

Carbon: An Asynchronous Voting-Based Payment System for a Client-Server Architecture

MARTINA CAMAIONI, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland

RACHID GUERRAOUI, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland

JOVAN KOMATOVIC, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland

MATTEO MONTI, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland

MANUEL VIDIGUEIRA, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland

We present Carbon, an asynchronous payment system. To the best of our knowledge, Carbon is the first asynchronous payment system designed specifically for a client-server architecture. Namely, besides being able to make payments, clients of Carbon are capable of changing the set of running servers using a novel voting mechanism – asynchronous, balance-based voting.

1 INTRODUCTION & OVERVIEW

This document represents the definition of the problem Carbon solves, its implementation and formal proof of correctness.

Problem overview. In its core, Carbon solves the asset-transfer problem [3, 6, 13, 17, 20, 21] among its users. A user of Carbon is able to issue a payment transaction transferring its money to another user, thus decreasing its balance and increasing the balance of the receiving user. In a nutshell, Carbon guarantees the following two properties:

- *Liveness:* A payment issued by a user is eventually processed, thus decreasing the balance of the issuer and increasing the balance of the receiver.
- *Safety:* No user can successfully issue multiple payments using the “same” money.

The violation of the safety property is traditionally known as *double-spending* [20] and represents the core problem in implementing a cryptocurrency.

Since the goal of Carbon is to serve millions of users in an efficient way, users themselves cannot be responsible for processing payments. To this end, we introduce *servers*: members of the system that are actually responsible for processing payments issued by Carbon’s users. Since Carbon is designed to be a long-lived BFT system, set of servers that actually process transactions must change over time (e.g., failed servers should be replaced with new ones). Thus, Carbon supports *reconfiguration*: the feature of changing the set of servers running the system while still processing payments.

Importantly, the set of servers running the system is *chosen* by users of Carbon. Specifically, users select which servers run Carbon through a *voting* mechanism: a user can support “candidacy” of a server for a spot in the “running set” by issuing a special vote transaction. A server eventually joins the set of running servers if money owned by users that have supported its candidacy accounts for more than half of the total amount of money in Carbon.

Inspiration. Carbon is influenced by a variety of previously developed ideas. This paragraph briefly presents the work which has inspired the development of Carbon.

The problem of a cryptocurrency rose to prominence with Bitcoin [20]. Bitcoin solves the problem by ensuring that its users agree on a sequence of processed transactions (i.e., payments), i.e., all transactions are totally-ordered. Since then, many protocols have followed the same approach in solving the problem [4, 9, 11, 16, 19, 21].

Only recently has it been shown that total order of transactions is not necessary to solve the problem of asset-transfer [13], which lies at the core of any cryptocurrency. Consequently, the reliable broadcast primitive [5], which can be implemented in a completely asynchronous distributed system, suffices for asset-transfer [3, 6]. Carbon builds upon this approach by adopting the reliable broadcast primitive for processing transactions.

On the other hand, reconfiguration of distributed systems have been studied in both crash-stop [1, 2, 10, 14] and Byzantine [12, 18] failure model. Since Carbon solves the cryptocurrency problem, which implies that Carbon assumes the Byzantine failure model, the reconfiguration logic of Carbon relies on [12, 18]. More concretely, Carbon’s reconfiguration mechanism is identical to the one of DBRB [12].

Roadmap. We start by introducing the system model and preliminaries in §2. §3 provides the formal definition of the problem Carbon solves. Then, we give the implementation of Carbon. First, we present the view generator primitive, which is the crucial building block of the reconfiguration mechanism of Carbon (§4). §5 is devoted to the storage module of a server: the module used for storing information. In §6, we introduce the reconfiguration module of a server: the module that contains the reconfiguration logic of a server. Next, we introduce the implementation of a Carbon user in §7. §8 presents the transaction module of a server: the module used for processing payments issued by users of Carbon. Finally, §9 is devoted to the voting module of a server: the module responsible for ensuring the validity of Carbon’s voting mechanism.

2 SYSTEM MODEL & PRELIMINARIES

Clients & servers. We consider a system of *asynchronous* processes: a process proceeds at its own arbitrary (and non-deterministic) speed. Each process is either a *client* or a *server*. We denote by C the (possibly infinite) set of clients and by \mathcal{R} the (possibly infinite) set of servers. Each process in the system is assigned its *protocol* to follow.

A process is in one of the four states at all times:

- *inactive*: The process has not yet performed a computational step.
- *obedient*: The process has performed a computational step and followed its protocol.
- *disobedient*: The process has performed a computational step and (at some point) deviated from its protocol.
- *halted*: The process has stopped executing computational steps.

Every process starts its execution in the inactive state. Once the special start event triggers at the process (e.g., the process turns on), the process transits to the obedient state. The process remains in the obedient state as long as it respects the assigned protocol and does not execute the special stop command. Once the process deviates from the assigned protocol, the process transits to the disobedient state and stays there permanently. Finally, once the special stop command is executed by the process (e.g., the process shuts down) which is in the obedient state, the process halts and stays in the halted state. If the process performs a computational step afterwards, it transits to the faulty state (and remains in that state forever). The state diagram of a process is given in Figure 1.

