x_i = 0$. A verifier accepts the proof iff $\Phi > 0$.

Despite its simplicity this approach covers every possible case:

- **Multi-/Threshold signature.** For the Bitcoin-style "M-out-of-N" multi-signature (i.e. the receiver should provide at least $0 \leq M \leq N$ valid signatures) $\Phi = x_1 + x_2 + \ldots + x_N \geq M$ (for clarity we are using common algebraic notation). The weighted threshold signature (some keys can be more important than other) could be expressed as $\Phi = w_1 \cdot x_1 + w_2 \cdot x_2 + \ldots + w_N \cdot x_N \geq w_M$. And scenario where the master-key corresponds to $\Phi = \texttt{max}(M \cdot x, x_1 + x_2 + \ldots + x_N) \geq M$. It is easy to show that any sophisticated case can be expressed with these operators, i.e. they form basis.

- **Password protection.** Possession of a secret password s is equivalent to the knowledge of a private key, deterministically derived from the password: $k = \texttt{KDF}(s)$. Hence, a receiver can prove that he knows the password by providing another signature under the key k. The sender simply adds the corresponding public key to his own output. Note that this method is much more secure than the "transaction puzzle" used in Bitcoin [13], where the password is explicitly passed in the inputs.

- **Degenerate cases.** $\Phi = 1$ means that anybody can spend the money; $\Phi = 0$ marks the output as not spendable forever.

In the case when the output script combined with public keys is too large for a sender, he can use special output type, which indicates that the recipient will put this data in his input while the sender provides only a hash of it. This approach is similar to Bitcoin's "pay-to-hash" feature, but instead of adding new script commands we handle this case at the data structure level.

2.7. Conclusion

We have investigated the major flaws in Bitcoin and proposed some possible solutions. These advantageous features and our ongoing development make new electronic cash system CryptoNote a serious rival to Bitcoin, outclassing all its forks.

Nobel prize laureate Friedrich Hayek in his famous work proves that the existence of concurrent independent currencies has a huge positive effect. Each currency issuer (or developer in our case) is trying to attract users by improving his product. Currency is like a commodity: it can have unique benefits and shortcomings and the most convenient and trusted currency has the greatest demand. Suppose we had a currency excelling Bitcoin: it means that Bitcoin would develop faster and become better. The biggest support as an open source project would come from its own users, who are interested in it.

We do not consider CryptoNote as a full replacement to Bitcoin. On the contrary, having two (or more) strong and convenient currencies is better than having just one. Running two and more different projects in parallel is the natural flow of electronic cash economics.

A Security

We shall give a proof for our one-time ring signature scheme. At some point it coincides with the parts of the proof in [24], but we decided to rewrite them with a reference rather than to force a reader to rush about from one paper to another.

These are the properties to be established:

- **Linkability.** Given all the secret keys $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ for a set $\mathcal{S}$ it is impossible to produce $n+1$ valid signatures $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_{n+1}$, such that all of them pass the **LNK** phase (i.e. with $n+1$ different key images I_i). This property implies the double spending protection in the context of CryptoNote.

- **Exculpability.** Given set $\mathcal{S}$, at most $n-1$ corresponding private keys x_i (excluding $i=j$) and the image I_j of the keys x_j it is impossible to produce a valid signature σ with I_j. This property implies theft protection in the context of CryptoNote.

- **Unforgeability.** Given only a public keys set $\mathcal{S}$ it is impossible to produce a valid signature σ.

- **Anonymity.** Given a signature σ and the corresponding set $\mathcal{S}$ it is impossible to determine the secret index j of the signer with a probability $p > \frac{1}{n}$.

