

This is a specification of *SCP*'s balloting protocol. We work at a high level of abstraction where we do not explicitly model messages. Instead, we track what statements are voted/accepted prepared and committed by each node. What we do model explicitly is how each node  $n$  votes and accepts statements based on its current ballot  $ballot[n]$  and its highest confirmed-prepared ballot  $h[n]$ .

We also do not model *Byzantine* behavior explicitly. Instead, whenever a node checks that a set (a quorum or a blocking set) voted or accepted a statement, it only checks that the non-Byzantine members of the set did so. This soundly models what could happen under *Byzantine* behavior because *Byzantine* nodes, being unconstrained, could have voted or accepted whatever is needed to make the check pass.

We provide an inductive invariant that implies the agreement property, and we check its inductiveness exhaustively for small instances of the domain model.

An informal specification of *SCP* can be found at: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-mazieres-dinrg-scp-05#section-3.5>

EXTENDS *DomainModel*

VARIABLES

$ballot$   
 $h$   
 $voteToPrepare$   
 $acceptedPrepared$   
 $voteToCommit$   
 $acceptedCommitted$   
 $externalized$   
 $byz$  the set of malicious nodes

$TypeOK \triangleq$

$\wedge ballot \in [N \rightarrow BallotOrNull]$   
 $\wedge h \in [N \rightarrow BallotOrNull]$   
 $\wedge voteToPrepare \in [N \rightarrow SUBSET\ Ballot]$   
 $\wedge acceptedPrepared \in [N \rightarrow SUBSET\ Ballot]$   
 $\wedge voteToCommit \in [N \rightarrow SUBSET\ Ballot]$   
 $\wedge acceptedCommitted \in [N \rightarrow SUBSET\ Ballot]$   
 $\wedge externalized \in [N \rightarrow SUBSET\ Ballot]$   
 $\wedge byz \in SUBSET\ N$

$Init \triangleq$

$\wedge ballot = [n \in N \mapsto nullBallot]$  current ballot of each node  
 $\wedge h = [n \in N \mapsto nullBallot]$  current highest confirmed-prepared ballot of each node  
 $\wedge voteToPrepare = [n \in N \mapsto \{\}]$   
 $\wedge acceptedPrepared = [n \in N \mapsto \{\}]$   
 $\wedge voteToCommit = [n \in N \mapsto \{\}]$   
 $\wedge acceptedCommitted = [n \in N \mapsto \{\}]$   
 $\wedge externalized = [n \in N \mapsto \{\}]$   
 $\wedge byz \in FailProneSet$   $byz$  is initially set to an arbitrary fail-prone set

Node  $n$  enters a new ballot and votes to prepare it. Note that  $n$  votes to prepare its new ballot  $ballot'[n]$  regardless of whether it has previously voted to commit an incompatible ballot  $b$ . The main subtlety of the protocol is that this is okay because:

- 1) We must have  $b \prec h[n]$  because, when  $n$  votes to commit  $b$  (see *VoteToCommit*), it sets  $h[n] = b$  if  $h[n] \prec b$ , and subsequently  $h[n]$  can only grow, and
- 2) therefore, if  $h[n].value \neq b.value$ , then  $n$  confirmed  $h[n]$  as prepared (by definition of how  $h[n]$  is updated) and thus we know that, even though  $n$  voted to commit  $b$ ,  $b$  can never gather a quorum of votes to commit.

Note how this reasoning appears in the inductive invariant below.

*IncreaseBallotCounter*( $n, c$ )  $\triangleq$

- $\wedge c > 0$
- $\wedge c > ballot[n].counter$
- $\wedge h[n].counter \leq c$
- $\wedge$  IF  $h[n] \neq nullBallot$ 
  - THEN  $ballot' = [ballot \text{ EXCEPT } ![n] = bal(c, h[n].value)]$
  - ELSE  $\exists v \in V : ballot' = [ballot \text{ EXCEPT } ![n] = bal(c, v)]$
- $\wedge voteToPrepare' = [voteToPrepare \text{ EXCEPT } ![n] = @ \cup \{ballot[n]'\}]$
- $\wedge$  UNCHANGED  $\langle h, acceptedPrepared, voteToCommit, acceptedCommitted, externalized, byz \rangle$

Next we describe when a node accepts and confirms ballots prepared. Nothing surprising here.

Note that we could check that nothing less-and-incompatible is accepted committed. That would simplify the agreement proof but complicate the liveness proof. In any case, it is an invariant that nothing less-and-incompatible is accepted committed at this point (see *AcceptNeverContradictory*).

