This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

IEEE Access
Multidisciplinary | Rapid Review | Open Access Journal

Date of publication xxxx 00, 0000, date of current version xxxx 00, 0000.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/ACCESS.2017.Doi Number

Blockchain-Based Energy Applications: The DSO Perspective

Ahmet Yagmur[1], Beyhan Adanur Dedeturk[2], Ahmet Soran[2], Jaesung Jung[3,*], Ahmet Onen[4]
[1] Electrical-Computer Engineering, Abdullah Gul University, 38080, Kayseri, Turkey
[2] Computer Engineering, Abdullah Gul University, 38080, Kayseri, Turkey
[3] Department of Energy Systems Research, Ajou University, Suwon, South Korea
[4] Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, College of Engineering, Sultan Qaboos University, Al-Khoud, Muscat,123, Oman

Corresponding author: Jaesung Jung (e-mail: jjung@ajou.ac.kr).

This work was supported by the Korea Institute of Energy Technology Evaluation and Planning (KETEP) and the Ministry of Trade, Industry & Energy (MOTIE) of the Republic of Korea (No. 20191210301820).
This work was supported by "Human Resources Program in Energy Technology" of the Korea Institute of Energy Technology Evaluation and Planning (KETEP), granted financial resource from the Ministry of Trade, Industry & Energy, Republic of Korea. (No. 20194030202370).

ABSTRACT This paper discusses blockchain-based energy applications from the distribution system operator (DSO) perspective. Blockchain has a potential impact on newly emergent actors, such as electric vehicles (EVs) and charging facility units (CFUs) of the electricity grid. Although Blockchain offers magnificent decentralized solutions, owing to the reality of the existing grid structure, the central management of DSOs still plays a significant, non-negligible role. Numerous studies of proposed blockchain-based EV systems have investigated the energy costs of EVs, fast and efficient charging, privacy and security, P2P energy trading, sharing economy, selection of appropriate CFUs location, and scheduling. However, cooperation with DSO organizations has not been adequately addressed. Blockchain-based solutions mainly suggest an entirely distributed and decentralized approach for energy trading; however, converting the entire power system infrastructure is considerably expensive. Building a thoroughly decentralized electricity network is nearly impossible in a short time, particularly at the national grid level. In this regard, the applicability of the solutions is as significant as their appropriateness, especially from the DSO perspective, and must be examined closely. We searched and analyzed the blockchain literature related to EVs, CFUs, DERs, microgrids, marketing, and DSOs to define the DSO-based requirements for potential blockchain applications in the energy sector, specifically EV evolution.

INDEX TERMS AMI, Blockchain in Energy, DERs, DSO blockchain, EVs, Market, Microgrid, SCADA

I. INTRODUCTION

The smart grid (SG) in the context of an electricity grid is one in which all parties act to reach the general aim of a sustainable, economical, and secure electricity supply environment [1-2]. The term "smart grid" includes various grid operations and energy measurement and control units such as smart meters, circuit breakers, load control switches, and other smart appliances. Increments in the usage of EVs, global orientation to low carbon energy solutions (RESs), and the tendency of sustainable DERs have made SG control and management methods more difficult and complicated than ever. Electricity is a commodity that every user consumes or produces continuously and has the same energy measurement and control methods in different fields. Energy in various areas creates a significant requirement for common agreement on solutions for similar problems. However, electricity usage related to a wide range of sectors has joint tenancy features, and every part of the system affects other parts positively or negatively. Nevertheless, the value of the traded energy and number of grid participants have increased rapidly, and all these changes have created an urgent need for cyber security and greater grid stability. The more intelligent and self-sufficient the grid becomes, the more robust and sustainable it is. Additionally, the natural development and transformation process of grid technologies have resulted in a grid system that is more decentralized every year. Blockchain is one of the most promising solutions for these issues; in terms of realizing SG requirements, it will most likely conquer the entire power grid and make itself a significant part of our daily electric usage routine. In the literature, the distributed structure of blockchain and energy [3-5], particularly distributed energy resources (DERs), electric vehicles (EVs), smart meters, supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA), marketing operations, and microgrids, as well as possible BC solutions have been discussed in detail [6]. BC technology seems relatively mature in the cryptocurrency area but is immature in the energy sector [7]. Local projects of energy blockchain and research on examples focused on one field have been

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

commonly studied, particularly in recent years. Security, privacy concerns, and a wide range of potential aspects of energy blockchain applications on grids, the existence of distributed energy users, and possible local markets in the future seem appropriate for the BC era. However, an essential part of the SG—the distribution system operator (DSO)—is missing [8]. The natural electrical connection of the grid parties and their inevitable relation with DSOs makes a relatively central authority, the DSOs, indispensable in the future. In addition, the existence of DSOs may fuel privacy and security concerns. Despite the considerable expectation of independent SG from third-party interventions with the help of decentralized BC technology, the role of central grid operators and their compulsory existence should be clarified. Meanwhile, the number of customers, prosumers, and sources of distributed generation (DG) have increased rapidly [9]. Hence, managing the activity of numerous parties and additional marketing operations with only a few sources is a challenging issue. In recent years, the modern world has embarked on a new promising solution, blockchain (BC). Studies have been conducted of BC and the energy sectors as energy markets, data sharing and security, energy management in SG, information transmission, P2P energy trading in microgrids, and the potential of BC [10-11].

Alonso et al. highlighted some of the problems of DSOs, such as a lack of unity of regulations worldwide, multiple DERs at different voltage levels, deployment of millions of e-mobility solutions, voltage/reactive power management, congestion management problems of smart grids, and the need to improve supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) abilities [12]. These problems have provoked new concerns and threaten reliability, stability, and network-maintaining quality. In this situation, the DSO faces two main problems: the exponential increment of DERs and their intermittent pattern caused by instant weather changes, and second, the dramatic increase in EVs and the effect of their user patterns on the grid. Both these uncertainties and quantitative rapid changes are more likely to strongly affect the operations of DSOs. DSOs have many units to fulfill the compulsory and specific tasks, such as maintenance of the grid, billing of consumed energy, participating in market operations, instant active/reactive load management, and investment to enlarge the grid area and capacity. Nevertheless, some of these areas are well suited to the application of blockchain (BC) technologies, some of which are slightly harder to implement in SGs. For instance, marketing staff, P2P trading, EVs (V2G, V2V, G2V), and billing workload seem appropriate and their problems soluble with BC. Conversely, regarding adapting equipment such as smart meters and SCADA in many countries, the DSOs in charge of maintaining these Smart Meters/SCADA-related devices find them harder to customize. Xie et al. comprehensively surveyed smart cities under smart citizens, smart healthcare, smart grids, smart transportation, and supply chain management [9]. Although studies suggest an entirely distributed and decentralized approach to energy trading, the power system infrastructure still needs to be managed by DSOs [13]. In many environments, there is no direct connection between consumers and producers [14]. Therefore, there is no choice other than to facilitate existing DSO components in the network. The greatest limitation on rapid changes in the current SG is that the energy flow must still go through the centralized electricity utility network. In this context, despite the centralized structure of DSOs, decentralized solutions are required [15].

More importantly, to the best of our knowledge, one important point is missing or not adequately discussed in current research. If we consider not the far future but the near future, the BC affordance of the existing structure of the electricity grid is directly related to the DSOs. Many DSO occupations and problems are soluble by incorporating them into the BC. However, future challenges, such as the cost of transformation, appropriateness, and privacy issues, tie DSO's hands in the face of rapid development. At first glance, at the national grid level, a thoroughly decentralized electricity network is nearly impossible because of the centralized nature of the DSO and existing grid structure, at least in the near future. However, apart from optimizing these solutions, the transaction cost of the new technology, possible needs for new devices, suitability of existing structure, the resilience of communication substructure, and adequate employee needs are main concerns for the near future [16]. In this regard, the applicability level of the solution is as significant as its appropriateness. Despite these requirements, studies of DSO interactions and their impact on the near future of BC are lacking [17]. In other words, in this case, the issues of the DSOs should be solved through new distributive solutions. However, the economic aspects of the solution and its applicability to BC in the near future, from the DSO perspective, must be investigated extremely closely. In this study, the literature on DSOs and blockchain is investigated, and its convenience or inappropriateness is discussed in the following respects: (i) the responsibilities that DSOs burden; (ii) possible costs of the transition from conventional to more decentralized blockchain-based modern electricity networks; (iii) the applicability of BC to the existing power systems and possible solutions; (iv) the suitability of existing structures of DSOs [18].

BC adoption on energy trading started with the significant Brooklyn experimental study; the BC solution matches the need of these distributed infrastructures considerably well, despite certain inappropriate and inapplicable aspects. In the modern world, the fulfillment of DSOs' responsibilities is significantly involved in maintaining resilience, stability, and fault detection/elimination systems [19]. However, all transaction details and the user's private data must be secured even from DSOs because of possible malicious manipulations. All these duties can only be conducted with the help of distributed BC technology. Teufel et al. found that social and technical transformation and political decisions, digitalization, have led to major challenges strongly affecting the development of the energy market from conventional to contemporary [20]. The method and

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

speed of the transformation of current power grids are not exactly clear but are foreseeable to some extent [21]. According to the predetermined rules of the smart contract, all parties can be combined to realize trusted trading between peers, ensure grid flexibility and reliability, and equalize all parties' rights [22]. This paper classifies DSO-level flexibility resources as DERs, demand response (DR), microgrids, energy storage systems (ESSs), market or pricing/tariff-based approaches, and network reconfiguration. Reference [5] offers a smart contract implementation under different blockchain technologies to take advantage of its features in an energy-trading area.

Electricity markets were, until recent decades, technically designed to deduce real-time demand-supply balance and manage the bottlenecks, constraints, and congestion in transmission systems [23]. Conversely, from the beginning of the development of DERs, EVs, and local markets, the aforementioned issues and solutions became the responsibilities of DSOs as well as the TSOs. In the near future, DSOs will probably manage the network's optimum power flow and maintain the security of the grid. A comprehensive survey of future SG under the sub-headings AMI, SCADA, energy trading and marketing, EVs and charging unit management, and microgrids has been conducted by the authors; however, the DSO role and BC applicability are lacking [24]. Owing to security and privacy concerns, Alladi et al. investigated the applicability of BC in smart grids [25]. Challenges facing BC in SGs are scalability, centralization, development and infrastructure costs, and legal and regulatory support. BC and distributed energy were researched and categorized under technological, economic, social, environmental, and industrial dimensions, and issues of technical and institutional readiness have been thoroughly investigated [26]. However, while some studies have addressed BC and SG applicability, none have investigated the existing situation of DSOs and BC to DSO applicability thoroughly [24-27]. In their study, Wu and Tran organized the features of the energy internet as accurate measurement, wide-area multisource cooperation, smart control, and open trading [28]. Although most of the parts of SG are inseparable and profoundly relevant to each other, they need to be clustered to be clearly understood.

Wide energy trading and bilateral power flow may create feasibility and stability issues. Thus, in the thriving energy sector, the security of supply and grid sustainability must be considered as significant as the cyber-security of the system. Another device intended to be useful, BC development, may eventually demolish and damage the entire system. To avoid these possible detrimental consequences, the DSO and its grid parties (SCADA, AMI) are discussed, and their existence in Blockchain in energy is emphasized. In this era of digitalization, the managing process of digital entities differs from managing physical entities in many aspects. Whensoever all these facts are considered, it seems that the electricity grid's physical manager, the DSO, will most likely retain its substantial and more active role in terms of maximizing the benefits of the majority, overcoming grid congestion, and fulfilling other grid requirements.

In this paper, the aforementioned situation is discussed, particularly from the perspective of DSOs and the practicability of BC solutions in the not-too-distant future under SCADA, AMI, EVs, DERs, microgrids, marketing, demand response (DR), DSO/TSO interaction, environmentalism, and grid investment topics. Within the context of this paper, we will investigate and discuss the literature related to the interaction between DSOs, EVOs/CFUs, DERs/RESs, microgrids, and electricity markets with the aid of blockchain technology. Subsequently, we examine the applicability of blockchain in the existing DSOs scheme. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 sketches the background of blockchain technology, including consensus algorithms (CAs) and their outstanding features. In Section 3, the DSO services required to participate in the blockchain system are discussed. Further, the DSO-related grid parties and their interactions are investigated in detail in Section 4. Section 5 discusses problems and possible solutions, and finally, Section 6 concludes the paper.

II. OVERVIEW OF BLOCKCHAIN

Blockchain technology is an immutable transaction ledger that allows for a secure and distributed system without the need for a central authority [29]. In blockchain, each transaction is maintained in a block on the network. A block, like a chain structure, stores the hash value of the previous block, and this structure creates immutability. Each transaction on the blockchain can be stated using cryptographically signed blocks, and transactions are verified by network users [30]. Different consensus algorithms are used by blockchain to verify transactions. Consensus algorithms are agreements among a group of people to validate transactions. The decision is made by majority voting at the end of the verification procedure [31]. Smart contracts are another important component of many blockchains and distributed ledger platforms. A smart contract is a set of rules executed on a blockchain. As the software representative of users, it automatically accomplishes specific obligations and tasks when proper conditions occur. Smart contracts are used to handle data, contracts, and relationships and provide functionalities to other contracts and complicated authentication [32-33].