Linkability

Theorem 1. *Our one-time ring signature scheme is linkable under the random oracle model.*

Proof. Suppose an adversary can produce $n+1$ valid signatures σ_i with key images $I_i \neq I_j$ for any $i, j \in [1 \dots n]$. Since $\#\mathcal{S} = n$, at least one $I_i \neq x_i \mathcal{H}_p(P_i)$ for every i. Consider the corresponding signature $\sigma = (I, c_1, \dots, c_n, r_1, \dots, r_n)$. $\mathbf{VER}(\sigma) =$ "true", this means that

$$\begin{cases} L'_i = r_i G + c_i P_i \\ R'_i = r_i \mathcal{H}_p(P_i) + c_i I \\ \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} c_i = \mathcal{H}_s(m, L'_1, \dots, L'_n, R'_1, \dots, R'_n) \mod l \end{cases}$$

The first two equalities imply

$$\begin{cases} \log_G L'_i = r_i + c_i x_i \\ \log_{\mathcal{H}_p(P_i)} R'_i = r_i + c_i \log_{H_p(P_i)} I \end{cases}$$

where $\log_A B$ informally denotes the discrete logarithm of B to the base A.

As in [24] we note that $\nexists i : x_i = \log_{\mathcal{H}_p(P_i)} I$ implies that all c_i's are uniquely determined. The third equality forces the adversary to find a pre-image of $\mathcal{H}_s$ to succeed in the attack, an event whose probability is considered to be negligible. □

Exculpability

Theorem 2. *Our one-time ring signature scheme is exculpable under the discrete logarithm assumption in the random oracle model.*

Proof. Suppose an adversary can produce a valid signature $\sigma = (I, c_1, \dots, c_n, r_1, \dots, r_n)$ with $I = x_j \mathcal{H}_P(P_j)$ with given $\{x_i \mid i = 1, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, n\}$. Then, we can construct an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ which solves the discrete logarithm problem in $E(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

Suppose $\mathrm{inst} = (G, P) \in E(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is a given instance of the DLP and the goal is to get s, such that $P = sG$. Using the standard technique (as in [24]), $\mathcal{A}$ simulates the random and signing oracles and makes the adversary produce two valid signatures with $P_j = P$ in the set $\mathcal{S}$: $\sigma = (I, c_1, \dots, c_n, r_1, \dots, r_n)$ and $\sigma' = (I, c'_1, \dots, c'_n, r'_1, \dots, r'_n)$.

Since $I = x_j \mathcal{H}_p(P_j)$ in both signatures we compute $x_j = \log_{\mathcal{H}_p(P_j)} I = \frac{r_j - r'_j}{c'_j - c_j} \mod l$

$\mathcal{A}$ outputs x_j because $L_j = r_j G + c_j P_j = r'_j G + c'_j P_j$ and $P_j = P$. □

Unforgeability

It has been shown in [24] that unforgeability is just an implication of both linkability and exculpability.

Theorem 3. *If a one-time ring signature scheme is linkable and exculpable, then it is unforgeable.*

Proof. Suppose an adversary can forge a signature for a given set $\mathcal{S}$: $\sigma_0 = (I_0, \dots)$. Consider all valid signatures (produced by the honest signers) for the same message m and the set $\mathcal{S}$: $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n$. There are two possible cases:

1. $I_0 \in \{I_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Which contradicts exculpability.
2. $I_0 \notin \{I_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Which contradicts linkability. □

Anonymity

Theorem 4. *Our one-time ring signature scheme is anonymous under the decisional Diffie-Hellman assumption in the random oracle model.*

Proof. Suppose an adversary can determine the secret index j of the Signer with a probability $p = \frac{1}{n} + \epsilon$. Then, we can construct algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ which solves the decisional Diffie-Hellman problem in $E(\mathbb{F}_q)$ with the probability $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Let inst $= (G_1, G2, Q_1, Q_2) \in E(\mathbb{F}_q)$ be the instance of DDH and the goal to determine if $\log_{G_1} Q_1 = \log_{G_2} Q_2$. $\mathcal{A}$ feeds the adversary with valid signature $\sigma_0 = (I, \ldots)$, where $P_j = x_j G_1 = Q_1$ and $I = Q_2$ and simulates oracle $\mathcal{H}_p$, returning G_2 for query $\mathcal{H}_p(P_j)$.