Once the start event triggers at a process, we say that the process *starts*. We assume that only finitely many servers start in any execution. On the other hand, infinitely many clients are allowed to start. Any process that starts and does not transit to the disobedient state is said to be *correct*. Any correct process that never halts is *forever-correct*. If, at any point, a process transits to the disobedient state, the process is *faulty*.

Cryptographic primitives. We make use of standard cryptographic primitives. Specifically, we assume an idealized *public-key infrastructure* (PKI): each process is associated with its own public/private key pair that is used to sign messages and verify signatures of other processes. Each message has its sender; we denote by $m.sender$ the sender




Fig. 1. State diagram of a process.

of message m . All messages are signed by their senders. We assume that faulty processes cannot forge signatures of correct processes. Moreover, a message that is not properly signed is immediately discarded by a correct process. We assume that processes can forward messages to other processes and include messages in other messages; forwarded and included messages can also be authenticated, i.e., their signatures can be verified¹.

Execution paradigm. We assume that each process is single-threaded, i.e., the execution of the protocol assigned to each process is single-threaded. The protocol of a process consists of a set of upon rules; if a rule guarding a part of the protocol is permanently active at a correct process, we assume that the part of the protocol guarded by that rule is eventually executed.

A discrete global clock is assumed and the range of clock's ticks is the set $\{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. No process has access to the discrete global clock. Computation proceeds in atomic steps. Each step happens at a clock's tick and a process may: (1) send a message, (2) receive a message, (3) get an external input (e.g., trigger of the special `start` event), or (4) perform an internal computation.

Communication. The processes are connected pair-wise by *asynchronous* authenticated channels [5]: there does not exist an upper bound on message delays. The only requirement is that message delays are finite.

We assume the existence of the following communication primitives:

(1) *Perfect links:* A process can directly send a message m to a process q ; we write “`send m to q`”. Perfect links provide the following properties:

- *Validity:* If a forever-correct process sends a message to a forever-correct process, then the message is eventually received.

¹If an included or forwarded message is not properly signed, the entire message is discarded by a correct process.

- *Integrity*: A message is received at most once by a correct process and, if the sender is correct, only if the message was sent by the sender.

Note that perfect links present a generalization of the perfect links primitive [5] to a dynamic environment in which correct processes can halt.

- (2) *Best-effort broadcast*: This primitive allows a process to send the same message m to a fixed set of processes; we write “**broadcast** m to S ”, where S is a set of processes. The best-effort broadcast ensures:

- *Validity*: If a forever-correct process broadcasts a message to a set S of processes and a process $q \in S$ is forever-correct, then q eventually receives the message.
- *Integrity*: A message is received at most once by a correct process and, if the sender is correct, only if the message was broadcast by the sender.

The best-effort primitive represents the generalization of the primitive [5] to dynamic environments. It consists of sending the broadcast message to all processes from the set of receivers using the perfect links.

- (3) *Gossip*: This primitive [15] allows a process to disseminate a message m to all processes without specifying the particular set of receivers; we write “**gossip** m ”. The gossip primitive ensures the following properties:

- *Validity*: If a forever-correct process gossips a message, then every forever-correct process receives the message infinitely many times.
- *Integrity*: If a message is received by a correct process and the sender of the message is correct, then the message was previously gossiped by the sender.

Preliminaries. We now introduce the concepts of changes, views and sequences. A *change* $c \in \{+, -\} \times \mathcal{R}$ is a tuple that expresses an intent of a server either to *join* the set of servers running Carbon or to *leave* it (see §1). For instance, $c = (+, r)$ denotes the intent of server $r \in \mathcal{R}$ to join, whereas $c' = (-, r')$ denotes the intent of server $r' \in \mathcal{R}$ to leave.

1 **Change:**

2 **instance** $c = (s, r)$, with $s \in \{+, -\}$ and r is Server

Listing 1. Change

A *view* is a set of changes. We associate three functions with any view v :

- *members*: returns *members* of the view v , i.e., returns all the servers $r \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $(+, r) \in v$ and $(-, r) \notin v$.
- *quorum*: returns the *quorum size* of the view v , i.e., it returns $n - \lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor$, where $n = |v.\text{members}()|$.
- *plurality*: returns the *plurality* of the view v , i.e., it returns $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor + 1$, where $n = |v.\text{members}()|$.

We say that views v_1 and v_2 are *comparable* if and only if $v_1 \subseteq v_2$ or $v_1 \supset v_2$. If $v_1 \subset v_2$, we say that v_1 is *smaller than* v_2 and v_2 is *greater than* v_1 . Finally, we render some views as *valid* (we give the formal definition in Definition 1).