There are two types of blockchain ledgers: public and private [34]. While the ledger of a public blockchain is totally transparent and permissionless, and anybody may view it, the ledger of a private blockchain is only accessible to users who have been granted permission. Consequently, it is possible to construct many channels and link only some users to them; non-registered users cannot view the data, and confidential information will remain private. Further, instead of utilizing their real identities, all users in blockchain systems have public and private keys. While everyone has access to public keys, private keys are unique to each user and are used to sign transactions. Hence, the first iteration of blockchain, the Bitcoin network, is known

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

to be pseudo-anonymous. In addition to the fact that the blockchain network comprises multiple components, the importance of the users involved in the network cannot be overlooked. The system needs an incentive design to ensure the participation of system users in the network and maintain their continuity. An incentive is a component of a platform's value proposition that helps organize the system for which the platform's token will be designed. Pay-for-performance reward systems that award individuals with money are examples of incentives, as are systems that do not involve any financial rewards at all [35].

A. CONSENSUS ALGORITHM

Consensus algorithms (CAs) enable a consensus on specific requests in distributed systems. To compromise systems, these systems do not need to be reliable in these CAs. Consequently, CAs are used to build a blockchain framework that does not require mutual trust. They play a critical role in ensuring the security and efficiency of the blockchain. Choosing the best consensus algorithm for a given problem is critical to enhancing the system performance, which could lead to an increase in the number of blockchain-based applications. There are many different types of CAs. All existing CAs are grouped under two main categories: lottery-based and voting-based (Fig. 1). Voting-based consensus techniques are democratic because they achieve consensus on critical network decisions by calculating the number of votes cast by nodes on the network. Random-selection-based CA methods are more scalable, and these lottery-based CA methods require the consolidation of multiple chains. The validator, or the node that selects which is the next block to be appended to the ledger, is elected by the lottery-based consensus algorithms. These elections are similar to those of a lottery. The winner is the validator, and a new draw is required for each new block. Voting-based methods are quicker to achieve finality but slower to reach a distributed consensus because of message exchanges between nodes. To summarize, each algorithm has its own set of benefits and drawbacks based on the system's purpose and requirements [31].




FIGURE 1.Two main types of consensus algorithms.

In the context of EV energy interactions, there is no need for a high volume of energy or money transfers because of the lack of consumed/produced energy by EVs compared to other energy-related transactions, such as high power producing energy units' energy trade volume. In most cases, the traded energy of EVs is extremely low. Thus, the selected CAs for EV projects need to be secure, but what should be prioritized is the energy consumption feature of the CAs for EV projects. In short, the CA should be sufficiently secure to ensure all transactions but more energy efficient not to waste energy. High electricity consumption may exceed the requirements of low-value low-cost transactions for EV charging. From the DERs' perspective, security would be much more significant in mitigating possible cyber-attacks because the potential high-value money transfers would increase hacker appetite. From the electricity market perspective, the security, scalability, and transaction period of the system are much more significant than the energy consumption.

In addition, the duration of the transaction settlement is a considerably important qualification for CAs. The transaction period represents the speed of the system, and all parties, especially the DSOs and EVs, require higher transaction speeds. Grid connection/disconnection can occur at any time from the EV's perspective. However, DSOs would somehow be in the center of the system. It is a fast event because of the EVOs' usage habits and reduction of charging period with the help of new quick charge technologies even for a few minutes. Therefore, transactions must be sufficiently fast to reach the flow of life [36]. Privacy is an indispensable characteristic of CAs. Data privacy is related to anonymity [21]. Nevertheless, data security concerns protecting data from unauthorized access. For EV users, a trip, either personal or business, is

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

always considered sensitive personal data. Thus, all personal data need to be preserved in a top-level secure manner. To prevent any possible exploitation, the selected CA must provide data privacy and security assurance.

B. SEVERAL CONSENSUS ALGORITHMS IN ENERGY SECTOR

While designing or selecting a proper CA, electric energy, computational CPU power, or the amount of money should be considered. Validation or incentives determine system vulnerability to malicious attacks or potential cyber-attacks and result in an equilibrium between system security and costs. High-cost distributed consensus solutions are worhwhile to endure with the aim of creating more secure blockchain environment. However, in addition to that necessity, private blockchains can be redundant, and limited expenditure is sufficient in most cases. From the perspective of the DERs, the security of the system is a more important feature, whereas EVs require high incentives, maximized privacy, and a lower level of energy consumption. In summary, the selection criteria change from one project to another and depend on the requirements of users. From the EV perspective, the selected CA should highly incentivize users to participate and share their CFUs publicly for everyone's benefit. In addition, high-level privacy is a significant requirement in the sector. Nevertheless, from the DERs perspective, the security of the system is more significant due to possible high-volume energy transactions.

Several CAs have been investigated in the literature, but CAs in energy-related studies are extremely limited. Andoni et al. took a wide view of distributed consensus algorithms and the system architecture of blockchain technologies in the energy sector [37], providing reviews of 140 blockchain research projects and classifying them according to their activity field, the platform of implementation, and strategy of consensus. P2P (peer-to-peer), M2M (machine-to-machine), B2B (business-to-business), and trading schemes are mentioned as related use cases. According to the activity field, only 7% of the studies were related to e-mobility. From the platform perspective, which was used to adopt the system, 50% of the studies used Ethereum; the most used consensus algorithm was PoW (55%) and PBFT (15%), respectively, in all energy-related blockchain studies. Proof-of-Work (PoW) is the most mature CA ever used. Despite its high security and scalability, the main problem with PoW is the huge amount of energy wastage and speed. PoW based on reputation (PoWR) is used to minimize transaction confirmation latency and new block creation time. The efficiency of energy trading, load balancing level increased, and computational complexity was minimized by leveraging contract theory in EV energy trading, but storage and scalability issues remain [38]. A credit-based PoW consensus algorithm is proposed to ensure a secure and reliable smart city environment [39].

The other mature and proven CA is Proof-of-Stake (PoS), and one of the promising application fields is the Internet of Vehicles [40]. However, it is argued that its energy efficiency and fast structure make the rich most probably richer. Another CA, the PoB, has much the same idea of proving transactions like POS and also has similar issues. A Proof-of-Benefit (PoB) mechanism with an online benefit-generating (ONPoB) algorithm has been proposed and argued to be likely to substantially reduce power fluctuations in future smart grids [41]. Delegated Proof-of-Stake (DPoS) is a more energy-efficient and scalable but semi-centralized version of the PoS. DPoS consensus-algorithm-based energy sharing was introduced into the internet of vehicle model to design a more efficient trading environment [42]. Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance (PBFT) is a faster and more economical solution than PoW. Unlike PoS, there is no required asset for the consensus process; it is argued to increase transaction throughput and reduce transaction delays [43]. Another study proposed a game-theory-based PBFT consortium blockchain and considered the profit of the energy seller in the P2P trading scheme [35]. Contrary to the advantages of PBFT, its disadvantage is that delays can occur as the network waits for all nodes to vote. However, Delegated Byzantine Fault Tolerance (DBFT) uses PBFT's mathematical solution with one difference—there is no need to wait for all nodes to vote. This less delay-offering solution may threaten network decentralization. A DBFT application is proposed as a secure charging scheme for EVs [45]. A utility-based DBFT consensus algorithm is used, and it is argued that an optimized smart contract ensures fast and reliable mining and validation processes for EV location preservation [46].

The directed acyclic graph (DAG) verification process is faster than PoW/PoS; additionally, power consumption is extremely low, and no mining process is needed [47]. In the study of Liu et al., proof-of-eligibility based on BFCV (Byzantine-fault-tolerance-connected vehicles) was used to make a group of vehicles within the vicinity of the information source provide a correct consensus to ensure the safety of vehicles in traffic [48]. Proof-of-authority (PoAu) is a type of modified PoS algorithm that is seemingly more appropriate for utility companies to govern and regulate in a centralized manner [49]. V2G has some concerns such as relatively transparent information, excessive transaction quantity, unrevealed rules, and randomness of trading hours. To overcome these issues, the PoAu consensus algorithm may be chosen. It is preferred to reduce the need for computing resources, enhance the efficiency of transactions, and eliminate mining requirements. The identified aggregator nodes are privileged, and charging piles are ordinary nodes—there is no need for ordinary nodes to store all other transactions, and only the storage of the privileged node's record of all transactions is sufficient [50]. Byzantine fault tolerance (BFT)-based blockchain is used and compared with PoW under finality and scalability performance, and the results support the BFT [51]. A pricing-based incentive mechanism was proposed with the help of a proof-of-reputation algorithm to efficiently reach consensus in vehicle energy delivery networks [52].

Some features of the abovementioned CAs used in the energy sector are highlighted in Table 1 to provide brief information for the readers.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF CONSENSUS ALGORITHMS

Consensus Algorithm	Main Goal	Drawbacks	Decentralization Level	Determining Verifiers Based on	Energy Consumption Level	Hardware Dependency	Scalability Level	Vulnerable to Attacks	Transaction Speed	Mining
PoW [38,39]	Sybil-proof	Energy consumption, hardware dependency	High	Work	High	Yes	High	51% attack, double-spend	Slow	Yes
PoS [40]	Energy efficiency	Domination of large stakeholders	Medium	Stake	Low	No	High	51% attack, double-spend	Fast	No
DPoS [42]	More energy efficiency, organizing PoS, fair reward distribution	Centralization possibility	Medium	Vote	Low	No	High	51% attack, double-spend	Fast	No
PBFT [43-44]	Improving security level in an economical way	Low scalability, possible Sybil attack in large scale networks	High	Vote	Low	No	Low	Sybil attack	Slow	No
DAG [47]	Speed, scalability, reducing hardware dependency	Centralization possibility	High	N/A	Low	No	Low	-	Fast	No
DBFT [45,46]	Improving speed and scalability of PBFT	Centralization possibility	Medium	Vote	Low	No	Medium	51% attack, double-spend	Slow	No
PoB [41]	Alternative Agreement of PoW	Energy consumption, hardware dependency, domination of large stakeholders	High	Burnt Coins	High	No	Medium	51% attack, double-spend	Fast	Yes
PoAu [49-57]	Speed, low transaction fee, Suitable for DApps	High centralization possibility	Low	Random among trusted nodes	Low	No	High	-	Fair	No

III. USE OF ESSENTIAL DSO SERVICES AND BLOCKCHAIN

A. SCADA

Supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) is one of the key instruments for grid management of DSOs to monitor and orient grid events and power flow, manage active/reactive power, and detect electrical fault points. The reality of the presence of cyberattacks creates a considerable need for intensive attention to the SCADA system for reasons of security, privacy, reliability, sustainability, and continuity of electricity procurement. SCADA systems typically comprise elements such as sensors, relay devices, circuit breakers, voltage regulators, power measurement units, and communication network components [53]. It collects all distributed information of sources and data in a central database, and all these system parts lack computational abilities because of low computational power. The absence of computational power on controlling units such as sensors, circuit breakers, actuators, delays, or rarity of computational power on other SCADA units causes failure to participate directly in BC as a node. In addition, the current SCADA and grid management systems' impulse response must be within seconds in BC systems. Conversely, BC technologies consume more time than the existing structures. Kong et al. studied countermeasures to improve this time efficiency by facilitating a multi-chain approach and using the PBFT consensus algorithm [37]. A novel consensus algorithm—PoRCH (Proof of Random Count in Hashes)—which does not require any incentive or penalty mechanism for validator/miner nodes, has been proposed [54]. The security and robustness of the entire power grid mainly depend on the security of the SCADA system because the grid's centralized nature and structure are vulnerable to cyber-attacks [11-55]. The high-level decentralized SCADA system architecture is highlighted to protect the grid from data poisoning and identity spoofing [56]. Except for the difficulty of managing centralized systems like SCADA as decentralized systems like BC, the abovementioned grid devices are indispensable because of their physical connection structure, the natural structure of electricity, and lack of an alternative to these devices. However, the SCADA system pieces are under the control

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

of DSOs, and the weak points of all systems are not tamperproof against physical interventions as well. This point needs to be investigated in detail.

B. AMI

In general, advanced metering infrastructures (AMI) are high-level measurement, metering, and monitoring devices that allow widespread communication among all grid users. In particular, smart meters and telemetry devices are assumed to be sealed tamper-proof devices to confirm the amount and flow direction of energy [57-58]. According to their adoption by the current TSO/DSO to the smart grid, the environment requires digitalization and advanced capability to monitor the grid's power flow, voltage, frequency, and stability. Teufel et al. discussed the current and prospective applicability of BC technologies in the energy sector [20] from old to new energy transformation processes characterized by structural coupling with multiple sectors and technological developments. In this context, as well as the current importance of smart meters, most will probably play a key role in this transition. The smart meters and BC of DSOs ensure the trust and security of the system and that DSOs manage to bill and trace energy exchanges [59-60]. These trusted parties, considered BC nodes, provide connections between users and the outside world. As one of the main components of the SG is smart meters, this type of current technology must be utilized to adapt blockchain to the new energy trading era [61-62]. Despite the immutability, transparency, resilience, and automation advantages of BC, little is known about the influence of current hardware and communication limitations [63-64]. The authors demonstrate a real case study of BC-managed microgrids that offer a higher bandwidth to maximize the throughput per second in an AMI environment. In addition, the number of validators, the maximum data rate of the communication infrastructure, and the available network infrastructure directly affect the throughput and latency. Additionally, the hardware capacity of smart meters is adequate nearly nowhere and requires additional improvements. Thus, governments or utility companies should further push smart meter producers to reach the level of the novel, sophisticated, and customizable devices. Enabling highly efficient collaboration between local prosumers, consumers, and DSOs is viable if and only if there are computationally capable smart meters.