*AcceptPrepared*( $n, b$ )  $\triangleq$

- $\wedge \forall \exists Q \in Quorum : \forall n2 \in Q \setminus byz : b \in voteToPrepare[n2] \cup acceptedPrepared[n2]$
- $\wedge \forall \exists Bl \in BlockingSet : \forall n2 \in Bl \setminus byz : b \in acceptedPrepared[n2]$
- $\wedge acceptedPrepared' = [acceptedPrepared \text{ EXCEPT } ![n] = @ \cup \{b\}]$
- $\wedge$  UNCHANGED  $\langle ballot, h, voteToPrepare, voteToCommit, acceptedCommitted, externalized, byz \rangle$

*ConfirmPrepared*( $n, b$ )  $\triangleq$

- $\wedge b.counter > -1$
- $\wedge h[n] \prec b$
- $\wedge \exists Q \in Quorum : \forall n2 \in Q \setminus byz : b \in acceptedPrepared[n2]$
- $\wedge h' = [h \text{ EXCEPT } ![n] = b]$
- $\wedge$  UNCHANGED  $\langle ballot, voteToPrepare, acceptedPrepared, voteToCommit, acceptedCommitted, externalized, byz \rangle$

When a node votes to commit a ballot, it must check that it has not already voted or accepted to abort it. This is crucial to avoid externalizing two different values in two different ballots. We also update  $h[n]$  if needed to reflect the new highest-confirmed prepared ballot.

*VoteToCommit*( $n, b$ )  $\triangleq$

- $\wedge b.counter > 0$
- $\wedge b = ballot[n]$
- $\wedge \forall b2 \in Ballot : LessThanAndIncompatible(b, b2) \Rightarrow b2 \notin voteToPrepare[n] \cup acceptedPrepared[n]$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \wedge b \prec h[n] \Rightarrow b.value = h[n].value \\
& \wedge \exists Q \in Quorum : \forall n2 \in Q \setminus byz : b \in acceptedPrepared[n2] \\
& \wedge voteToCommit' = [voteToCommit \text{ EXCEPT } ![n] = @ \cup \{b\}] \\
& \wedge \text{IF } h[n] \preceq b \\
& \quad \text{THEN } h' = [h \text{ EXCEPT } ![n] = b] \\
& \quad \text{ELSE UNCHANGED } h \\
& \wedge \text{UNCHANGED } \langle ballot, voteToPrepare, acceptedPrepared, acceptedCommitted, externalized, byz \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Next we describe when a node accepts and confirms ballots committed. Nothing surprising here.

$$\begin{aligned}
AcceptCommitted(n, b) & \triangleq \\
& \wedge b = ballot[n] \\
& \wedge \vee \exists Q \in Quorum : \forall n2 \in Q \setminus byz : b \in voteToCommit[n2] \\
& \quad \vee \exists Bl \in BlockingSet : \forall n2 \in Bl \setminus byz : b \in acceptedCommitted[n2] \\
& \wedge acceptedCommitted' = [acceptedCommitted \text{ EXCEPT } ![n] = @ \cup \{b\}] \\
& \wedge \text{UNCHANGED } \langle ballot, h, voteToPrepare, acceptedPrepared, voteToCommit, externalized, byz \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Externalize(n, b) & \triangleq \\
& \wedge b = ballot[n] \\
& \wedge \exists Q \in Quorum : \forall n2 \in Q \setminus byz : b \in acceptedCommitted[n2] \\
& \wedge externalized' = [externalized \text{ EXCEPT } ![n] = @ \cup \{b\}] \\
& \wedge \text{UNCHANGED } \langle ballot, h, voteToPrepare, acceptedPrepared, voteToCommit, acceptedCommitted, byz \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we put everything together:

$$\begin{aligned}
Next & \triangleq \\
& \vee \exists n \in N \setminus byz, c \in BallotNumber, v \in V : \\
& \quad \text{LET } b \triangleq bal(c, v) \text{ IN} \\
& \quad \vee IncreaseBallotCounter(n, c) \\
& \quad \vee AcceptPrepared(n, b) \\
& \quad \vee ConfirmPrepared(n, b) \\
& \quad \vee VoteToCommit(n, b) \\
& \quad \vee AcceptCommitted(n, b) \\
& \quad \vee Externalize(n, b)
\end{aligned}$$

$$vars \triangleq \langle ballot, h, voteToPrepare, acceptedPrepared, voteToCommit, acceptedCommitted, externalized, byz \rangle$$

$$Spec \triangleq Init \wedge \square [Next]_{vars}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Agreement & \triangleq \\
& \forall n1, n2 \in N \setminus byz : \forall b1, b2 \in Ballot : \\
& \quad b1 \in externalized[n1] \wedge b2 \in externalized[n2] \Rightarrow b1.value = b2.value
\end{aligned}$$