1 **View:**

2 **instance** v , with v is Set(Change)

4 **function** (View v).members():

5 **return** $\{r \mid (+, r) \in v \text{ and } (-, r) \notin v\}$

7 **function** (View v).quorum():

8 $n = |v.\text{members}()|$

9 **return** $n - \lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor$

```

11  function (View  $v$ ).plurality():
12       $n = |v.members()|$ 
13      return  $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor + 1$ 

15  function comparable(View  $v$ , View  $w$ ):
16      return  $v \subseteq w$  or  $v \supseteq w$ 

18  function valid(View  $v$ )  $\rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}$ 

```

Listing 2. View

Lastly, a *sequence* is a set of views with any two views of the sequence being comparable. We say that a sequence *seq* follows a view v if all views contained in *seq* are greater than v . Moreover, we define the *first* (resp., *last*) view of a sequence as the smallest (resp., greatest) view that belongs to the sequence.

```

1 Sequence:
2  instance seq, with seq is Set(View) such that  $\text{comparable}(v, w) = \top$ , for all  $v, w \in \text{seq}$ 

4  function (Sequence seq).follows(View  $v$ ):
5      return for every  $w \in \text{seq}$ :  $w \supseteq v$ 

7  function (Sequence seq).first():
8      return  $w \in \text{seq}$  such that  $w \subseteq v$ , for every  $v \in \text{seq}$ 

10 function (Sequence seq).last():
11  return  $w \in \text{seq}$  such that  $w \supseteq v$ , for every  $v \in \text{seq}$ 

```

Listing 3. Sequence

If $\text{seq} = \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$ is a sequence, we write $\text{seq} = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x$, where $v_i \subset v_{i+1}$, for every $1 \leq i < x$.

In summary, a change is a tuple $c = (\text{sym} \in \{+, -\}, r \in \mathcal{R})$ and it symbolizes the intent of server r to either join (if $\text{sym} = +$) or leave (if $\text{sym} = -$). A view is a set of changes, whereas a sequence is a set of comparable views.

Failure model. We assume that at most $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor$ members of v are faulty, where $n = |v.members()|$, for every valid view v .²

Certificates. Throughout the implementation of Carbon, we often use *certificates*. A certificate is a construct used to prove that a value is indeed “produced” by a specific instance of a distributed primitive. Therefore, certificates prevent faulty processes to “lie” about obtained values. If $\text{verify_output}(\text{value}, \text{instance}, \omega) = \top$, then we say that *value* is produced by *instance*, where *instance* is an instance of a distributed primitive.

```

1 function verify_output(Value value, Distributed_Primitive_Instance instance, Certificate  $\omega$ )  $\rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}$ 

```

Listing 4. The verify_output function

²Recall that a view v is valid if and only if $\text{valid}(v) = \top$ (see Listing 2).

Constants. We assume the existence of a specific view known by all processes; we denote this view by *genesis*. The *genesis* view does not contain $(-, r)$ changes, i.e., $(-, r) \notin \textit{genesis}$, for any server r . Moreover, *genesis* has only finitely many members. Finally, we assume that the `start` event eventually triggers at all members of the *genesis* view.

```

1 Constants:
2   View genesis

```

Listing 5. Constants

3 PROBLEM DEFINITION

As briefly mentioned in §1, the core problem solved by Carbon is the asset-transfer problem [3, 6, 13, 17, 20, 21] among clients (i.e., users of Carbon). We present the formal definition of the asset-transfer problem in §3.1.

Since our goal is to allow Carbon to efficiently serve millions of clients, the burden of transaction processing must be taken away from clients. We put this burden on a set of servers - *validators*. In order to allow clients to select validators that actually process payments in Carbon, we develop *asynchronous balance-based voting*: the mechanism that allows clients to vote a server in or out of the set of validators. We formally define the asynchronous balance-based voting problem in §3.2.

Finally, the definitive formulation of the problem consists of the asset-transfer problem (§3.1) enriched by the problem of changing the set of validators based on our voting mechanism (§3.2). We merge these in §3.3, thus painting the full picture of the problem Carbon solves.

3.1 Core Problem: Asset-Transfer

The asset-transfer problem allows clients to issue transactions in order to (1) transfer some of their money to another clients, thus decreasing their balance, and (2) claim money transferred to them by another clients, thus increasing their balance. We proceed to formally define the asset-transfer problem.

Transactions. Clients can issue transactions of the following three types:

- *withdrawal*: A client issues a withdrawal transaction once it aims to transfer some of its money to another client.
- *deposit*: A client issues a deposit transaction in order to claim money transferred to it by another client.
- *minting*: A client issues a minting transaction to increase the amount of money owned by it.