However, smart meters can send and receive data about consumed or produced energy and additional information such as price and cut off data for managing and billing [65-66]. Smart meters have many security vulnerabilities, such as the interference of unauthorized users through manipulations at a physical metering box and of metering data and interventions of eavesdroppers in wireless/wired communication channels to capture customer data for malicious purposes [67-68]. Automatic billing services for all electricity users may reduce the overall administrative costs of DSOs, which may secondarily reduce the electricity prices for customers as well [6]. BC has a remarkable cyber security ability to protect all users and promises considerable benefit to society. However, physical interventions and manipulations must be prevented by DSOs. Instant physical attacks and retroactive past attacks and measures to prevent such situations should be considered in light of the immutability of BC technology. Another important point is how the DSOs should interpret past attacks and how to penetrate BC to correct all wrongdoings. Under these conditions, the responsibility of DSOs is as significant as the general security of the entire energy environment. This DSO role, its limits and its scope on the system are regrettably mentioned nearly nowhere in the BC and energy-related studies. Although the adaptation of current metering, measuring, controlling, and communication systems are real requirements, BC systems require high throughput and speed. However, the current abilities and hardware backgrounds of smart meters are limited.

IV. GRID STAKEHOLDERS AND BLOCKCHAIN

DSOs have new roles and responsibilities in the decentralized energy era. From voltage control and management of power flow to the contribution of nationwide frequency control, the new crucial operation and working areas of the DSO need considerable precision and sensitivity. The increase in the number of distributed energy resources (DERs), electric vehicles (EVs), and the increase in the need for a new energy market have led to new requirements for systems like blockchain to create a decentralized, reliable, and secure energy environment. Blockchain with EVs, energy storage systems (ESSs), DERs, and energy markets were investigated from the DSO perspective.

A. EVS/ ESSS (ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEMS)

The growing popularity of electric vehicles (EVs) has led to new challenges and opportunities in the modern world. From the electric car customer's perspective, they offer a lower carbon footprint and environmentally friendly choices to individuals, cheaper journey opportunities, and perhaps more car engine power for low-income customers who are eager for higher power. From a car maker's perspective, they provide opportunities to make electric cars more suitable, efficient, and sufficient, and thereby gain market share. However, the main reason for forcing electric car makers to move toward this area and EV users to refer to this choice is the government's compulsory laws to reach lower CO_2 emission levels. The CO_2 emission standards of the European Union will gradually force car manufacturers to reach an average EV sales share of 5% in 2020, 10% in 2021, and 20% in 2025 [69-70]. From the distribution system operators (DSO) viewpoint, EVs provide new opportunities for creating more sustainable energy systems and smoothing consumption patterns, thereby entailing less distribution grid investment and fewer technical losses. Contrary to these positive effects, there are certain adverse effects of EVs.

The more decentralized electricity grid participants such as DERs (solar, wind, hydro) and EVs there are attached to the grid, the more powerful, reliable, and robust a

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

distribution grid that can come into existence. Contarary to that, the instant production and consumption patterns can cause electricity disasters, even nationwide power outages. The proposed blockchain and EV design should ensure grid robustness by attending DSOs, perhaps by including the DSO as part of the incentive mechanism. In the aforementioned system framework, DSOs can decide the congestion points with deficient or surplus energy data beforehand to canalize EVOs to those specific locations. If the grid needs more energy, then fully charged vehicles are directed to energy shortage points through an incentive mechanism and vice versa. Thus, EV and blockchain interactions ensure the sustainability of the national grid. However, the cost of producing and delivering electricity is not truly dependent on the amount of energy used but mostly depends on that of short-term demand. As grid investment is directly related to the peak load of the network, intelligent and self-sufficient grid management schemes are required. In particular, EVs can lead to more distribution grid investment because of the possible instant load increases if they cannot be managed effectively. To mitigate the investment amount of DSOs, many countries have created different political demand-side management (DSM) aspects. In addition to these grid enhancement offerings, EVs/CFUs can work for grid capacity improvement; if the EVs are canalized to the energy shortage points, then the short-term grid investment expenses would decrease. Finally, centralized and unidirectional power flow can cause more power loss owing to the extremely long transmission and distribution networks. A decentralized grid with an increasing number of EVs makes for a more energy-efficient system because of the proximity of the consumer and producer to each other.

From the viewpoint of EV makers, modern electric cars have attracted eco-sensitive customers by using environmentally friendly solutions, such as suggesting emission-free EVs. Despite its benefits in creating new trading opportunities by utilizing EV technology, EV producers will put up with the need for more research and development investment expenses. However, it is considered compensable because of the ever-growing number of EVs sold. Additionally, multi-dimensional problems of EVs are expected to be solved in many ways in the future. However, expanding the usage of EVs worldwide with the help of blockchain makes them beneficial for all customers and most probably encourages EV producers to make vehicles better, cheaper, and beneficial to users. In sum, an increase in new EV sales and more customers choosing EVs would be likely to heat up the car production sector, which would be beneficial for car producers, potential customers, DSOs, and the environment.

In addition to these impacts on all parties in general and EVOs in particular, one specific issue can be stated as the main problem, the range of the cars from the single charge and, consequently, the availability of charging utilities/stations. Despite EVs being cheaper, more environmentally friendly, and relatively comfortable, their battery performance drastically limits their range. Although car producers are working on more durable vehicle power supply solutions, it is a challenging problem to solve in the near future. However, alternative solutions can be created by third parties. The problems of EV ranges and the locations of charging facility units can be solved by using the distributed, private, and secure structures of blockchain networks. Imagine traveling from one location to another by EV, where most of the time, the EVO is obligated to navigate to reach the target area in an optimum manner. In this journey, the fastest and cheapest route will certainly be chosen. However, finding possible locations of service areas and alternative charging opportunities is another major obligation for travelers not to be stranded on the road. Thus, convenient charging facility units that belong to other EVOs become a part of the solution to the already diminishing battery power of the EV. If all included CFU owners make their devices available for strangers when they are not used, EVOs can spend less energy and time to find charging locations. Therefore, concerns regarding reaching CFUs before depleting the battery will be reduced. Finding appropriate CFUs for blockchain-user EVOs will be considerably easy in city centers and even in rural areas, because of the distributed available CFUs. The main obstacles to the spread and proliferation of CFUs and a charging system are privacy, security, and lack of encouragement processes. Hence, in the BC-centered EV era, EVOs will be free to travel far distances and feel secure and safe and their privacy preserved. Nevertheless, CFU owners will be free to trade (sell/buy) energy with other participants without third-party intermediaries. Additionally, through the automatic payment mechanism, both the grid and off-grid electricity stakeholders can participate in the EV charging system without having to worry about billing staff and payment details.

Apart from these positive and negative effects of EVs with BC, the owner of the grid assets, the DSO, is mentioned almost nowhere. The electricity grid is like a living being that requires regular maintenance and repair. Several grid situations, such as overloading of grid equipment, may adversely affect EV/ESS users. To keep the electricity grid alive, the DSO must manage the load and power flow directly. Rapid increases in the number of EVs/ESSs will most probably create congestion at the weak points of the grid. Hence, the overloaded charging scheme may be interrupted by the DSO using the BC structure to keep the grid alive. However, it is necessary to determine how the DSO act that situation. In addition, interruptions must be fair and sustainable for all users. This poses an obstacle to the operation of the entirely liberal and self-sufficient blockchain in energy studies.

B. EV-BLOCKCHAIN-RELATED WORKS

EVs and the e-mobility area have attracted companies and researchers because of their inevitable decentralization process. Most EV owners have a car charging facility/unit for their own use, which can be either connected to the grid (on-grid) or not (off-grid). Regardless of whether they are on-grid or off-grid electricity users, property owners or EV

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

charging facility owners are free to rent their charging capacity and share their facility publicly when they are not using them. Thus, both parties eliminate intermediaries and allow individual trading opportunities and are also freed from commercial charging station companies' monopolies. Although this projection gives freedom to the charging station owners, it has some drawbacks, such as how to pay for the consumed energy. Might the cash system violate car owners' privacy rights? By constructing blockchain-based networks, EV owners can gain greater privacy when traveling between different locations, including even foreign countries. In this regard, Teufel et al. take a holistic approach to blockchain technology in the energy sector based on a literature review and expert interviews [20]. It considers that the greatest impact of blockchain will occur in the short term on EV integration, while in the long term, blockchain will affect P2P energy trading on microgrids. It has been argued that the most challenging part of blockchain development in the electricity sector is inflexible regulations. In addition, researchers have emphasized the need for a consensus between past and future decentralized energy systems, where blockchain is perfectly suited to this requirement. However, this study investigates all energy sectors in general and EVs in particular, apart from DSOs' interaction with others and short-term necessities of BC. Conversely, another study classified 140 blockchain research projects according to the activity field and only 7% of the studies related to e-mobility [71].

The adoption of EVs to improve transportation opportunities requires further research. In particular, the optimum charging station location, battery limitation, management of charging scheme, and impact of the EV on the power grid require more studies [72-74]. On the one hand, EV owners expect their cars to be charged in the fastest and cheapest way. On the other hand, DSOs struggle to manage peak load and system robustness issues. In addition to these problems, one of the major problems is the privacy of EV owners and the security of the entire system. Lazaroiu et al. proposed a method based on fuzzy logic to charge fast and efficiently by connecting publicly available private charging points and the PoS consensus algorithm used because of its energy-saving fast structure [75]. They focused mainly on grid congestion management and peak load hour compensation. Fuzzy logic is used to generate the weight of each member of the system to generate a new block. This study focuses on the excessive power production of PV panels and stores surplus energy to reach common fairness between individuals. However, the author's major consideration is the lack of efforts to promote the involvement of EVOs/CFU owners and DSOs. EVs and energy storage units act as charging points for filling energy valleys and feeding back into the power network to reduce the peak demand that is a major DSO burden [76]. A secure and credit-based BC payment mechanism enabled V2G energy delivery in microgrids and overcame confirmation delays. The auction mechanism and a smart-contract-based trading platform on a private Ethereum network were proposed and simulated. Further, an existing metering staff of utilities remained unchanged to avoid major changes in infrastructure [77]. DSOs are argued to be incentivized by the energy transaction corresponding fee payment of the blockchain users. However, the stimulation is superficial because of the reality that DSOs prepare billing for all energy transactions, except for limited off-grid connections in some cases. Thus, the incentivizing ability of the proposed system was meaningless. Charging location selection is presented based on a protocol for dynamic tariff decisions, different pricing of energy providers, and distance to the EV. The bidding mechanism offered as an EV signals the demand, and the charging station sends bids like an auction using blockchain [78]. The price will be the lowest for EVs and the highest for charging stations. The main motivation is finding the cheapest and most appropriate CFU, but reasons for the EVOs to participate in this system are lacking. Although DSOs should be significant and natural users of blockchain/energy studies, they were not mentioned.

Despite all the abovementioned studies, reasons to encourage all EVOs, CFU owners, and DSOs to participate in the blockchain have been neglected. Fu et al. offer a cooperation system that connects companies and their customers via smart contracts [79]. For the benefit of EV users and new energy companies, a novel convenient charging system is proposed to maintain the fairness of user allocation and balance the profit of the company alliance based on a consortium blockchain. The Limited Neighborhood Search with Memory (LNSM) algorithm is used to make a faster smart contract with better performance. However, despite all these allocation schemes for the appropriate EV charging pile, the situation of the DSOs and the responsibility due to possible grid congestion resultant status were not mentioned.

Sharma et al. and Pustišek et al. focused on selecting the most convenient EV charging station autonomously, booking charging slots from remote locations to schedule charging time and cost values by implementing a blockchain-enabled EV charging infrastructure approach [80-81]. Information regarding when and where users charge their vehicles is ensured by the blockchain network. However, charging costs are detailed as the time of use, type of charging power source, and waiting time of users among others, while the DSO rights and reasons for forcing it to involve its entire system are not mentioned. In smart grid systems, P2P energy trading (ET) schemes based on Ethereum smart contracts to procure more secure, private, and adequate latency and real-time settlement have been proposed [82]. It is claimed that the aforementioned system design of energy trading between EV owners and prosumers, who are interested in selling surplus energy, is facilitated. The performance was evaluated by comparing the data storage cost and latency, but scalability was not verified. Nevertheless, DSOs and measures to softly force the EV/CFU owners to enter the system are not touched on.

