- MODULE TLCVDFConsensus

```
CONSTANTS
    p1,\;p2,\;p3
\begin{array}{ccc} P & \stackrel{\triangle}{=} & \{p1, \ p2, \ p3\} \\ B & \stackrel{\triangle}{=} & \{p1\} \\ tAdv & \stackrel{\triangle}{=} & 2 \end{array}
tWB \stackrel{\triangle}{=} 3 the adversary has a 1.5x advantage
INSTANCE VDFConsensus
 The TLC model-checker confirms all the assumptions below.
ASSUME Intersection(\{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}\}) = \{2\}
Assume Intersection(\{\}) = \{\}
ASSUME Intersection(\{\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}\}) = \{\}
m1 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} [id \mapsto 1, round \mapsto 0, pred \mapsto \{\}] well-behaved message
m2 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} [id \mapsto 2, round \mapsto 0, pred \mapsto \{\}] well-behaved message
m3 \triangleq [id \mapsto 3, round \mapsto 0, pred \mapsto \{\}] malicious message
m4 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} [id \mapsto 4, round \mapsto 1, pred \mapsto \{m1, m2\}] well-behaved message
m_5 \triangleq [id \mapsto 5, round \mapsto 1, pred \mapsto \{m_1, m_2, m_3\}] well-behaved message
m6 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} [id \mapsto 6, round \mapsto 1, pred \mapsto \{m1, m3\}] malicious message
Assume \neg ConsistentSet(\{m1, m2, m3\})
Assume ConsistentSet(\{m4, m5\})
Assume \neg ConsistentSet(\{m4, m5, m6\})
Assume ConsistentChain(\{m1, m2, m3\})
ASSUME ConsistentChain(\{m1, m2, m4, m5\})
ASSUME \neg Consistent Chain(\{m1, m2, m3, m4, m5\}) m3 is not a predecessor of m4
ASSUME \neg ConsistentChain(\{m1, m2, m3, m4, m5, m6\}) \ \{m4, m5, m6\} is not even consistent
Assume HeaviestConsistentChain(\{m1, m2, m3\}) = \{m1, m2, m3\}
Now we have a problem: the heaviest consistent chain in \{m1, m2, m3, m4, m5\} does not have
all the well-behaved messages. That's because both \{m1, m2, m3, m5\} and \{m1, m2, m4, m5\}
are consistent chains, and we break ties arbitrarily. Should we make more recent messages heavier?
```

Assume $HeaviestConsistentChain(\{m1, m2, m3, m4, m5\}) = \{m1, m2, m3, m5\}$ oops