1 Withdrawal_Transaction:	1 Deposit_Transaction:	1 Minting_Transaction:
2 Client <i>issuer</i>	2 Client <i>issuer</i>	2 Client <i>issuer</i>
3 Client <i>receiver</i>	3 Withdrawal_Transaction	3 Integer <i>amount</i>
4 Integer <i>amount</i>	<i>withdrawal</i>	4 Integer <i>sn</i>
5 Integer <i>sn</i>	4 Integer <i>sn</i>	

Each transaction is parameterized with its issuer (i.e., the client issuing the transaction) and its sequence number. Withdrawal transactions specify the client that receives the transferred money and the amount of the money being transferred. Each deposit transaction specifies a corresponding withdrawal transaction, i.e., the transaction that allows the issuer to claim the money. A minting transaction specifies the amount of money the issuer obtains. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that sequence numbers of all transactions are greater than 0 and, if tx is a deposit transaction, then $tx.\textit{withdrawal.receiver} = tx.\textit{issuer}$. We denote by \mathcal{T} the set of all possible transactions.

Client's balance. Each client has its *balance*, i.e., the amount of money owned by the client at a given time. The balance of a client is the sum of claimed (by deposit or minting transactions) money subtracted by the sum of transferred money. The initial balance of a client c is denoted by $\text{initial_balance}(c)$.

Commitment proofs. We denote by Σ_c the set of *commitment proofs*. Intuitively, a commitment proof shows that a specific transaction is successfully processed in Carbon. Formally, we define the $\text{verify_commit}: \mathcal{T} \times \Sigma_c \rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}$ function that maps a transaction and a commitment proof into a boolean value. A transaction $tx \in \mathcal{T}$ is *committed* if and only if a (correct or faulty) process obtains (i.e., stores in its local memory) a commitment proof $\sigma_c \in \Sigma_c$ such that $\text{verify_commit}(tx, \sigma_c) = \top$; if the first attainment of such commitment proof occurs at time t , we say that tx is committed at time $t' \geq t$.

Logs. A log is a set of transactions. We say that a log log is *admissible* if and only if:

- for every deposit transaction $tx \in log$, $tx.withdrawal \in log$, i.e., a deposit transaction is “accompanied” by the corresponding withdrawal transaction, and
- for each client c , let $log_c = \{tx \mid tx \in log \text{ and } tx.issuer = c\}$. Then, the following holds:
 - log_c does not contain conflicting transactions, i.e., different transactions with the same sequence number, and
 - all transactions in log_c must have adjacent sequence numbers, i.e., no “gaps” can exist, and
 - a single withdrawal transaction is referenced by at most one deposit transaction, i.e., the client cannot claim the “same” money multiple times, and
 - the client has enough money for every issued withdrawal transaction.

More formally, a log log is admissible if and only if $\text{admissible}(log) = \top$, where the admissible function is defined in the following manner:

```

1 function admissible(Log log):
2   // check whether the withdrawals of all deposit transactions are in log
3   for each Deposit_Transaction tx ∈ log:
4     if tx.withdrawal ∉ log:
5       return ⊥
6
7   for each Client c:
8     Log logc = {tx | tx ∈ log and tx.issuer = c}
9     if admissible_client_log(c, logc) = ⊥: // the client log is not admissible
10      return ⊥
11  return ⊤

13 function admissible_client_log(Client c, Log logc):
14  // if logc is empty, then return ⊤
15  if logc = ∅:
16    return ⊤
17
18  // if there exist conflicting transactions, return ⊥
19  if exist Transaction tx1, tx2 ∈ logc such that tx1 ≠ tx2 and tx1.sn = tx2.sn:
20    return ⊥

```

```

22 // sequence numbers of transactions must be adjacent
23 if exists Transaction  $tx \in \log_c$  and exists Integer  $num$ , where  $1 \leq num < tx.sn$ , such that does not
    exist Transaction  $tx' \in \log_c$  with  $tx'.sn = num$ :
24     return  $\perp$ 

26 // the client log contains non-conflicting transactions and transactions have adjacent sequence numbers
27 // sort the log by the sequence numbers of the transactions in the ascending order
28 Array  $array\_log_c = \log_c.sort\_by(sn)$ 

30 // introduce the balance of the client before executing any transaction from its log
31 Integer  $balance = initial\_balance(c)$ 
32 Set(Withdrawal_Transaction)  $withdrawals = \emptyset$  // observed withdrawal transactions

34 // iterate through all transactions in the increasing order of their sequence numbers
35 for each Transaction  $tx \in array\_log_c$ :
36     if  $tx$  is Withdrawal_Transaction: // withdrawal transaction
37         if  $tx.amount > balance$ : // not enough money
38             return  $\perp$ 
39          $balance = balance - tx.amount$ 
40     else if  $tx$  is Deposit_Transaction: // deposit transaction
41         if  $tx.withdrawal \in withdrawals$ : // withdrawal already used
42             return  $\perp$ 
43         else:
44              $withdrawals = withdrawals \cup \{tx.withdrawal\}$ 
45              $balance = balance + tx.withdrawal.amount$ 
46     else: // minting transaction
47          $balance = balance + tx.amount$ 

49 return  $\top$ 

```

Listing 6. Log admissibility

Interface. Interface of a client consists of:

- invocation issue tx : the client issues a transaction tx ,
- invocation query market: the client requests to learn the total amount of money in Carbon,
- indication committed tx : the client learns that a transaction tx is committed, and
- indication total money $money$: the client learns that the total amount of money in Carbon is $money$.