When all the abovementioned blockchain and EV-based studies are examined, they investigate the energy costs of EVs, fast and efficient charging, selection of appropriate

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

CFUs location, scheduling, and booking charging slots automatically. Although they are trying to solve the main problems of the state-of-the-art confusions of EVs, there is a lack of linkage between DSOs' interaction with EVs and a shortage of encouragement of EVs/CFU owners to participate. Although Blockchain offers decentralized networks, owing to the reality of the existing grid structure, the central management of DSOs plays a significant, non-negligible role. In summary, there is a considerable requirement for a scheme that offers less grid capacity enhancement investments, fewer grid losses, and a sustainable power system but strengthens DSO operations through the block chain's decentralized structure as well. However, struggling to find appropriate CFUs should be facilitated by a reward mechanism for EVOs and CFU owners so that the traveling area of the EVOs can be expanded widely. It is necessary to determine how to enroll DSOs and secure the rights/responsibilities of DSO while maximizing the benefit to EVs/ESSs owners.

1) FUTURE EV USAGE AND ITS PROBLEMS

It is not too far-fetched to expect to see EVs throughout the world in every city or rural area. Nevertheless, it is difficult to create available charging units for cars to prevent them from running out of energy. In this context, for the abovementioned reasons, most EVOs would have their own EV charging units. However, establishing a new charging facility unit (CFU) may be expensive, and the time to amortize this new device would be long. In addition, energy storage units will shortly be considerably common. These types of extra loads create an intensive need for demand-side management solutions and difficult situations from a grid management perspective. In addition, in a charging scheme, the relation between EVOs, CFOs, and charging stations requires clearer explanations. Payment details, the privacy of EVOs, and the security of the offered solutions are commonly discussed. Gabay et al. mainly focus on the privacy issue of the charging period scheduling of EVs [83]. The main issues are that car users' daily or hourly locations must be protected as private data. In summary, the main problems that will be faced in the near future caused by commonly used EVs can be described as follows:

- Finding an available charging facility during a trip is a difficult task, even impossible, in rural areas.
- Shorter and less comfortable journeys are less preferable for EV usage. Therefore, the global CO_2 emissions goal may be unattainable.
- Overloaded grid problem may make congestion management extremely difficult, even unmanageable.
- Increments in short-term energy demand would increase grid investments due to the relationship between instant electricity demand and grid capacity.
- Increments in energy demand and the number of unbalanced loads are more likely to increase grid losses and energy wastage.
- The applicability of BC technologies to the existing DSO structure is a complicated task because of the need for the central authority as the main actor.
- Constructing an EV charging facility for the EVOs' own purpose of use would be expensive.
- Privacy concerns of the EVOs' trip data are emerging.
- Security concerns and vulnerability against cyberattacks are also vital and up-to-date topics.
- Mature incentives or reward mechanisms to promote EVOs and CFUOs to participate as actors in the system are lacking.

2) BENEFITS OF EV WITH THE HELP OF BLOCKCHAIN

The aforementioned negative sides of EVs can be made into positives. The benefits of the wide usage of EVs with the help of blockchain technology are as follows.

- Every EV owner can be a charging station owner; thus, a more decentralized EV network system can be created, and finding the CFUs will be easier
- Increments in using EVs cause less global CO_2 emissions and lower carbon footprint (decarbonization) for individuals and companies
- A reliable and robust energy system can be obtained by promoting EV usage by Blockchain
- Decentralized bi-directional V2G and V2V low-cost energy transaction
- Sustainable and renewable energy usage will be encouraged by providing trading opportunities
- Decreasing technical losses of the electricity distribution grid and enhancing grid efficiency
- Supporting EVs as ancillary services (real-time energy management) and as grid inertia sources
- V2G and more smooth consumption pattern, and therefore, less distribution grid investment
- No need for extra billing staff or individuals to trade face to face.
- More secure and private transactions and freedom of traveling ensured

The benefits of the blockchain mechanism contemplated in the study of Liu et al. are obvious: the contribution of EV charging on the smart grid improves resilience and minimizes the power fluctuation level [84]. This study aims to reduce the overall charging cost for EV users using the proposed novel adaptive blockchain-based electric vehicle participation (AdBEV) scheme. Crasta et al. proposed a blockchain-based solution to DSO to be freed from the extra burdens of the EV charging schedule and facility constraint problems while ensuring fairness between EVs [85]. Matsuda and Taraka showed that EV agent systems within blockchain platforms are adequate to maximize the value of local renewable energy sources [86]. Some benefits of the study are that the load variance of the power grid is mitigated by the effect of peak load shifting, reducing the stability and safety issues of the power grid [87]. As per the above, all general negative effects of EVs may be converted into positive ones by leveraging blockchain technology as well. However, all beneficial features of the BC seem obviously utilizable, but how DSOs will act as BC users

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

remains unclear. Instant overloaded grid equipment and its management using a BC should be investigated. How the power flow can be oriented while saving the fairness of users is a notable issue.

Abovementioned issues and potential problems demonstrate possible adverse even devastating effects of proliferation of EVs on the grid. All these possible detrimental impacts and other issues (privacy, security) are solvable by adapting BC technology in to that area. In sum, existence of DSO may keep EV users in suspense owing to its central nature, despite BC's improved data security feature. Also on the other hand, EVs' inattentive consumption patterns may keep DSOs in suspense owing to relatively unexpected rise and new extra grid load of EVs. DSOs' essential responsibilities and EVs' expectations should be deal within common ground by utilizing wide range of BC features. Interaction between EVs and DSOs most likely gain importance and that mutual effect will give direction to the development ultimately.

C. USE OF BLOCKCHAIN IN DERs AND MICROGRIDS

The cost of renewables, energy storage, and other technological developments are rapidly decreasing; thus, this situation will prompt the users to become involved more actively in the grid. The cost of the transition from conventional grid systems to smart grid systems, with the help of AI and BC technologies, is relatively high. Nevertheless, the benefits are abundant, particularly for DER [88]. Some benefits of information technologies are said to be the lively collection of energy consumption/production statistics, enhanced grid efficiency, peak demand adjustment, and sustainable energy trading that can ensure the possibility of choosing low carbon energy sources. This provides extended support for other plug-in energy infrastructures (e.g., city surveillance systems, public lighting), advances the support of EVs, and reduces suspicions of reliability and stability concerns. In addition, effective monitoring of the grid could help address the issues of grid congestion and massive energy transfers. The resilience of the grid can be ensured against extreme weather events, acute accidents, asset failures, and even operational human errors by distributed smart devices and BC. All system components are cordially related to each other. In the modern world, uncertainties in RESs due to instant changes in weather conditions and changes in human consumption behavior may adversely affect the performance of planned P2P trading [89]. Therefore, utilities have no choice other than fight-and-innovate strategies, while acknowledging customers as potential generators through such devices as rooftop PV units [71]. However, within the grid modernization concept, the cost of system-wide participation of DERs is as important as integrating them effectively as an inseparable part of the network [90]. There is a considerable need for a novel BC structure, as DSOs influence the power grid the most and will plan the blockchain framework in the presence of DERs [8]. Nevertheless, microgrids comprise DERs and consumption units most of the time, and they are expressed as interconnected electricity devices, local balancing of electricity consumption and production, and small-scale, self-controlled grid systems [91]. However, as a highly scalable and flexible solution, microgrids are also a potential source of inefficiencies and vulnerabilities, especially because of the transmission of energy over long distances through transmission lines. The DSO is responsible for monitoring and controlling the utility network to guarantee quality and sustainability, even in a highly decentralized microgrid-based environment. Although widespread microgrid implementation collectively provides new opportunities, it also mandates that the power distribution network adapt to a new feasibility paradigm [92]. Most grid-connected microgrids belong to facility owners [93]; recognizing the contribution of microgrids to existing distribution infrastructure is a special topic. P2P energy trading projects mainly focus on microgrid-level investigations because of the existence of adaptable local markets and available information and communication technology) [94-95]. In the P2P, prosumer to the grid, prosumer to community scheme, P2P trading is probably the structure furthest from today's central grid model. Different consensus algorithms have been proposed to achieve fairness and the optimum profit of both microgrids and miners in the IoT [27]. This decentralized structure requires a decentralized solution, such as blockchain. Nevertheless, the main obstacle to P2P energy trading in microgrids is regulatory challenges [96].

The existence of DERs and prosumers creates a bidirectional power flow reality. Thus, DSOs must behave like traditional TSOs and be more active in redirecting energy. Reduction in the investment costs of DERs and widespread BC applications may accelerate the transformation process. In the future, BC technology will most likely play a significant role in the DER-connected grid with the help of its secure, distributed, and adequate structure for energy trading. However, in the short term, DSOs will remain the main actors of the grid and significant energy providers in the trading system. Production instability due to sudden weather changes may cause extreme surplus energy. DSOs are responsible for managing local and broad energy disturbances with canalizing power from more to fewer points with the help of BC under these conditions. In addition, legislation in favor of grid users will likely foster blockchain usage in microgrids. However, inner energy trading operations are relatively independent of DSOs, and the interconnection of multiple MMG schemes would only be possible with the existence of a physical connection of DSOs.

D. BLOCKCHAIN IN A DECENTRALIZED ENERGY MARKET

Most studies of energy trading and blockchain have focused on the electricity market, P2P energy trading, and V2G and V2V approaches [97-99]. However, today's widespread market structure is centralized in day-ahead and intraday markets. In this energy trading scheme, transactions must be timely because of the timely usage of electricity. Contrary to classic cryptocurrency algorithms, especially in the electricity market, the transactions have time constraints on

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

aggregation and processing. Therefore, in sufficiently large environments, communication problems and possible solutions must be strictly considered. The energy internet requires real-time settlement, intelligent interaction and decision-making, and extensive interconnection among all parties [100]. Moreover, electricity trading is distinguished from other commodities by its physical laws and technical constraints [91]. DSOs must be considered third-party validators for energy exchange to not violate technical network constraints, a methodology based on sensitivity analysis, and economic benefits [101]. Apart from maintaining the existing retail market, allowing DSOs to manage local flexibility markets and negotiate in it is an alternative solution to cope with grid constraints [102]. A possible limitation of the DSO-managed local market design is that it may fail to exceed the minimums voltage and power flow limits of the transformer [103]. To cope with these issues, the requirement for coordination efforts between users and DSOs has increased owing to the intermittency and bidirectional energy flow [63].

Guerrero et al. presented P2P energy trading in a low-voltage network with a low requirement for the DSO scenario [104]. Trading in the market occurs between closest agents. Therefore, it is argued that the mechanism reduces technical power losses and network congestion with the lowest level of DSO involvement. The main goal of the DSO is to match the electrical distance between peers. In Lee et al.'s study, messaging was authenticated for prosumers and consumers to notify and verify the injection of surplus energy to the grid [14]. DSOs' responsibilities are described as handling financial operations, monthly billing of customers and prosumers, and also maintaining the physical part of the grid, such as registering new smart meters to the system [105]. Token-based smart contracts were utilized and the total amount of energy compared with DSO in trading in ref [106]. Despite DSOs' responsibility to institute reliable measures to prevent customers from stealing electric power, the need for new devices or new approaches is neglected in this study. In addition, the DSO should be a guarantor for the rights and duties of each party. The transaction rate within a market time step is not discussed in this study. Owing to the distributed nature of marketing operations and its direct relevance to money, it is highly applicable to BC, despite some drawbacks such as lack of regulatory legislation, deficiency of distributed hardware capacity, and the significant lack of practical experiments.




FIGURE 2. **Near future energy market structure towards a decentralized BC-based general market.**

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

The primitive version of the market contained only a few market participants (TSO, DSO, and big power plants). Power flow was unidirectional, and trading was somewhat limited and dependent mainly on TSO operations. The TSO was the central authority responsible for electrical and commercial affairs. The main structure of the present national market comprises several users (DERs, prosumers, big consumers, and microgrids). Consequently, power flow has started becoming bilateral, and the market is freer than before. Although the DSO has new roles (DSM) on the grid, with the TSO overwhelmingly managing the main tasks (frequency control, ancillary services), the DSO renders support to the TSO. However, the inclusiveness of the market is satisfying, and most small consumers are still out of market. In addition, the BC-based national market is far from being true. Contrary to that slower development, in the near future the inclusiveness of the national market is expected to be wider, and most users will be market participants. More importantly, an increase in the requirements of DSM, the number of rooftop PVs, new distributed electricity generation methods, and particularly EVs may take DSO a step forward. Additionally, the development of BC and brand-new EVs will most likely stimulate the transformation process the most. The proliferation of BC and new pilot projects based on BC may create new interconnected local markets also connected to the national market (Fig. 2). These local markets will most probably comprise EVs, DERs, and DSO in the first place. However, in the new era of BC, the market may not embrace all small electricity users, and the DSO will continue to perform its critical duties. The DSO's electrical and commercial active role may effect new issues such as centralization, manipulation, and intervention possibilities in the new market model. To arrive at the ultimate decentralized BC-based energy market target, the limits of the DSO, technical responsibilities, and commercial duties must be strictly determined.