Here is an inductive invariant that implies agreement:

$$\begin{aligned}
InductiveInvariant & \triangleq \\
& \text{First, the boring stuff:} \\
& \wedge TypeOK
\end{aligned}$$

$\wedge \text{byz} \in \text{FailProneSet}$   
 $\wedge \forall n \in N \setminus \text{byz}, c1, c2 \in \text{BallotNumber}, v1, v2 \in V :$   
 $\text{LET } b1 \triangleq \text{bal}(c1, v1) b2 \triangleq \text{bal}(c2, v2) \text{IN}$   
 $\wedge \text{ballot}[n].\text{counter} > -1 \Rightarrow \text{ballot}[n].\text{counter} > 0$   
 $\wedge b1 \in \text{voteToPrepare}[n] \vee b1 \in \text{voteToCommit}[n] \Rightarrow b1.\text{counter} > 0 \wedge b1.\text{counter} \leq \text{ballot}[n].\text{counter}$   
 $\wedge b1 \in \text{acceptedPrepared}[n] \Rightarrow \exists Q \in \text{Quorum} : \forall n2 \in Q \setminus \text{byz} : b1 \in \text{voteToPrepare}[n2]$   
 $\wedge b1 \in \text{acceptedCommitted}[n] \Rightarrow \exists Q \in \text{Quorum} : \forall n2 \in Q \setminus \text{byz} : b1 \in \text{voteToCommit}[n2]$   
 $\wedge h[n].\text{counter} > 0 \Rightarrow \exists Q \in \text{Quorum} : \forall n2 \in Q \setminus \text{byz} : h[n] \in \text{acceptedPrepared}[n2]$   
 $\wedge b1 \in \text{externalized}[n] \Rightarrow \exists Q \in \text{Quorum} : \forall n2 \in Q \setminus \text{byz} : b1 \in \text{acceptedCommitted}[n2]$   
 $\wedge b1 \in \text{voteToPrepare}[n] \vee b1 \in \text{voteToCommit}[n] \Rightarrow$   
 $\quad \wedge b1.\text{counter} \leq \text{ballot}[n].\text{counter}$   
 $\quad \wedge b1.\text{counter} = \text{ballot}[n].\text{counter} \Rightarrow b1.\text{value} = \text{ballot}[n].\text{value}$   
 $\wedge \text{bal}(c1, v1) \in \text{voteToPrepare}[n] \wedge \text{bal}(c1, v2) \in \text{voteToPrepare}[n] \Rightarrow v1 = v2$   
 $\wedge \text{bal}(c1, v1) \in \text{voteToCommit}[n] \wedge \text{bal}(c1, v2) \in \text{voteToCommit}[n] \Rightarrow v1 = v2$   
 $\wedge b1 \in \text{voteToCommit}[n] \Rightarrow$   
 $\quad \wedge \exists Q \in \text{Quorum} : \forall n2 \in Q \setminus \text{byz} : b1 \in \text{acceptedPrepared}[n2]$   
 $\quad \wedge b1 \preceq h[n] \quad \text{note this is important}$

Next, the crux of the matter:

(in short, a node only overrides “commit  $v$ ” only if it is sure that “commit  $v$ ” cannot reach quorum threshold)

$\wedge \wedge b1 \in \text{voteToCommit}[n]$   
 $\wedge \text{LessThanAndIncompatible}(b1, b2)$   
 $\wedge b2 \in \text{voteToPrepare}[n]$   
 $\Rightarrow \forall Q \in \text{Quorum} : \exists n2 \in Q \setminus \text{byz} :$   
 $\quad b1 \notin \text{voteToCommit}[n2] \wedge \text{ballot}[n2].\text{counter} > b1.\text{counter}$

Finally, our goal:

$\wedge \text{Agreement}$

An additional property implies by the inductive invariant:

$\text{AcceptNeverContradictory} \triangleq \forall b1, b2 \in \text{Ballot}, n1, n2 \in N \setminus \text{byz} :$   
 $\wedge b1 \in \text{acceptedCommitted}[n1]$   
 $\wedge b2 \in \text{acceptedPrepared}[n2]$   
 $\wedge b1 \prec b2$   
 $\Rightarrow b1.\text{value} = b2.\text{value}$