Rules. The following is assumed about a correct client c :

- The client does not invoke an operation (i.e., does not issue a transaction or does not query about the total amount of money) before the previous invocation is completed.

- If a transaction tx is issued by c , then $tx.issuer = c$.
- Client c does not issue a transaction before it learns that all previously issued transactions by c are committed.
- Let tx be the i -th transaction issued by c . Then, $tx.sn = i$.
- Client c does not issue a withdrawal transaction tx unless the balance of c at the moment of issuing tx is at least $tx.amount$.
- Client c does not issue a deposit transaction tx before it learns that $tx.withdrawal$ is committed.
- Client c does not issue conflicting transactions, i.e., different transactions with the same sequence number.
- Client c does not issue multiple deposit transactions that reference the same withdrawal transaction.

Properties. Finally, we introduce the properties of the asset-transfer problem:

- *Commitment Validity:* If a forever-correct client issues a transaction tx , then tx is eventually committed.
- *Commitment Integrity:* If a transaction tx is committed and $tx.issuer$ is correct, then tx was issued by $tx.issuer$.
- *Commitment Learning:* Let a transaction tx be committed. If $tx.issuer$ is forever-correct, then tx eventually learns that tx is committed. If tx is a withdrawal transaction and $tx.receiver$ is forever-correct, then $tx.receiver$ eventually learns that tx is committed.
- *Commitment Admissibility:* Let log_t denote the set of all committed transactions at time t . For all times t , log_t is admissible.
- *Query Validity:* If a forever-correct client requests to learn the total amount of money in Carbon, the client eventually learns.
- *Query Safety:* Let $mints_{\infty}$ denote the set of all committed minting transactions. If a correct client learns that the total amount of money is $money$, then $money \leq \sum_{tx \in mints_{\infty}} tx.amount$.
- *Query Liveness:* Let $mints$ denote a finite set of committed minting transactions. If a forever-correct client requests infinitely many times to learn the total amount of money in Carbon, the client eventually learns $money \geq \sum_{tx \in mints} tx.amount$.

3.2 Asynchronous Balance-Based Voting

The asynchronous balance-based voting mechanism revolves around the clients being able to express their support for a specific *motion* by issuing *vote* transactions. Intuitively, a motion *passes* if “enough” clients (i.e., clients that own “enough” money) have expressed their support for the motion. We formally define the problem below.

Vote transactions. As withdrawal and deposit transactions, each vote transaction is parametrized with its issuer and its sequence number. Moreover, each vote transaction specifies the motion for which the issuer votes by issuing the transaction.

```

1 Vote_Transaction:
2   Client issuer
3   Motion motion
4   Integer sn

```

Motions. A motion is any statement that can be voted for by clients. We say that a motion *mot* is *proposed* at time t if and only if a correct process (either client or a server) obtains a vote transaction for *mot* at time t and no correct process has obtained a vote transaction for *mot* before t . Intuitively, a motion is proposed at time t if and only if the first correct process to observe a client voting for the motion observes such voting action at time t .

A log *supports* a motion if a “majority” of the money votes for the motion. In order to formally define when a log supports a motion, we first define how the balance of each client is calculated in a log. Moreover, we define the total amount of money in a log. Finally, we define the amount of money in a log “voting” for a motion.

```

1 Log:
2   instance log, with log is Set(Transaction)

4   function (Log log).balance(Client c):
5     Log logc = {tx | tx ∈ log and tx.issuer = c}
6     balance = initial_balance(c)
7     Array array_logc = logc.sort_by(sn) // sort the log by the sequence numbers
8     for each Transaction tx ∈ array_logc:
9       if tx is Withdrawal_Transaction:
10        balance = balance − tx.amount
11      else if tx is Deposit_Transaction:
12        balance = balance + tx.withdrawal.amount
13      else if tx is Minting_Transaction:
14        balance = balance + tx.amount
15    return balance

17  function (Log log).total_money():
18    Set(Transaction) mints = {tx | tx ∈ log and tx is Minting_Transaction}
19    return  $\sum_{tx \in mints} tx.amount$  // the sum of all minting transactions

21  function (Log log).voted_for(Motion mot):
22    Set(Client) voted_for = {c | tx ∈ log and tx is Vote_Transaction and tx.motion = mot and tx.issuer = c}
23    return  $\sum_{c \in voted\_for} log.balance(c)$ 

```

Listing 7. Log

Finally, we are ready to formally define when a log supports a motion. A log *log* supports a motion *mot* if and only if $\text{support}(log, mot) = \top$, where the support function is defined in the following manner:

```

1 function support(Log log, Motion mot):
2   return log.voted_for(mot) > 0 and log.voted_for(mot) ≥  $\frac{log.total\_money()}{2}$ 

```

Listing 8. Motion support

Voting proofs. We denote by Σ_v the set of *voting proofs*. Intuitively, a voting proof shows that a specific motion passes. Formally, a motion *mot* passes if and only if a (correct or faulty) process obtains a voting proof $\sigma_v \in \Sigma_v$ such that $\text{verify_voting}(mot, \sigma_v) = \top$. We use voting proofs in §3.3 in order to abstract away the asynchronous balance-based voting problem (for the sake of simplicity).