E. BLOCKCHAIN APPLICATION IN OTHER DSO ASPECTS

1) BLOCKCHAIN CONTRIBUTION IN DEMAND RESPONSE

Blockchain's incentive mechanism and smart contract's transparency and reliability features will have a positive effect on the smart grid. Power grid quality criteria can be ensured by the DSO with the aid of regulating the voltage/frequency fluctuations. The goal of DR is to incentivize the desired behaviors of customers, producers, and prosumers while disincentivizing undesired usage behaviors. In the study of Alonso et al., the open automated demand response (OpenADR) mechanism is argued to successfully apply the PoC peak shaving scenario [12]. In the study of Nuur et al., continuously growing demand and high penetration of intermittent resources have become challenging issues, and the article proposes a game theoretic approach for DSM to reduce peak-to-average and smooth the dips [107]. Further, in the study of Pop et al., the Ethereum platform is used to self-enforce the smart contract that defines the energy flexibility of each prosumer and related reward/penalty mechanism [108]. Moreover, Stephent et al. analyze collective self-consumption, address measures to encourage consumers to participate in the DR, and propose the consumption management of prosumers and consumers through BC [109]. Thomas et al. use a smart-contract-based DC control element to satisfy control instructions. Zhou et al. propose an encouragement method for EVs to enhance participation and maximize social welfare. Additionally, it is mentioned that central authorities like the DSO should be investigated in depth [110-85]. Ali et al. suggested that renewables and the energy storage integration of DSO-level aggregators be directed for DR purposes [111-112]. In Di Silvestre et al.'s study, load increment and reduction requests were notified by DSOs to provide flexibility to the system. The DSO communicates with each customer to reduce use proportionally by facilitating smart contract abilities 113]. In Edmonds et al.'s study, home owners are required to send forecasted consumption patterns to the responsible DSO to reach a balanced power grid goal [114]. After aggregating the forecasted data, the utility solves the convex optimization problem of power balancing. Therefore, DSO and BC secure user privacy to encourage users to participate and balance the power grid. However, the timely forecasting and aggregation unleash scalability concerns. Cost-related DR was investigated in Canada, and Brown argued that the existence of DR induces electricity customers to consume more energy than the existing DR option [115]. Khajeh et al. addressed the DR problem at three points in the electricity network [22]. TSO-DSO-Customer level flexible resources are mentioned as each level's system operator's deployment responsibility. The power of each branch and voltage of each node used is integrated, and after price customization calculations, the optimum power flow scheme is reached [116].

F. BLOCKCHAIN FOR TSO/DSO INTERACTIONS

The requirements for determining the roles, needs, and guiding principles of the TSO/DSO interaction are highlighted in one study [117]. The hierarchical relationship between the TSO and DSO would be more horizontal in the future. In the old version of the grid, the DSOs have limited duties and responsibilities compared to TSOs. BC and rising distributed technologies will most probably influence bilateral interactions, such as power flow direction, grid responsibilities, and technical requirements. Additionally, DSOs have been considered responsible for voltage regulations, consumption billing, and customer operations, particularly for household customers. Contrary to the customary structure, DSOs will heavily burden other works such as frequency control, managing DG (solar, wind, etc.) participation, local markets, ancillary services, optimum power flow, and creating more democratizing grid structures henceforward [118-123]. However, TSOs would have interpenetrating and mutual duties and responsibilities against DSOs. TSOs may act as partners of future grid operations and transfer some liabilities, such as facilitating

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

the power of DSOs and related DERs in possible blackouts. All these abovementioned situations were already inevitable, but heretofore with the emerging BC technology, these changes will speed up and be driven toward an ambitious ideal grid. Similar to all other grid shareholders, the TSO/DSO relation requires blockchain technology and its practical solutions [22].

1) GRID CAPACITY INVESTMENT LINKAGE WITH BLOCKCHAIN

Electricity grid vulnerabilities against extreme weather conditions and federal funding opportunities that support grid resilience are highlighted in [124]. In addition, grid investments and BC collaboration are discussed under two topics. The first, as mentioned in the DR and EV subtitles, is mitigating the peak demand by encouraging users to participate in grid management by facilitating BC and smart contracts. Leveraging blockchain technology can reduce peak demand, thus reducing the DSOs' grid capacity increment investments. For a detailed clarification, the abovementioned subsections can be referred to accordingly. The other important subject of BC and grid investment is related to tracing grid investment and making it more transparent. In the vast majority of the world, the grid infrastructure is public property, representing an investment of billions of dollars. In underdeveloped low-income countries, the corruption level is much higher than in the rest of the world. In Ahmad et al.'s study, a blockchain-based custody evidence recording framework is highlighted to ensure the data reliability and prevent possible misconduct interventions. Shwetha et al. use a blockchain-based verification system to ensure commodity/food security through accountability in the public distribution system [125-126]. Alketbi et al. takes advantage of BC technology to deal with the data integrity of government services in a more secure way [127]. Hence, as a similar application, to prevent undesirable corruption, a smart contract structure would be extremely beneficial for pursuing and recording the investment details in an immutable and transparent way. All the grid investment auction details, payment details, competence of electricity contractor details, and useful economic life of the grid components can be traceable, owing to the unalterable BC technology. Despite the impossibility of entirely preventing corruption, tracking the relevant money and clearing the debate about public wastage by smart contracts would be a remarkable solution.

2) BLOCKCHAIN FOR ENVIRONMENTALISM

Renewables are highlighted in tandem with carbon trading by Hua et al. and Keypour et al. [128-129]. Blockchain usage in SGs affects the environment in two ways: First, by encouraging participants to produce and consume low carbon energy, the CO2 emission level decreases [130-131]. Second, a possible mining procedure for BC may increase energy wastage. Carbon trading projects are environmentally friendly [6]. First, the carbon emission level may be measured, and all produced environmentally hazardous CO_2-equivalent green energy may be bought from the specific market using a smart contract. However, the carbon trading markets are considerably similar and appropriate to the distributed nature of BC; the application is in the initial stages owing to the computational constraints and response speed issues [132]. However, although the BC offers significant benefits, the amount of energy consumed in the mining process will amount to 45.8 TWh according to Vranken and Stoll et al. [133-134]. While the energy production methods mainly originate from fossil fuel sources, this is a vast figure for environmental concerns. In summary, despite computational constraints and response speed issues of BC in carbon trading, DSOs would play a crucial role because of their existing infrastructure.

V. DISCUSSION

Erturk et al. investigated the positive and negative impacts of the application of BC in smart energy [135]. Beneficial impacts are classified as improved system security, increased data privacy, removal of intermediaries, and immutability, whereas adverse effects are sorted as scalability, cost of establishment/maintenance, and the need for further studies [136]. Finally, it is recommended that economic feasibility and other costs should be studied. However, the BC in the energy sector, especially the EV and prosumer sides, did not prove to be an entirely secure and privacy-preserving solution. Significant challenges to application are the cost of integrating the new BC-based technology with existing devices and the convenience level of the grid framework [37]. To this end, the hardware cost of the BC-enabled counterpart of the grid management, monitoring, and measuring devices is still extremely expensive, and further research is required to achieve complete adoption of BC in the power grid [6]. The demand for communication and data processing will increase steeply because of the steepest increase in the quantity of transaction data, simultaneous energy trading of participants every second, and an increase in the number of network users. In addition, instant changes in the network will require researchers to investigate less-data-costly options, such as side chains [9-24]. Blockchain technologies in SGs are categorized as demand response (DR), EVs, IoT, decentralized energy management, environmentalism, energy trading, finance, and cybersecurity [8]. Kulkarni et al. viewed BC technology as a solution to the problem of a lack of electrification in rural areas because of its low cost and accurate transaction opportunity [137]. Issues and challenges that SG faces are as follows: mistrust in the industry, vulnerability to security threats, functionality and low penetration of EVs, frequency and voltage problems due to grid imbalance, and lack of standardization [138]. The concept, structure, architecture, and trading mechanism of "Energy Internet" have been discussed. However, the transaction costs are claimed to remain an obstacle, but utilities can promote such transformation [28].

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

TABLE 2
THE SHORT-TERM APPLICABILITY OF BLOCKCHAIN FROM THE DSO PERSPECTIVE

DSO&Blockchain Aspects	Shortcomings in Terms of		Applicability in the Short Term	Main Obstacle of Blockchain
	Computational Power	Incentive Mechanism		
SCADA	High	N/A	Medium	- Low computational power at end points (sensors, relay devices, circuit breakers) - Highly centralized structure
AMI	High	N/A	Medium	- Low computational power - Low communication power - Lack of widespread communication network substructure - Scalability
EVs	Low	High	High	- Lack of incentive mechanism - Privacy concerns - Scalability - Negative effects on grid, e.g., grid congestion
DERs	Medium	Medium	High	- Security concerns
Microgrids	Medium	Medium	Medium	- Lack of legal regulation
Marketing	N/A	Low	High	- Lack of legal regulation - Scalability - Speed - Security - Privacy
Demand Response	N/A	High	High	- Lack of legal regulation
DSO/TSO Interaction	N/A	No	Medium	- Lack of legal regulation

All DSO-related energy parties are listed, and the short-term applicability levels in a general blockchain are interpreted in [Table 2]. Apart from local projects and those containing only one type of grid user, in the condition called general BC expresses the environment that containing all electricity users in one place or nested BC environment as well. SCADA and AMI are the main grid management and monitoring technologies for DSOs. The central operation part of the SCADA system has high computational power, but the distributed parts of the SCADA and AMI must lack computational power. In addition, neither DSO unit requires intensive mechanisms to participate in the blockchain system. While communication is not an issue for SCADA, smart meters' communicational power should be enhanced, and new expensive hardware investments are thus required [139]. This investment should be undertaken by the DSO, for which the motivation must be specified. Meanwhile, SCADA has a centralization issue, but AMI systems are highly decentralized. Therefore, as all aspects of both grid components are considered, both SCADA and AMI nodes are noted as having medium-level applicability in the short term. EVs most likely have substantial computational power arising from smart cars and CFUs. The EV environment is most likely the pioneer unit, even a forcing point for the encouragement of new BC implementation in the near future. Owing to EV circulation worldwide, the desire for BC will increase. However, with the dilemma that while an incentive mechanism can be implemented to charm all EV users into participating in the system, this may have harmful negative effects on the grid. Therefore, these unintended conditions may be self-destructive, and it is difficult to enhance EV usage. Nevertheless, the need for a privacy-preserving environment for EVs and the demonstration of existing EV projects indicate its applicability level as high in the short term. Conversely, the up-to-date requirements for computational power of microgrids "and DERs" are generalized and categorized as medium level. Given the established place and exact situation for all DERs and microgrids, it is a bit harder to determine the exact situation for all DERs and microgrids. Although self-sufficient microgrids are highly appropriate for BC frameworks because of their local and minimal conformation, self-contained nature, and limited need for an on-grid system, the participation of microgrids in a widely established BC environment is a challenging situation. Therefore, its applicability is seen as medium level. Marketing and demand response do not require additional computational power because of the inclusiveness of other BC users. Demand response may require a highly stimulated structure in the BC. The inadequacy of legal regulation is one of the notable obstacles to the BC transformation.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

a) From the SCADA and AMI perspectives, the main obstacle that emerging blockchain technologies face is the deficiency of the computational power of existing devices. The SCADA network is a centralized system, and decentralized blockchain is highly contradictory. AMI has insufficient communication hardware to cope with blockchain necessities, and the number of participants can cause scalability issues.

b) From a blockchain-related EV perspective, the existing structure is insufficient to encourage most EVOs to participate in the BC environment because of the lack of an intensive/reward mechanism.

c) Both DERs and microgrids have a lack of regulatory unity and raise potential security concerns.

d) From the market perspective, transaction time/speed is a significant and non-negligible matter. Regardless of the amount of energy, energy trading occurs every second, and future BC structures must cope with these scalability and speed issues.

e) Apart from cyber-attacks, it is a matter of debate regarding who should be responsible for the physical manipulation or intervention of measurement or control devices. In the event of such physical attacks due to the decentralized nature of the blockchain, it is almost impossible to detect the amount and party of the commercial relation. The difficulty of determining possible fraud also poses new challenges to DSOs. One of the partial solutions can be the use of AI technology to detect possible physical fraudulent attacks from users' previous consumption or production patterns. However, this seems inadequate for the current infrastructure.

f) Unlike cryptocurrencies, transactions in the electricity sector are continuous. In other words, validation of transactions takes time, and with cryptocurrencies, users have to wait until confirmation. However, in the energy sector, energy flow is perpetual, and even if a transaction is not confirmed, real trading will be almost complete and energy delivered to the other party. Therefore, it is unclear what will happen if communication or validation problems occur in the system.

Along with the increase in DERs (connected to the DSO level), bilateral power flow has been increasing gradually in recent years, and this situation forces DSOs to act more like TSOs. In this context, future research should investigate the DSO-level ancillary service–blockchain interaction and its areas of application, particularly regarding the sustainability of the grid in a secure and private manner.




