

EXTENDS *Integers, FiniteSets*

CONSTANTS

$p1, p2, p3$

$P \triangleq \{p1, p2, p3\}$

$B \triangleq \{p1\}$

$tAdv \triangleq 2$

$tWB \triangleq 3$ the adversary has a 1.5x advantage

We use the following definition to bound the state-space for the model-checker

$MaxTick \triangleq 9$

$MCTick \triangleq 0 \dots MaxTick$

$MCRound \triangleq 0 \dots (MaxTick \% tWB)$

$MCMessID \triangleq 0 \dots (MCRound * Cardinality(P))$

VARIABLES *messages, messageCount, pendingMessage, tick, doneTick* , pc

INSTANCE *VDFConsensus*

$TickConstraint \triangleq tick \leq MaxTick$

$Canary1 \triangleq \neg(\forall p \in P : doneTick[p] > 5)$
)

Check that the adversary can indeed outpace the round number of well-behaved nodes:

$Canary2 \triangleq \neg(tick = 6 \wedge \exists m \in messages : m.sender = p1 \wedge m.round = 2)$
)

The *TLC* model-checker confirms all the assumptions below.

ASSUME $Intersection(\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}) = \{2\}$

ASSUME $Intersection(\{1\}) = \{1\}$

ASSUME $Intersection(\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}) = \{1\}$

$m1 \triangleq [id \mapsto 1, round \mapsto 0, coffer \mapsto \{\}]$ well-behaved message

$m2 \triangleq [id \mapsto 2, round \mapsto 0, coffer \mapsto \{\}]$ well-behaved message

$m3 \triangleq [id \mapsto 3, round \mapsto 0, coffer \mapsto \{\}]$ malicious message

$m4 \triangleq [id \mapsto 4, round \mapsto 1, coffer \mapsto \{m1, m2\}]$ well-behaved message

$m5 \triangleq [id \mapsto 5, round \mapsto 1, coffer \mapsto \{m1, m2, m3\}]$ well-behaved message

$m6 \triangleq [id \mapsto 6, round \mapsto 1, coffer \mapsto \{m1, m3\}]$ 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 *ConsistentChain*($\{m1, m2, m3, m4, m5\}$) $m3$ 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