Rules. We assume that a correct client does not vote for the same motion more than once.

Properties. Finally, we define the properties of the asynchronous balance-based voting primitive:

- *Voting Safety:* Let a motion mot be proposed at time t and let mot pass. Let a correct client learn at time t that the total amount of money in Carbon is $money$ and let log_{∞} denote the set of all committed transactions. There exists an admissible log $log_{pass} \subseteq log_{\infty}$ such that $log_{pass}.voted_for(mot) \geq \frac{money}{2}$.
- *Voting Liveness:* Let a motion mot be proposed and let log_{∞} denote the set of all committed transactions. If there exists an admissible log $log_{pass} \subseteq log_{\infty}$ such that $log_{greater}$ supports mot , for every admissible log $log_{greater}$, where $log_{pass} \subseteq log_{greater} \subseteq log_{\infty}$, then mot passes.

Intuitively, the voting safety property guarantees that, if a motion passes, more than half of the money held in the system “at the moment” of proposing the motion has “voted” for the motion to pass. Voting liveness guarantees that a motion passes if, after some time, the motion is “forever-supported”.

3.3 Carbon = Asset-Transfer + Voting-Driven Reconfiguration

Finally, we formally define the “complete” problem solved by Carbon.

Validators. A correct server $joins$ once the server triggers the special $joined$ event; if the special $joined$ event is triggered at time t , the server joins at time t . A faulty server r joins if a correct server triggers the special r $joined$ event and no correct server has previously triggered the special r $left$ event; if the first r $joined$ event that satisfies the aforementioned condition is triggered at time t , the server joins at time t .

A correct server $leaves$ once the server triggers the special $left$ event; if the special $left$ event is triggered at time t , the server leaves at time t . A faulty server r leaves if a correct server triggers the special r $left$ event; if the first r $left$ event triggered by correct servers is triggered at time t , the server leaves at time t . In summary, a correct server joins (resp., leaves) once the server itself claims to have joined (resp., left); a faulty server joins (resp., leaves) once a correct server claims that r has joined (resp., left).

A server r is a *validator* at time t if and only if the server joins by time t and does not leave by time t . Moreover, a server is a *forever-validator* if and only if it joins and never leaves.

Commitment proofs - revisited. Since the notion of a validator is introduced, we aim to ensure that transactions are “processed” only by validators of Carbon. Intuitively, if a transaction tx is issued at time t and a server r left before time t , our goal is to guarantee that r cannot be a server that helps tx to be processed. In order to formally define such property of Carbon, we introduce a set of *signers* of a commitment proof: the set of servers that have “created” a commitment proof. We denote by $\sigma_c.signers$ the set of signers of a commitment proof σ_c .

Server’s interface. Interface of a server consists of two invocations:

- Invocation “join with voting proof σ_v ”: The server requests to join (i.e., to become a validator) and provides the voting proof σ_v such that $verify_voting(“add server r ”, σ_v) = $\top$$.
- Invocation “leave”: The server requests to leave (i.e., to stop being a validator).

Server’s rules. The following is assumed about a correct server r :

- (1) If $r \in genesis.members()$, then r does not request to join.
- (2) Server r requests to join at most once.
- (3) If r requests to join and provides the voting proof σ_v , then $verify_voting(“add server r ”, σ_v) = $\top$$.
- (4) If r requests to join, then r does not halt before it leaves.
- (5) If r requests to leave, r has previously joined.

(6) If r leaves, then r immediately halts.

Properties of Carbon. Finally, we introduce the complete list of properties satisfied by Carbon. We say that a transaction tx is *issued* at time t if and only if:

- if $tx.issuer$ is correct, then tx was invoked at time t (see §3.1),
- if $tx.issuer$ is not correct, then the first correct process that obtains tx obtains tx at time t .