FIGURE 3.Dso Grid Control Unit (Scada, Ami) Connection Diagram.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

Grid management, grid control, grid monitoring, and customer management are vital responsibilities of the DSO; therefore, the positions of SCADA and AMI are obviously extremely specific (Fig. 3). Both SCADA and AMI, particularly AMI, are directly or indirectly connected to all customers/stakeholders electrically. Any load change in the grid, even infinitesimal changes, must be measured and controlled by the DSO and responded to as soon as possible. The DSO's technical centrality makes its existence crucial in BC networks, especially in the consumption/production billing of grid usage, registration of new customers in the system, and other grid management procedures. However, the security, privacy, immutability, and accountability attributes of the energy system procured by BC technology, its physical security and security of supply, the technical and commercial quality of the system, improved efficiency of grid operations, reductions in technical losses, and sustainability of the entire energy system must remain under the control of the DSO. These inseparable features of the energy network make the DSO crucial and more important than ever.

VI. CONCLUSION

Many studies have discussed the benefits of blockchain applications and the possible negative aspects of the energy sector. In short, it seems that DERs, microgrids, and particularly electric vehicles (EVs) and charging facility units (CFUs) will be emergent actors of the electricity grid, and from the DSOs' perspective, there will be challenges on the grid, such as the short-term peak load management problem and grid capacity concerns due to the quick charging technology and instant energy production changes. However, the security, privacy, scalability, and transaction speed of blockchain technologies in the energy sector are other concerns. Despite blockchain's magnificent decentralized solutions, the role of DSOs is undeniable because of the existing grid structure. Numerous blockchain-based studies have highlighted EVs, energy markets, distributed energy resources (DERs), microgrids, and demand response (DR) from the perspective of appropriateness. Nevertheless, the applicability of blockchain in the energy system and the considerable need for the current operation of DSOs have mostly not been extensively addressed. Although blockchain has a wonderful problem-solving capacity, the transition from conventional to modern blockchain-based power grids is significantly expensive and difficult to realize in a short time. In the short term, building a completely distributed power system will be nearly impossible, and the transition must be examined in depth. We searched and analyzed the blockchain-based energy sector literature and defined DSO-based requirements for potential blockchain applications in the energy sector.

ABBREVIATIONS

DSO: Distribution System Operator
TSO: Transmission System Operator
BC: Blockchain
SCADA: Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
AMI: Advanced Measurement Infrastructure
EVs: Electric Vehicles
EVOs: Electric Vehicle Owners
CFUs: Charging Facility Units
CFUOs: Charging Facility Unit Owners
DERs: Distributed Energy Resources
DG: Distributed Generation
RESs: Renewable Energy Sources
PV: Photovoltaic
SG: Smartgrid
P2P: Peer-to-Peer
V2V: Vehicle-to-Vehicle
V2G: Vehicle-to-Grid
M2M: Machine-to-Machine
B2B: Business-to-Business
DR: Demand Response
DSM: Demand Side Management
ESSs: Energy Storage Systems
CAs: Consensus Algorithms
PoW: Proof-of-Work
PoS: Proof-of-Stake
PoWR: Proof-of-Work based on Reputation
PoB: Proof-of-Benefit
ONPoB: Online Benefit Generating PoB
BFT: Byzantine Fault Tolerance
PBFT: Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance
DBFT: Delegated Byzantine Fault Tolerance
DAG: Directed Acyclic Graph
PoAu: Proof-of-Authority
PoR: Proof-of-Reputation
PoRCH: Proof-of-Random Count in Hashes
LNSM: Neighborhood Search with Memory
ET: Energy Trading
AdBEV: Adaptive Blockchain-based Electric Vehicle Participation
ICT: Information and Communication Technology
OpenADR: Open Automated Demand Response
IoT: Internet-of-Things

REFERENCES

[1] Y. Liu, Y. Yu, N. Gao, and F. Wu, "A Grid as Smart as the Internet," *Engineering*, vol. 6, no. 7, pp. 778–788, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.eng.2019.11.015.

[2] A. Miglani, N. Kumar, V. Chamola, and S. Zeadally, "Blockchain for Internet of Energy management: Review, solutions, and challenges," *Comput. Commun.*, vol. 151, no. January, pp. 395–418, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.comcom.2020.01.014.

[3] Y. Zou, T. Meng, P. Zhang, W. Zhang, and H. Li, "Focus on Blockchain: A Comprehensive Survey on Academic and Application," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 187182–187201, 2020, doi: 10.1109/access.2020.3030491.

[4] Q. Wang and M. Su, "Integrating blockchain technology into the energy sector - From theory of blockchain to research and application of energy

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

blockchain," *Comput. Sci. Rev.*, vol. 37, p. 100275, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.cosrev.2020.100275.

[5] M. L. Di Silvestre *et al.*, "Blockchain for power systems: Current trends and future applications," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 119, no. November 2019, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2019.109585.

[6] A. Adeyemi *et al.*, "Blockchain technology applications in power distribution systems," *Electr. J.*, vol. 33, no. 8, p. 106817, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.tej.2020.106817.

[7] D. Efanov and P. Roschin, "The all-pervasiveness of the blockchain technology," *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, vol. 123, pp. 116–121, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2018.01.019.

[8] Hasankhani A, Hakimi SM Shafie-khah M, Asadolahi H. (2021). Blockchain technology in the future smart grids: A comprehensive review and frameworks. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, *129*, 106811.

[9] J. Xie *et al.*, "A Survey of Blockchain Technology Applied to Smart Cities: Research Issues and Challenges," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutorials*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 2794–2830, 2019, doi: 10.1109/COMST.2019.2899617.

[10] L. Ante, F. Steinmetz, and I. Fiedler, "Blockchain and energy: A bibliometric analysis and review," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 137, no. October 2020, p. 110597, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2020.110597.

[11] G. Liang, S. R. Weller, F. Luo, J. Zhao, and Z. Y. Dong, "Distributed Blockchain-Based Data Protection Framework for Modern Power Systems Against Cyber Attacks," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 3162–3173, 2019, doi: 10.1109/TSG.2018.2819663.

[12] J. I. G. Alonso *et al.*, "Flexibility services based on openadr protocol for dso level," *Sensors (Switzerland)*, vol. 20, no. 21, pp. 1–24, 2020, doi: 10.3390/s20216266.

[13] T. Gaybullaev, H. Y. Kwon, T. Kim, and M. K. Lee, "Efficient and privacy-preserving energy trading on blockchain using dual binary encoding for inner product encryption†," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1–26, 2021, doi: 10.3390/s21062024.

[14] B. S. Lee, J. G. Song, S. J. Moon, I. H. Park, and J. W. Jang, "Blockchain Architectures for P2P Energy Trading between Neighbors," *ICTC 2019 - 10th Int. Conf. ICT Converg. ICT Converg. Lead. Auton. Futur.*, pp. 1013–1017, 2019, doi: 10.1109/ICTC46691.2019.8939856.

[15] G. C. Lazaroiu and M. Roscia, "Blockchain and smart metering towards sustainable prosumers," *SPEEDAM 2018 - Proc. Int. Symp. Power Electron. Electr. Drives, Autom. Motion*, pp. 550–555, 2018, doi: 10.1109/SPEEDAM.2018.8445384.

[16] Y. M. Kim, D. Jung, Y. Chang, and D. H. Choi, "Intelligent micro energy grid in 5G era: Platforms, business cases, testbeds, and next generation applications," *Electron.*, vol. 8, no. 4, 2019, doi: 10.3390/electronics8040468.

[17] G. Suciu *et al.*, "Securing the Smart Grid: A Blockchain-based Secure Smart Energy System," *2019 54th Int. Univ. Power Eng. Conf. UPEC 2019 - Proc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1109/UPEC.2019.8893484.

[18] M. F. Zia, M. Benbouzid, E. Elbouchikhi, S. M. Muyeen, K. Techato, and J. M. Guerrero, "Microgrid transactive energy: Review, architectures, distributed ledger technologies, and market analysis," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 19410–19432, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2968402.

[19] E. Mengelkamp, J. Gärttner, K. Rock, S. Kessler, L. Orsini, and C. Weinhardt, "Designing microgrid energy markets: A case study: The Brooklyn Microgrid," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 210, pp. 870–880, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.06.054.

[20] B. Teufel, A. Sentic, and M. Barmet, "Blockchain energy: Blockchain in future energy systems," *J. Electron. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 17, no. 4, p. 100011, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jnlest.2020.100011.

[21] K. Hojčková, B. Sandén, and H. Ahlborg, "Three electricity futures: Monitoring the emergence of alternative system architectures," *Futures*, vol. 98, no. June 2017, pp. 72–89, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.futures.2017.12.004.

[22] H. Khajeh, H. Laaksonen, A. S. Gazafroud, and M. Shafie-Khah, "Towards flexibility trading at TSO-DSO-customer levels: A review," *Energies*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–19, 2019, doi: 10.3390/en13010165.

[23] M. R. M. Cruz, D. Z. Fitiwi, S. F. Santos, and J. P. S. Catalão, "A comprehensive survey of flexibility options for supporting the low-carbon energy future," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 97, no. August, pp. 338–353, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2018.08.028.

[24] M. B. Mollah *et al.*, "Blockchain for Future Smart Grid: A Comprehensive Survey," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 18–43, 2021, doi: 10.1109/JIOT.2020.2993601.

[25] T. Alladi, V. Chamola, J. J. P. C. Rodrigues, and S. A. Kozlov, "Blockchain in smart grids: A review on different use cases," *Sensors (Switzerland)*, vol. 19, no. 22, pp. 1–25, 2019, doi: 10.3390/s19224862.

[26] A. Ahl, M. Yarime, K. Tanaka, and D. Sagawa, "Review of blockchain-based distributed energy: Implications for institutional development," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 107, no. November 2018, pp. 200–211, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2019.03.002.

[27] J. Li *et al.*, "Decentralized On-Demand Energy Supply for Blockchain in Internet of Things: A Microgrids Approach," *IEEE Trans. Comput. Soc. Syst.*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 1395–1406, 2019, doi: 10.1109/TCSS.2019.2917335.

[28] J. Wu and N. K. Tran, "Application of blockchain technology in sustainable energy systems: An overview," *Sustain.*, vol. 10, no. 9, pp. 1–22, 2018, doi: 10.3390/su10093067.

[29] Yaga D, Mell P, Roby N, Scarfone K. Blockchain technology overview. arXiv preprint 2019; arXiv:1906.11078.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

[30] Kaderali F. Foundations and Applications of Cryptology 2007. Retrieved from https://www.kaderali.de

[31] Mingxiao D, Xiaofeng M, Zhe Z, Xiangwei W, Qijun C. A review on consensus algorithm of blockchain. In 2017 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC); 2567-2572: IEEE.

[32] Macrinici D, Cartofeanu C, Gao S. Smart contract applications within blockchain technology: A systematic mapping study. Telematics and Informatics 2018.

[33] Wang S, Ouyang, L, Yuan Y, Ni X, Han X et al. Blockchain-Enabled Smart Contracts: Architecture, Applications, and Future Trends 2019; IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems.

[34] Sultan K, Ruhi U, Lakhani R. Conceptualizing Blockchains: Characteristics \& Applications 2018. arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.03693.

[35] Di Pierro M. What is the blockchain. Computing in Science Engineering 2017; 19(5): 92-95.

[36] C. Fan, S. Ghaemi, H. Khazaei, and P. Musilek, "Performance Evaluation of Blockchain Systems: A Systematic Survey," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 126927–126950, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3006078.

[37] M. Andoni *et al.*, "Blockchain technology in the energy sector: A systematic review of challenges and opportunities," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 100, no. November 2018, pp. 143–174, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2018.10.014.

[38] A. S. Yahaya, N. Javaid, M. U. Javed, M. Shafiq, W. Z. Khan, and M. Y. Aalsalem, "Blockchain-Based Energy Trading and Load Balancing Using Contract Theory and Reputation in a Smart Community," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 222168–222186, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3041931.

[39] Guo, J., Ding, X., & Wu, W. (2020). A blockchain-enabled ecosystem for distributed electricity trading in smart city. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, *8*(3), 2040-2050.

[40] C. T. Nguyen, D. T. Hoang, D. N. Nguyen, D. Niyato, H. T. Nguyen, and E. Dutkiewicz, "Proof-of-Stake Consensus Mechanisms for Future Blockchain Networks: Fundamentals, Applications and Opportunities," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 85727–85745, 2019, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2925010.

[41] C. Liu, K. K. Chai, X. Zhang, and Y. Chen, "Proof-of-benefit: A blockchain-enabled ev charging scheme," *IEEE Veh. Technol. Conf.*, vol. 2019-April, 2019, doi: 10.1109/VTCSpring.2019.8746399.

[42] Sun, G., Dai, M., Zhang, F., Yu, H., Du, X., & Guizani, M. (2020). Blockchain-enhanced high-confidence energy sharing in Internet of electric vehicles. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, *7*(9), 7868-7882.

[43] Chen, X., & Zhang, X. (2019). Secure electricity trading and incentive contract model for electric vehicle based on energy blockchain. *IEEE Access*, *7*, 178763-178778.

[44] Jiang, Y., Zhou, K., Lu, X., & Yang, S. (2020). Electricity trading pricing among prosumers with game theory-based model in energy blockchain environment. *Applied Energy*, *271*, 115239.

[45] Su, Z., Wang, Y., Xu, Q., Fei, M., Tian, Y. C., & Zhang, N. (2018). A secure charging scheme for electric vehicles with smart communities in energy blockchain. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, *6*(3), 4601-4613.