The adversary returns k as his guess for the index i: $I = x_i \mathcal{H}_P(P_i)$. If $k = j$, then $\mathcal{A}$ returns 1 (for "yes") otherwise a random $r \in \{1, 0\}$. The probability of the right choice is computed as in [24]: $\frac{1}{2} + \Pr(1 \mid \text{inst} \in DDH) - \Pr(1 \mid \text{inst} \notin DDH) = \frac{1}{2} + \Pr(k = j \mid \text{inst} \in DDH) + \Pr(k \neq j \mid \text{inst} \in DDH) \cdot \Pr(r = 1) - \Pr(k = j \mid \text{inst} \notin DDH) - \Pr(k \neq j \mid \text{inst} \notin DDH) \cdot \Pr(r = 0) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n} + \epsilon + (\frac{n-1}{n} - \epsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$

In fact, the result should be reduced by the probability of collision in $\mathcal{H}_s$, but this value is considered to be negligible. □

Notes on the hash function $\mathcal{H}_p$

We defined $\mathcal{H}_p$ as deterministic hash function $E(\mathbb{F}_q) \to E(\mathbb{F}_q)$. None of the proofs demands $\mathcal{H}_p$ to be an ideal cryptographic hash function. It's main purpose is to get a pseudo-random base for image key $I = x\mathcal{H}_p(xG)$ in some determined way.

With fixed base ($I = xG_2$) the following scenario is possible:

3. Purpose of PPP(Purchase and Payment Plus) COIN Development

The purpose of PPP coin development is not just to develop and distribute another new coin product like many other coins in the market, but to implement a practical P2P platform for the PPP coin system that can perform good functions with values as a currency.

Through this, it is intended to grant convenience, safety, and stable value to more people by maximizing the advantages of cryptocurrency which an electronic currency has and strengthening more efficient technologies.

One step further, it aims to maximize the advantages of PPP that are based on the Ethereum blockchain and unify the PPP by applying an integrated P2P system platform. In addition, it also aims to equip the integrated security P2P system platform to freely utilize and use as well as stably manage the private assets of individuals and corporates. By accomplishing these objectives, it is intended to contribute to protecting the assets that each individual owns and reorganizing the chaos of the currency market.

We can hardly find coins that are actually being used compared to many numbers of coins that have been currently saturated by being stretched out tremendously. This may be because the purpose of coin production is oriented more toward adverse functions for speculation than toward good functions as a currency. If a coin fails to achieve the good functions that it must be equipped as a coin, it should be noted that the coin may not only negatively affect currency development in the future, but also cause only many problems such as enormous financial damages to the entire society that has the same goals as well as lose even the value of labor and lead to a sense of deprivation against a value.

4. Issuance and Mining of Coins

PPP Coin, which is an issued coin, was created by initial issuance, and coins can be paid immediately when a buyer purchases the issued coin.

The dApp architecture of the PPP COIN allows the COIN administration entity to have no trust or a minimum trust, and was designed to have transparent operational principles and facilitate the implementation of rules, as well as to fit into the security improvement and privacy protection. It also enables to maximize the utilization of resources already invested and to have the strength of being easy for global services that are beyond the regulations of each nation. In particular, it has the greatest advantage in resolving the issue of monopolization of services (profit) of minority corporations.

PPP Coin can be conveniently available after creating a sign with a QR code or barcode generator using dApp. PPP Coin is based on a blockchain and has its own main network. It also issues coins collectively and constructs the issued PPP Coin based on various airdrop systems, thereby creating and proceeding an environment for reduction to society in the following way.

1) Key Coin of Nossdaq Exchange

2) Activation of transactions with screened products through shopping malls [Transaction coin within the shopping mall]

3) Pay in coins according to the transaction volume during commercial transactions [Transaction mining]

4) Interest income by entrusting individual coins to the company [Interest mining]

5) Activation of coin transactions between individuals [P2P transactions]

6) Coin for transaction and distribution within a specialized complex [Tourist Coin]

7) Support for various coin mining businesses as a company specialized in coins [Mining of various coins]

8) Continuous updates of various content [Content Enhancement]

5. Increase in the Value of PPP Coin

In the case of purchasing the previously issued PPP Coins from the developing entity or acquiring coins through various airdrops, the PPP Coin is expected to have the following values.