If the motion “add server r ” passes, we say that r is *voted in*. Similarly, if the motion “remove server r ” passes, we say that r is *voted out*. We are ready to define the properties of Carbon:

- *Commitment Validity:* If a forever-correct client issues a transaction tx , then tx is eventually committed.
- *Commitment Integrity:* If a transaction tx is committed and $tx.issuer$ is correct, then tx was issued by $tx.issuer$.
- *Commitment Learning:* Let a transaction tx be committed. If $tx.issuer$ is forever-correct, then tx eventually learns that tx is committed. If tx is a withdrawal transaction and $tx.receiver$ is forever-correct, then $tx.receiver$ eventually learns that tx is committed.
- *Commitment Admissibility:* Let log_t denote the set of all committed transactions at time t . At all times t , log_t is admissible.
- *Commitment Signing:* Let a transaction tx be issued at time t . Let a commitment proof σ_c be obtained at time t' , where $verify_commit(tx, \sigma_c) = \top$. If $a \in \sigma_c.signers$, then a is a validator at time t_{val} , where $t \leq t_{val} \leq t'$.
- *Query Validity:* If a forever-correct client requests to learn the total amount of money in Carbon, the client eventually learns.
- *Query Safety:* Let $mints_\infty$ denote the set of all committed minting transactions. If a correct client learns that the total amount of money is $money$, then $money \leq \sum_{tx \in mints_\infty} tx.amount$.
- *Query Liveness:* Let $mints$ denote a finite set of committed minting transactions. If a forever-correct client requests infinitely many times to learn the total amount of money in Carbon, the client eventually learns $money \geq \sum_{tx \in mints} tx.amount$.
- *Join Safety:* If a server r joins, then $r \in genesis.members()$ or r is voted in.
- *Leave Safety:* If a correct server leaves, then the server requested to leave or is voted out.
- *Join Liveness:* If a correct server requests to join, the server eventually joins (i.e., becomes a validator).
- *Leave Liveness:* If a correct server requests to leave, the server eventually leaves (i.e., stops being a validator).
- *Removal Liveness:* If a correct forever-validator obtains a voting proof σ_v such that $verify_voting(\text{“remove server } r\text{”}, \sigma_v) = \top$ and r is a validator at some time (i.e., r has joined), then r eventually leaves (i.e., stops being a validator).

4 VIEW GENERATOR

The first primitive we present, which is used in the implementation of Carbon, is the *view generator* primitive [2]. The view generator primitive is used by the servers exclusively.

Each instance of the view generator is parameterized with a view. We denote by $vg(v)$ the instance of the view generator primitive parameterized with view v . Servers can (1) start $vg(v)$ with or without a proposal, (2) stop $vg(v)$, (3) propose a set of views (along with some additional information) to $vg(v)$, and (4) decide a set of views from $vg(v)$. Finally, we assume that (at least) a quorum of members of view v are correct.

We assume an existence of *evidences*, which are (for now) abstract constructs. The input of a view generator instance is a tuple (v, set, ϵ) , where v is a view, set is a set of views and ϵ is a proof. For every tuple $input = (v, set, \epsilon)$ and

every view v' , we define $\text{valid}(\text{input}, v')$ function that returns either \top or \perp . Again, the concrete implementation of the valid function is not given for now.

```

1 View, Set, Evidence:
2   instance  $(v, \text{set}, \epsilon)$ , with  $v$  is View,  $\text{set}$  is  $\text{Set}(\text{View})$  and  $\epsilon$  is Evidence

4   function  $\text{valid}(\text{View}, \text{Set}, \text{Evidence } (v, \text{set}, \epsilon), \text{View } v') \rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}$ 

```

Listing 9. (View, Set, Evidence) tuple

We are now ready to introduce the interface of an instance of the view generator primitive.

```

1 View Generator:
2   instance  $\text{vg}(v)$ , with  $v$  is View

4   Interface:
5     Requests:
6     •  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Start} \mid \text{View}, \text{Set}, \text{Evidence } (v', \text{set}', \epsilon') \rangle$ : starts  $\text{vg}(v)$ ; if  $(v', \text{set}', \epsilon') = \perp$ , then
       $\text{vg}(v)$  is started without a proposal. If  $(v', \text{set}', \epsilon') \neq \perp$ , then the server has proposed to  $\text{vg}(v)$ .

8     •  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Stop} \rangle$ : stops  $\text{vg}(v)$ .

10    •  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Propose} \mid \text{View}, \text{Set}, \text{Evidence } (v', \text{set}', \epsilon') \rangle$ : proposes  $(v', \text{set}', \epsilon')$  to  $\text{vg}(v)$ .

12    Indications:
13    •  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Decide} \mid \text{Set}(\text{View}) \text{ set}', \text{Certificate } \omega' \rangle$ : indicates that  $\text{set}'$  is decided with the
      certificate  $\omega'$ .

15    Rules:
16    1) No correct server  $r \notin v.\text{members}()$  invokes any request to  $\text{vg}(v)$ .
17    2) Every correct server invokes each request at most once.
18    3) If a correct server invokes  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Start} \mid (v', \text{set}', \epsilon') \neq \perp \rangle$ , then the server does not
      invoke  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Propose} \rangle$ .
19    4) No correct server invokes  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Stop} \rangle$  or  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Propose} \rangle$  unless it has already
      invoked
       $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Start} \rangle$ .
20    5) A correct server invokes  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Stop} \rangle$  before halting.
21    6) If a correct server invokes  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Start} \mid (v', \text{set}', \epsilon') \neq \perp \rangle$  or  $\langle \text{vg}(v).\text{Propose} \mid$ 
       $(v', \text{set}', \epsilon') \rangle$ , then  $\text{valid}((v', \text{set}', \epsilon'), v) = \top$ .

