The Extended UTXO Model

Manuel M.T. Chakravarty, James Chapman, Kenneth MacKenzie,
Orestis Melkonian, Michael Peyton Jones, Philip Wadler

(presented by **Alexander Nemish**)

February 14, 2020



INPUT | OUTPUT

Introduction

Blockchain	Model	Turing-complete	Deterministic
 Bitcoin	UTXO	×	✓
 Ethereum	Accounts	✓	×
 Cardano (IOHK)	UTXO^{++}	✓	✓

Methodology

- Focus on validating the relevant meta-theory
  - In contrast to validating individual contracts
- Fully mechanized approach, utilizing Agda's rich type system
- Fits well with IOHK's research-oriented approach



Contributions

- **Detailed description of the Extended UTXO model (EUTXO)**



$$\nu(\rho,\ x,\ \delta,\ \sigma) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{True}$$

- **Formalization in** Agda

- **Proof of bisimulation with a specific form of state machines**



EUTXO, Informally...

UTXO vs EUTXO



$$v(\rho) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{True}$$



$$v(\rho,\ x,\ \delta,\ \sigma) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{True}$$

Example: Asynchronous Multi-signature Contract



Pay value (v) to payee (p) until deadline (d)



- $\delta \in \{\text{Holding}, \text{Collecting}\}$
- $\rho \in \{\text{Propose}, \text{Add}, \text{Cancel}, \text{Pay}\}$



$$v(\rho,\ x,\ \delta,\ \sigma) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{True}$$

Example in the Wild: Marlowe



EUTXO, Formally...

Enhanced Scripting: Data Values & Contract Continuity

1. Data values additionally carried by outputs
   - passed as extra argument of type Data during validation
   - allows a contract to carry data without changing its code
   - otherwise we could not identify a contract by its code's hash
2. More information about the transaction available to the validator
   - passed as extra argument of type TxInfo during validation
   - allows inspection of the transaction's outputs, thus supporting contract continuity (i.e. outputs use the expected validator)

Enhanced Scripting: Validity Intervals & Determinism

3. Transactions have (restricted) access to time
    - addition transaction field: validity interval
    - specifies a time interval, in which the transaction must be processed
    - in contrast to allowing access to the current time
        - allows for deterministic script execution
        - we can pre-calculate consumed resources/time
        - a user can simulate execution locally

Validity of EUTXO Transactions (I)

1. **The current tick is within the validity interval**

$$\text{currentTick} \in t.\mathit{validityInterval}$$

2. **All outputs have non-negative values**

$$\forall o \in t.\mathit{outputs},\ o.\mathit{value} \geq 0$$

3. **All inputs refer to unspent outputs**

$$\{i.\mathit{outputRef} : i \in t.\mathit{inputs}\} \subseteq \text{unspentOutputs}(l)$$

4. **Value is preserved (ignoring fees)**

$$\sum_{i \in t.\mathit{inputs}} \text{getSpentOutput}(i, l).\mathit{value} = \sum_{o \in t.\mathit{outputs}} o.\mathit{value}$$

Validity of EUTXO Transactions (II)

5. **No output is double spent**

   $$\text{If } i_1, i_2 \in t.\mathit{inputs} \text{ and } i_1.\mathit{outputRef} = i_2.\mathit{outputRef} \text{ then } i_1 = i_2$$

6. **All inputs validate**

   $$\forall i \in t.\mathit{inputs},\ [\![i.\mathit{validator}]\!](i.\mathit{data},\ i.\mathit{redeemer},\ \text{toTxInfo}(t, i)) = \text{true}$$

7. **Validator scripts match output addresses**

   $$\forall i \in t.\mathit{inputs},\ \text{scriptAddr}(i.\mathit{validator}) = \text{getSpentOutput}(i, l).\mathit{addr}$$

8. **Data values match output hashes**

   $$\forall i \in t.\mathit{inputs},\ \text{dataHash}(i.\mathit{data}) = \text{getSpentOutput}(i, l).\mathit{dataHash}$$

Expressiveness of EUTXO

Constraint Emitting Machines (CEM)

To formally reason about the expressiveness of EUTXO, we introduce a specific form of state machines:

- Type of states S, type of inputs I
- final : $S \to \text{Bool}$
- step : $S \to I \to \text{Maybe } (S \times \text{TxConstraints})$

These are similar to Mealy machines, but differ in some aspects:

1. No notion of initial states
2. Cannot transition out of a final state
3. Blockchain-specific output values (TxConstraints)
    - these typically are first-order equality constraints on the fields of Tx

Behavioural Equivalence: Notation

- A ledger l corresponds to a CEM state s:

$$l \sim s$$

- New (valid) transaction submitted to ledger l:

$$l \xrightarrow{tx} l'$$

- Valid CEM transition from source state s to target state s', using input symbol i and emitting constraints $tx^{\equiv}$:

$$s \xrightarrow{i} (s', tx^{\equiv})$$

Transitions-as-transactions

Given a smart contract, expressed as a CEM C, we can derive the validator script that disallows any invalid transitions:

$$\text{validator}_C(s, i, \mathit{txInfo}) = \begin{cases} \text{true} & \mathit{if}\ s \xrightarrow{i} (s', tx^{\equiv}) \\ & \mathit{and}\ \text{satisfies}(\mathit{txInfo}, tx^{\equiv}) \\ & \mathit{and}\ \text{checkOutputs}(s', \mathit{txInfo}) \\ \text{false} & \mathit{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Behavioural Equivalence: Weak Bisimulation

Proposition 1 (Soundness)

Given a valid CEM transition, we can construct a new valid transaction, such that the resulting ledger corresponds to the target CEM state:

$$\frac{s \xrightarrow{i} (s', tx^{\equiv}) \quad l \sim s}{\exists tx\ l'\ .\ l \xrightarrow{tx} l' \ \wedge\ l' \sim s'}\ \textsc{sound}$$

Proposition 2 (Completeness)

Given a new valid transaction on the ledger, it is either irrelevant to the state machine or corresponds to a valid CEM transition:

$$\frac{l \xrightarrow{tx} l' \quad l \sim s}{l' \sim s \ \vee\ \exists i\ s'\ tx^{\equiv}\ .\ s \xrightarrow{i} (s', tx^{\equiv})}\ \textsc{complete}$$

Related Work

- Bitcoin Covenants [Möser et al. @ FC'16]
  - Allows restricting how output values will be used in the future
  - Major inspiration for our introduction of *data values*
- Bitcoin Modelling Language (BitML) [Bartoletti et al. @ CCS'18]
  - Process-calculus with automata-based operational semantics
  - Compiles down to standard Bitcoin transactions
  - Quite complicated translation and requires off-chain communication
- Scilla [Sergey et al. @ OOPSLA'19]
  - For Ethereum-like contracts, using *communicating automata*
  - Embedded in Coq, allows proving temporal (hyper-)properties
- Timed Automata [Andrychowicz et al. @ FORMATS'14]
  - Pragmatic model checking of Bitcoin contracts using UPPAAL
  - Does not come with formal guarantees though

Contributions

- **Detailed description of the Extended UTXO model (EUTXO)**



$$\nu(\rho,\ x,\ \delta,\ \sigma) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{True}$$

- **Formalization in** Agda

- **Proof of bisimulation with a specific form of state machines**



Questions?

Ledger Primitives

Quantity	an amount of currency
Tick	a tick
Address	an "address" in the blockchain
Data	a type of structured data
DataHash	the hash of a value of type Data
TxId	the identifier of a transaction
txId : Tx → TxId	get a transaction's identifier
Script	the (opaque) type of scripts
scriptAddr : Script → Address	the address of a script (i.e. its hash)
dataHash : Data → DataHash	the hash of a data value
⟦_⟧ : Script → Args → Bool	applying a script to its arguments

Defined Types

$$
\begin{aligned}
\textbf{Output} &= (\mathit{value} : \text{Quantity}, \mathit{addr} : \text{Address}, \mathit{dataHash} : \text{DataHash}) \\
\textbf{OutputRef} &= (\mathit{id} : \text{TxId}, \mathit{index} : \mathbb{N}) \\
\textbf{Input} &= (\mathit{outputRef} : \text{OutputRef}, \mathit{validator} : \text{Script}, \\
&\quad \mathit{data} : \text{Data}, \mathit{redeemer} : \text{Data}) \\
\textbf{Tx} &= (\mathit{inputs} : \text{Set[Input]}, \mathit{outputs} : \text{List[Output]}, \\
&\quad \mathit{validityInterval} : \text{Interval[Tick]}) \\
\textbf{Ledger} &= \text{List[Tx]}
\end{aligned}
$$