[46] Boualouache, A., Sedjelmaci, H., & Engel, T. (2021). Consortium Blockchain for Cooperative Location Privacy Preservation in 5G-enabled Vehicular Fog Computing. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*.

[47] C Duan, Q., Quynh, N. V., Abdullah, H. M., Almalaq, A., Do, T. D., Abdelkader, S. M., & Mohamed, M. A. (2020). Optimal scheduling and management of a smart city within the safe framework. IEEE Access, 8, 161847-161861.

[48] W H. Liu, C. W. Lin, E. Kang, S. Shiraishi, and D. M. Blough, "A byzantine-tolerant distributed consensus algorithm for connected vehicles using proof-of-eligibility," *MSWiM 2019 - Proc. 22nd Int. ACM Conf. Model. Anal. Simul. Wirel. Mob. Syst.*, pp. 225–234, 2019, doi: 10.1145/3345768.3355910.

[49] S. Kaur, S. Chaturvedi, A. Sharma, and J. Kar, "A Research Survey on Applications of Consensus Protocols in Blockchain," *Secur. Commun. Networks*, vol. 2021, 2021, doi: 10.1155/2021/6693731.

[50] H. Liu, Y. Zhang, S. Zheng, and Y. Li, "Electric Vehicle Power Trading Mechanism Based on Blockchain and Smart Contract in V2G Network," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 160546–160558, 2019, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2951057.

[51] A. Sheikh, V. Kamuni, A. Urooj, S. Wagh, N. Singh, and D. Patel, "Secured Energy Trading Using Byzantine-Based Blockchain Consensus," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 8554–8571, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2963325.

[52] Y. Wang, Z. Su, and N. Zhang, "Bsis: Blockchain-based secure incentive scheme for energy delivery in vehicular energy network," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informatics*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 3620–3631, 2019, doi: 10.1109/TII.2019.2908497.

[53] X. Kong, J. Zhang, H. Wang, and J. Shu, "Decentralized multi-chain data management framework for power systems," *CSEE J. Power Energy Syst.*, 2019, doi: 10.17775/cseejpes.2018.00820.

[54] M. T. Hossain, S. Badsha, and H. Shen, "PoRCH: A novel consensus mechanism for blockchain-enabled future SCADA systems in smart grids and industry 4.0," *IEMTRONICS 2020 - Int. IOT, Electron. Mechatronics Conf. Proc.*, pp. 0–6, 2020, doi: 10.1109/IEMTRONICS51293.2020.9216438.

[55] J. M. Anita and R. Raina, "Review on Smart Grid Communication Technologies," *Proc. 2019 Int. Conf. Comput. Intell. Knowl. Econ. ICCIKE 2019*, pp. 215–220, 2019, doi: 10.1109/ICCIKE47802.2019.9004389.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

[56] A. O. Gomez Rivera and D. K. Tosh, "Towards security and privacy of SCADA systems through decentralized architecture," *Proc. - 6th Annu. Conf. Comput. Sci. Comput. Intell. CSCI 2019*, pp. 1224–1229, 2019, doi: 10.1109/CSCI49370.2019.00230.

[57] Y. B. Son, J. H. Im, H. Y. Kwon, S. Y. Jeon, and M. K. Lee, "Privacy-preserving peer-to-peer energy trading in blockchain-enabled smart grids using functional encryption," *Energies*, vol. 16, no. 3, 2020, doi: 10.3390/en13061321.

[58] Y. Kabalci, "A survey on smart metering and smart grid communication," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 57, pp. 302–318, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.114.

[59] C. Plaza, J. Gil, and K. A. Strang, "Distributed solar self-consumption and blockchain," pp. 2018–2021, 2018.

[60] Y. Wang, F. Luo, Z. Dong, Z. Tong, and Y. Qiao, "Distributed meter data aggregation framework based on Blockchain and homomorphic encryption," *IET Cyber-Physical Syst. Theory Appl.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 30–37, 2019, doi: 10.1049/iet-cps.2018.5054.

[61] S. M. S. Hussain, S. M. Farooq, and T. S. Ustun, "Implementation of Blockchain technology for Energy Trading with Smart Meters," *2019 Innov. Power Adv. Comput. Technol. i-PACT 2019*, 2019, doi: 10.1109/i-PACT44901.2019.8960243.

[62] Z. A. El Houda, A. Hafid, and L. Khoukhi, "Blockchain Meets AMI: Towards Secure Advanced Metering Infrastructures," *IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, vol. 2020-June, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ICC40277.2020.9148963.

[63] A. Meeuw *et al.*, "Implementing a blockchain-based local energy market: Insights on communication and scalability," *Comput. Commun.*, vol. 160, no. April, pp. 158–171, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.comcom.2020.04.038.

[64] N. H. Motlagh, M. Mohammadrezaei, J. Hunt, and B. Zakeri, "Internet of things (IoT) and the energy sector," *Energies*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 1–27, 2020, doi: 10.3390/en13020494.

[65] S. M. S. Hussain, S. M. Farooq, and T. S. Ustun, "Implementation of Blockchain technology for Energy Trading with Smart Meters," *2019 Innov. Power Adv. Comput. Technol. i-PACT 2019*, pp. 11–15, 2019, doi: 10.1109/i-PACT44901.2019.8960243.

[66] J. Gao *et al.*, "GridMonitoring: Secured Sovereign Blockchain Based Monitoring on Smart Grid," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 9917–9925, 2018, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2806303.

[67] S. K. Kim and J. H. Huh, "A study on the improvement of smart grid security performance and blockchain smart grid perspective," *Energies*, vol. 11, no. 8, 2018, doi: 10.3390/en11081973.

[68] Z. Zeng *et al.*, "Blockchain technology for information security of the energy internet: Fundamentals, features, strategy and application," *Energies*, vol. 13, no. 4, 2020, doi: 10.3390/en13040881.

[69] C. Lazaroiu, M. Roscia, and S. Saatmandi, "Blockchain strategies and policies for sustainable electric mobility into Smart City," *2020 Int. Symp. Power Electron. Electr. Drives, Autom. Motion, SPEEDAM 2020*, pp. 363–368, 2020, doi: 10.1109/SPEEDAM48782.2020.9161832.

[70] C. Thiel, W. Nijs, S. Simoes, J. Schmidt, A. van Zyl, and E. Schmid, "The impact of the EU car CO2 regulation on the energy system and the role of electro-mobility to achieve transport decarbonisation," *Energy Policy*, vol. 96, no. 2016, pp. 153–166, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2016.05.043.

[71] J. Green and P. Newman, "Citizen utilities: The emerging power paradigm," *Energy Policy*, vol. 105, no. June 2016, pp. 283–293, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2017.02.004.

[72] S. Sachan and N. Kishor, "Optimal location for centralized charging of electric vehicle in distribution network," *Proc. 18th Mediterr. Electrotech. Conf. Intell. Effic. Technol. Serv. Citizen, MELECON 2016*, no. April, pp. 18–20, 2016, doi: 10.1109/MELCON.2016.7495326.

[73] H. Hayajneh, M. B. Salim, S. Bashetty, and X. Zhang, "Logistics system planning for battery-powered electric vehicle charging station networks," *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, vol. 1311, no. 1, pp. 2019–2022, 2019, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1311/1/012025.

[74] [X. Huang, C. Xu, P. Wang, and H. Liu, "LNSC: A Security Model for Electric Vehicle and Charging Pile Management Based on Blockchain Ecosystem," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 13565–13574, 2018, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2812176.

[75] C. Lazaroiu, M. Roscia, and S. Saadatmandi, "Blockchain and Fuzzy Logic Application in EV's Charging," *9th Int. Conf. Renew. Energy Res. Appl. ICRERA 2020*, pp. 315–320, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ICRERA49962.2020.9242662.

[76] Z. Li, J. Kang, R. Yu, D. Ye, Q. Deng, and Y. Zhang, "Consortium blockchain for secure energy trading in industrial internet of things," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informatics*, vol. 14, no. 8, pp. 3690–3700, 2018, doi: 10.1109/TII.2017.2786307.

[77] N. Lasla, M. Al-Ammari, M. Abdallah, and M. Younis, "Blockchain Based Trading Platform for Electric Vehicle Charging in Smart Cities," *IEEE Open J. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 1, no. July, pp. 80–92, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ojits.2020.3004870.

[78] F. Knirsch, A. Unterweger, and D. Engel, "Privacy-preserving blockchain-based electric vehicle charging with dynamic tariff decisions," *Comput. Sci. - Res. Dev.*, vol. 33, no. 1–2, pp. 71–79, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s00450-017-0348-5.

[79] Z. Fu, P. Dong, and Y. Ju, "An intelligent electric vehicle charging system for new energy companies based on consortium blockchain," *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 261, p. 121219, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121219.

[80] S. Sharma, A. Mathur, K. Choudhary, and P. Singh, "Blockchain Enabled Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure," *Proc. 2nd Int. Conf. Inven. Res. Comput. Appl. ICIRCA 2020*, pp. 975–979, 2020, doi:

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

10.1109/ICIRCA48905.2020.9183298.

[81] M. Pustišek, A. Kos, and U. Sedlar, "Blockchain based autonomous selection of electric vehicle charging station," *Proc. - 2016 Int. Conf. Identification, Inf. Knowl. Internet Things, IIKI 2016*, vol. 2018-Janua, pp. 217–222, 2018, doi: 10.1109/IIKI.2016.60.

[82] A. Kumari, A. Shukla, R. Gupta, S. Tanwar, S. Tyagi, and N. Kumar, "ET-DeaL: A P2P smart contract-based secure energy trading scheme for smart grid systems," *IEEE INFOCOM 2020 - IEEE Conf. Comput. Commun. Work. INFOCOM WKSHPS 2020*, pp. 1051–1056, 2020, doi: 10.1109/INFOCOMWKSHPS50562.2020.9162989.

[83] D. Gabay, K. Akkaya, and M. Cebe, "Privacy-Preserving Authentication Scheme for Connected Electric Vehicles Using Blockchain and Zero Knowledge Proofs," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 69, no. 6, pp. 5760–5772, 2020, doi: 10.1109/TVT.2020.2977361.

[84] C. Liu, K. K. Chai, X. Zhang, E. T. Lau, and Y. Chen, "Adaptive Blockchain-Based Electric Vehicle Participation Scheme in Smart Grid Platform," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 25657–25665, 2018, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2835309.

[85] Z. Zhou, B. Wang, Y. Guo, and Y. Zhang, "Blockchain and Computational Intelligence Inspired Incentive-Compatible Demand Response in Internet of Electric Vehicles," *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Top. Comput. Intell.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 205–216, 2019, doi: 10.1109/TETCI.2018.2880693.

[86] Y. Matsuda and K. Tanaka, "EV mobility charging service based on blockchain," *Proc. - 2020 IEEE Int. Conf. Environ. Electr. Eng. 2020 IEEE Ind. Commer. Power Syst. Eur. EEEIC / I CPS Eur. 2020*, 2020, doi: 10.1109/EEEIC/ICPSEurope49358.2020.9160608.

[87] Y. Li and B. Hu, "A Consortium Blockchain-enabled Secure and Privacy-Preserving Optimized Charging and Discharging Trading Scheme for Electric Vehicles," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informatics*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 1–1, 2020, doi: 10.1109/tii.2020.2990732.

[88] N. M. Kumar *et al.*, "Distributed Energy Resources and the Application of AI, IoT, and Blockchain in Smart Grids," *Energies*, vol. 13, no. 21, p. 5739, 2020, doi: 10.3390/en13215739.

[89] Y. Zhou, J. Wu, and C. Long, "Evaluation of peer-to-peer energy sharing mechanisms based on a multiagent simulation framework," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 222, no. February, pp. 993–1022, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.02.089.

[90] M. Shahidehpour and M. Fotuhi-Friuzabad, "Grid modernization for enhancing the resilience, reliability, economics, sustainability, and security of electricity grid in an uncertain environment," *Sci. Iran.*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 2862–2873, 2016, doi: 10.24200/sci.2016.3995.

[91] Z. Li, S. Bahramirad, A. Paaso, M. Yan, and M. Shahidehpour, "Blockchain for decentralized transactive energy management system in networked microgrids," *Electr. J.*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 58–72, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.tej.2019.03.008.

[92] C. Banks *et al.*, "Blockchain for Power Grids," *Conf. Proc. - IEEE SOUTHEASTCON*, vol. 2019-April, pp. 1–5, 2019, doi: 10.1109/SoutheastCon42311.2019.9020573.

[93] A. Hirsch, Y. Parag, and J. Guerrero, "Microgrids: A review of technologies, key drivers, and outstanding issues," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 90, no. March, pp. 402–411, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2018.03.040.

[94] C. Zhang, J. Wu, C. Long, and M. Cheng, "Review of Existing Peer-to-Peer Energy Trading Projects," *Energy Procedia*, vol. 105, pp. 2563–2568, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.737.

[95] G. van Leeuwen, T. AlSkaif, M. Gibescu, and W. van Sark, "An integrated blockchain-based energy management platform with bilateral trading for microgrid communities," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 263, no. January, p. 114613, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.114613.