First, Technological future value based on the security technology of blockchain

Second, the value improvement of PPP coins is expected to continue depending on the scarcity of PPP Coins that are produced and issued, the expandability through activation measures using shopping malls, P2P transactions, and member stores, and the characteristics through security solutions according to its expansion. In addition, the company will manage and supplement the values of the coins at a policy level and ensure continuous support for the coin owners to obtain stable returns in the long run.

Third, PPP Coin will be the key coin and a representative coin of all listed coins of the Nossdaq Exchange.

Another aspect of improving the value of PPP Coins is their marketability. The growth of users who use PPP Coins soon entails a contribution to the improvement of coin value. In

this context, it is thought that the marketability of PPP Coins will have a significant impact on the value improvement of PPP Coins, which is optimized to infrastructure configurations operated through the integrated membership solution.

6. Proposal for PPP Coin

The approach strategy of PPP Coin is to apply a domain-specific language that can be not only easily read by ordinary users but also mathematically proved whether it is computationally determined according to the implementation mechanism.

Therefore, we aim to develop a standard platform for the technology-based cryptocurrency that is secure and convenient through PPP Coin.

In addition, we also intend to address the commonly recurred issues related to cryptocurrency through PPP Coin. In the case of PPP Coin, the development has been focused on the standardization in technology and security that could be used to improve the entire ecosystem of the coin domain through these proposals.

In the ecosystem of cryptocurrency, most cases tend to be a hotbed of speculation due to the limited places to be used as a decentralized currency.

We attempt an essential approach to the value of a currency and think of the value of a currency as realistically and practically associated characteristics about how valuably the currencies are being used. Thus, the PPP Coin development team will continue to release applications that use PPP Coins so that they can be applied to various domains.

The newly developed application will not only increase the transaction value of coins but also help PPP Coin users secure a position of real-life coins that can be used to purchase products and transactions between parties.

7. Coin Issuance

PPP Coin plans to issue a total of 7.7 billion coins. The PPP Coin team aims to overcome various technical and operational problems that might be inherent in cryptocurrency.

The incentive system and issuance plan aim not only to suppress the centralization of power but also to create the value of coins.

The PPP Coin team aims to achieve the above objectives while creating a standard for safe and convenient cryptocurrency that can be secured through blockchain technology.

8. Asset Inspection

PPP Coin will become the new cryptocurrency based on blockchain technology in the digital marketing domain as well as in top-tier exchanges and shopping malls over the world. PPP Coin is not only an exciting reward system that provides rewards through active users, advanced matching, multilingual support, and decentralization but also the first genuine global service platform that combines open meritocracy with virtual currency.

9. Coin Transactions and Refunds

PPP Coin is not a security, a stock, or any profit-sharing mechanism. The participants in the coin transactions should understand the risk factors involved when purchasing coins and read the entire PPP Coin white paper prior to participating in the transactions. Once an individual or an entity participates in coin transactions, all parties are subject to the terms and conditions related to transactions and purchases of the PPP Coins.

Technical Risks

The PPP Coin contract is based on the CryptoNote standard. We prepared Mainnet 1.0 with every effort in order to ensure that no technical error is involved in the contract. Participants should be familiar with blockchain technology to understand the risks associated with storing and transmitting private keys.

Hacker and Criminal Intervention

The PPP Coin contract address is provided through <http://www.PnPPcoin.com>. According to the records thus far, there have been criminal attempts to take over the control of computers and e-mail servers to trick people into sending money to the wrong addresses. Social engineering might be involved here. PPP Coin has implemented all best practices for security measures to prevent potential attacks. Nevertheless, participants must make every reasonable effort to handle the accurate contract address and comply with all guidelines of PPP Coin. Participants should not use any externally posted contract address other than http://www.PnPPcoin.com because it may cause fraud in pretending to represent PPP Coin. Participants must follow all best practices for security as per the directives from PPP Coin.

Risk Factors associated with Taxes and Regulatory Aspects

Participants of the coin transactions must conduct self-inspection to ensure compliance with all local laws relating to taxes, securities, and other regulations of cryptocurrencies in their jurisdiction. PPP Coin transactions may be subject to additional regulation in the future.

Refund

No refund will be available. Once a transaction is completed, no cancellation is allowed.