[96] Y. Yoldaş, A. Önen, S. M. Muyeen, A. V. Vasilakos, and İ. Alan, "Enhancing smart grid with microgrids: Challenges and opportunities," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 72, no. January, pp. 205–214, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2017.01.064.

[97] C. Shen and F. Pena-Mora, "Blockchain for Cities - A Systematic Literature Review," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 76787–76819, 2018, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2880744.

[98] C. Crasta, H. Agabus, and I. Palu, "Blockchain for EU electricity market," *Proc. - 2020 IEEE Int. Conf. Environ. Electr. Eng. 2020 IEEE Ind. Commer. Power Syst. Eur. EEEIC / I CPS Eur. 2020*, 2020, doi: 10.1109/EEEIC/ICPSEurope49358.2020.9160575.

[99] D. Orazgaliyev, Y. Lukpanov, I. A. Ukaegbu, and H. S. V. Sivanand Kumar Nunna, "Towards the Application of Blockchain technology for Smart Grids in Kazakhstan," *Int. Conf. Adv. Commun. Technol. ICACT*, vol. 2019-Febru, pp. 273–278, 2019, doi: 10.23919/ICACT.2019.8701996.

[100] X. Zhu, "Application of Blockchain Technology in Energy Internet Market and Transaction," *IOP Conf. Ser. Mater. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 592, no. 1, 2019, doi: 10.1088/1757-899X/592/1/012159.

[101] Guerrero J, Chapman AC, Verbic G. Decentralized P2P energy trading under network constraints in a low-voltage network. 2018. IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid, 10(5), 5163-5173.

[102] T. Morstyn, A. Teytelboym, and M. D. McCulloch, "Designing decentralized markets for distribution system flexibility," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 1–12, 2019, doi: 10.1109/TPWRS.2018.2886244.

[103] Y. Zou, J. Zhao, X. Gao, Y. Chen, and A. Tohidi, "Experimental results of electric vehicles effects on low voltage grids," *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 255, p. 120270, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120270.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

[104] J. Guerrero, B. Sok, A. C. Chapman, and G. Verbič, "Electrical-distance driven peer-to-peer energy trading in a low-voltage network," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 287, no. January, p. 116598, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.116598.

[105] S. Eisele, T. Eghtesad, K. Campanelli, P. Agrawal, A. Laszka, and A. Dubey, "Safe and private forward-trading platform for transactive microgrids," *ACM Trans. Cyber-Physical Syst.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–29, 2021, doi: 10.1145/3403711.

[106] Pee SJ, Kang ES, Song JG, Jang JW. Blockchain based smart energy trading platform using smart contract. In: 2019 int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Inf. Commun.; 2019. p. 322–325.

[107] S. Noor, W. Yang, M. Guo, K. H. van Dam, and X. Wang, "Energy Demand Side Management within micro-grid networks enhanced by blockchain," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 228, no. June, pp. 1385–1398, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.07.012.

[108] C. Pop, T. Cioara, M. Antal, I. Anghel, I. Salomie, and M. Bertoncini, "Blockchain based decentralized management of demand response programs in smart energy grids," *Sensors (Switzerland)*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2018, doi: 10.3390/s18010162.

[109] M. Stephant, K. Hassam-Ouari, D. Abbes, A. Labrunie, and B. Robyns, "A survey on energy management and blockchain for collective self-consumption," *2018 7th Int. Conf. Syst. Control. ICSC 2018*, pp. 237–243, 2018, doi: 10.1109/ICoSC.2018.8587812.

[110] L. Thomas, Y. Zhou, C. Long, J. Wu, and N. Jenkins, "A general form of smart contract for decentralized energy systems management," *Nat. Energy*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 140–149, 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41560-018-0317-7.

[111] J. Ali, S. Massucco, and F. Silvestro, "Distribution level aggregator platform for DSO support-integration of storage, demand response, and renewables," *Front. Energy Res.*, vol. 7, no. APR, pp. 1–13, 2019, doi: 10.3389/fenrg.2019.00036.

[112] F. Lezama, J. Soares, B. Canizes, and Z. Vale, "Flexibility management model of home appliances to support DSO requests in smart grids," *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, vol. 55, no. January, p. 102048, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scs.2020.102048.

[113] M. L. Di Silvestre, P. Gallo, E. R. Sanseverino, G. Sciume, and G. Zizzo, "A new architecture for Smart Contracts definition in Demand Response Programs," *Proc. - 2019 IEEE Int. Conf. Environ. Electr. Eng. 2019 IEEE Ind. Commer. Power Syst. Eur. EEEIC/I CPS Eur. 2019*, 2019, doi: 10.1109/EEEIC.2019.8783960.

[114] L. Edmonds, B. Liu, H. Zhang, C. Scoglio, D. Gruenbacher, and H. Wu, "Blockchain-Enabled Transactive Home Energy Management Systems in Distribution Networks," *2020 IEEE Kansas Power Energy Conf. KPEC 2020*, 2020, doi: 10.1109/KPEC47870.2020.9167602.

[115] David Brown. (2020). The economics of costly demand response. The Electricity Journal, 33(8):106821, doi: 10.1016/j.tej.2020.106821.

[116] X. Wu, B. Duan, Y. Yan, and Y. Zhong, "M2M blockchain: The case of demand side management of smart grid," *Proc. Int. Conf. Parallel Distrib. Syst. - ICPADS*, vol. 2017-Decem, pp. 810–813, 2018, doi: 10.1109/ICPADS.2017.00113.

[117] ENTSO-e. (2015). Towards smarter grids: developing TSO and DSO roles and interactions for the benefit of consumers.

[118] H. Gerard, E. I. Rivero Puente, and D. Six, "Coordination between transmission and distribution system operators in the electricity sector: A conceptual framework," *Util. Policy*, vol. 50, pp. 40–48, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jup.2017.09.011.

[119] R. Schwerdfeger, S. Schlegel, T. Jiang, and D. Westermann, "Approach for load frequency control participation by decentralized energy devices," *IEEE Power Energy Soc. Gen. Meet.*, vol. 2015-Septe, pp. 2–6, 2015, doi: 10.1109/PESGM.2015.7285929.

[120] E. Mengelkamp, B. Notheisen, C. Beer, D. Dauer, and C. Weinhardt, "A blockchain-based smart grid: towards sustainable local energy markets," *Comput. Sci. - Res. Dev.*, vol. 33, no. 1–2, pp. 207–214, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s00450-017-0360-9.

[121] M. L. Di Silvestre *et al.*, "Ancillary Services in the Energy Blockchain for Microgrids," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Appl.*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 7310–7319, 2019, doi: 10.1109/TIA.2019.2909496.

[122] A. M. Eltamaly, Y. Sayed, and A. N. A. Elghaffar, "Optimum power flow analysis by Newton Raphson method, a case study," *A NNALS Fac. Eng. Hunedoara – Int. J. Eng.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 51–58, 2018.

[123] T. Alskaif and G. Van Leeuwen, "Decentralized Optimal Power Flow in Distribution Networks Using Blockchain," *SEST 2019 - 2nd Int. Conf. Smart Energy Syst. Technol.*, pp. 1–6, 2019, doi: 10.1109/SEST.2019.8849153.

[124] C. D. Zamuda and A. Ressler, "Federal adaptation and mitigation programs supporting Community investment in electricity resilience to extreme weather," *Electr. J.*, vol. 33, no. 8, p. 106825, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.tej.2020.106825.

[125] Ahmad, L., Khanji, S., Iqbal, F., & Kamoun, F. (2020, August). Blockchain-based chain of custody: towards real-time tamper-proof evidence management. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security* (pp. 1-8).

[126] A. N. Shwetha and C. P. Prabodh, "Blockchain - Bringing Accountability in the Public Distribution System," *2019 4th IEEE Int. Conf. Recent Trends Electron. Information, Commun. Technol. RTEICT 2019 - Proc.*, pp. 330–335, 2019, doi: 10.1109/RTEICT46194.2019.9016903.

[127] A. Alketbi, Q. Nasir, and M. A. Talib, "Blockchain for government services-Use cases, security benefits and challenges," *2018 15th Learn. Technol. Conf. L T*

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

2018, pp. 112–119, 2018, doi: 10.1109/LT.2018.8368494.

[128] W. Hua and H. Sun, "A Blockchain-Based Peer-to-Peer Trading Scheme Coupling Energy and Carbon Markets," *SEST 2019 - 2nd Int. Conf. Smart Energy Syst. Technol.*, pp. 1–6, 2019, doi: 10.1109/SEST.2019.8849111.

[129] R. Keypour and S. Bazyari, "Optimal scheduling of DERs in a micro-grid by considering CO2 emissions trade," pp. 1–8, 2015, doi: 10.1109/sgc.2014.7151037.

[130] T. Kobashi *et al.*, "On the potential of 'Photovoltaics + Electric vehicles' for deep decarbonization of Kyoto's power systems: Techno-economic-social considerations," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 275, no. March, p. 115419, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115419.

[131] W. Choi, E. Yoo, E. Seol, M. Kim, and H. H. Song, "Greenhouse gas emissions of conventional and alternative vehicles: Predictions based on energy policy analysis in South Korea," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 265, no. February, p. 114754, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.114754.

[132] Y. Pan *et al.*, "Application of blockchain in carbon trading," *Energy Procedia*, vol. 158, pp. 4286–4291, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.egypro.2019.01.509.

[133] H. Vranken, "Sustainability of bitcoin and blockchains," *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, vol. 28, pp. 1–9, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.cosust.2017.04.011.

[134] C. Stoll, L. Klaaßen, and U. Gallersdörfer, "The Carbon Footprint of Bitcoin," *Joule*, vol. 3, no. 7, pp. 1647–1661, 2019, doi: 10.1,016/j.joule.2019.05.012.

[135] E. Erturk, D. Lopez, and W. Y. Yu, "Benefits and risks of using blockchain in smart energy: A literature review," *Contemp. Manag. Res.*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 205–225, 2019, doi: 10.7903/cmr.19650.

[136] N. M. Kumar and P. K. Mallick, "Blockchain technology for security issues and challenges in IoT," *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, vol. 132, pp. 1815–1823, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2018.05.140.

[137] V. Kulkarni and K. Kulkarni, "A Blockchain-based Smart Grid Model for Rural Electrification in India," *8th Int. Conf. Smart Grid, icSmartGrid 2020*, pp. 133–139, 2020, doi: 10.1109/icSmartGrid49881.2020.9144898.

[138] A. Joseph and P. Balachandra, "Smart Grid to Energy Internet: A Systematic Review of Transitioning Electricity Systems," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 215787–215805, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3041031.

[139] Baashar Y, Alkawsi G, Alkahtani AA, Hashim W et al. Toward Blockchain Technology in the Energy Environment. 2021. Sustainability, 13(16), 9008.



Ahmet Yagmur received the B.S. degree in Electrical and Electronics Engineering from Gazi University, Ankara, in 2010. He is a graduate student having an education at Abdullah Gul University, Graduate School of Engineering and Science.

From 2010 to 2011, he was working for a high voltage cable manufacturer as a test engineer, Hascelik Cable. From 2011 to 2012, he was working for CEDAS (Electricity Distribution Company), Sivas. From 2012 to today, he has been working as a distribution project engineer, smart meter (AMI) engineer, and electricity marketing operation expert respectively for KCETAS (Electricity Distribution Company), Kayseri, Turkey. His current research interest includes the energy market, DSO-TSO operations, Smart Grid, and blockchain.



Beyhan Adanur Dedeturk received his M.S. degree in Electrical and Computer Engineering from Abdullah Gül University, Kayseri, Turkey, in 2020. She also received her B.S. degree in Computer Engineering from Erciyes University, Kayseri, Turkey, in 2017. She is a Research Assistant with the Department of Computer Engineering, Abdullah Gül University, Kayseri, Turkey. Her current research interests include Bioinformatics, Blockchain and Network Security.



Ahmet Soran received the B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees in computer engineering from TOBB ETU, Ankara, Turkey, in 2009 and 2012, respectively, and the Ph.D. degree in computer science and engineering from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), in 2017. He joined the computer engineering department at Abdullah Gul University, Kayseri, Turkey in 2018. His research interests include graph theory applications, network communications, device-to-device protocols, network and traffic management, network architecture, smart grids, internet of things, cyber-security, and privacy. He is a member of IEEE.



Jaesung Jung (M'09) received the B.S. degree in electrical engineering from Chungnam National University, Korea; the M.S. degree in electrical engineering from the North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC; and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from the Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA. He is currently a faculty member in the Department of Energy Systems Research at Ajou University, Korea. His research interests include the development and deployment of renewable and sustainable energy technologies.



Ahmet Onen received the B.Sc. degree in Electrical-Electronics Engineering from Gaziantep University in 2005. He received the M.S degree in Electrical-Computer Engineering from Clemson University in 2010 and his Ph.D. from Virginia Tech – Electrical and Computer Engineering Department in 2014. He is currently Turkish Transmission Network (TEIAS)

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3122987, IEEE Access

Academic Advisor. He is currently working as an Assoc. Prof. in Sultan Qaboos University.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License. For more information, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/