```

Listing 10. View generator - interface

We denote by E_t^v the set of evidences such that, for every $\epsilon \in E_t^v$, the following holds: (1) ϵ is obtained (i.e., stored in the local memory) by time t by a (correct or faulty) process³, and (2) there exists a view v' and a set of views set' that satisfy $\text{valid}((v', set', \epsilon), v) = \top$. By definition, $E_t^v \subseteq E_{t'}^v$, for any times t, t' with $t' > t$.

Now, let $\Lambda_t^v = \{(v', set', \epsilon') \mid \text{valid}((v', set', \epsilon'), v) = \top \text{ and } \epsilon' \in E_t^v\}$. Due to the fact that $E_t^v \subseteq E_{t'}^v$, for any times t, t' with $t' > t$, we have that $\Lambda_t^v \subseteq \Lambda_{t'}^v$.

Moreover, we define the $\text{preconditions}(v, t)$ function such that $\text{preconditions}(v, t) = \top$ if and only if:

- for every $(v', set', \epsilon') \in \Lambda_t^v$, set' is a sequence, and
- for every $(v', set' = \emptyset, \epsilon') \in \Lambda_t^v$, $v \subset v'$, and
- for every $(v', set' \neq \emptyset, \epsilon') \in \Lambda_t^v$, $set'.\text{follows}(v) = \top$ and $v' \in set'$, and
- if $(+, r) \notin v$, for some server r , then, for every $(v', set', \epsilon') \in \Lambda_t^v$, $(-, r) \notin v'$ and, if $set' \neq \emptyset$, $(-, r) \notin set'.\text{last}()$, and
- for any pair $(v', set', \epsilon'), (v'', set'', \epsilon'') \in \Lambda_t^v$, either $set' \subseteq set''$ or $set' \supset set''$.

Since $\Lambda_t^v \subseteq \Lambda_{t'}^v$, for any times t, t' with $t' > t$, we have that $\text{preconditions}(v, t') = \top \implies \text{preconditions}(v, t) = \top$.

Finally, if a (correct or faulty) process obtains (i.e., stores in its local memory) a certificate ω , where $\text{verify_output}(set, \text{vg}(v), \omega) = \top$, for some set set of views, then we say that set is *committed* by $\text{vg}(v)$. Moreover, set is committed at time t if and only if the certificate attainment happens at time $t' \leq t$. Note that we assume that an attainment of a certificate is irrevocable; hence, if set is committed at time t , then set is committed at any time $t' > t$.

We are now ready to define properties of $\text{vg}(v)$.

1 View Generator:

2 **instance** $\text{vg}(v)$, with v is View

4 Properties:

- 5 - **Integrity:** No correct server $r \notin v.\text{members}()$ receives any indication from $\text{vg}(v)$.
- 6 - **Comparability:** If set_1 and set_2 are committed by $\text{vg}(v)$, then either $set_1 \subseteq set_2$ or $set_1 \supset set_2$.
- 7 - **Validity:** If set is committed by $\text{vg}(v)$ at time t and $\text{preconditions}(v, t-1) = \top$, then (1) $set \neq \emptyset$, (2) set is a sequence, and (3) $set.\text{follows}(v) = \top$.
- 8 - **Membership Validity:** If set is committed by $\text{vg}(v)$ at time t , $(+, r) \notin v$, for some server r , and $\text{preconditions}(v, t-1) = \top$, then $(-, r) \notin set.\text{last}()$.
- 9 - **Safety:** Let set be committed by $\text{vg}(v)$ at time t and let $\text{preconditions}(v, t-1) = \top$. Then, $(v^*, \emptyset, \epsilon^*) \in \Lambda_{t-1}^v$ or $(v^*, set, \epsilon^*) \in \Lambda_{t-1}^v$, for some view v^* and some evidence ϵ^* .
- 10 - **Decision Certification:** If a correct server decides set with a certificate ω from $\text{vg}(v)$, then $\text{verify_output}(set, \text{vg}(v), \omega) = \top$.
- 11 - **Decision Permission:** If a set of views is committed by $\text{vg}(v)$, then at least $v.\text{plurality}()$ of correct members of v have previously started $\text{vg}(v)$.
- 12 - **Bounded Decisions:** Let $SET = \{set \mid set \text{ is committed by } \text{vg}(v)\}$. Then, $|SET| < \infty$.
- 13 - **Liveness:** If all correct servers $r \in v.\text{members}()$ start $\text{vg}(v)$, at least one correct server proposes to $\text{vg}(v)$ and no correct server stops $\text{vg}(v)$, then all correct servers $r \in v.\text{members}()$ eventually decide from $\text{vg}(v)$.

Listing 11. View generator - properties

³Once an evidence is obtained by a (correct or faulty) process, the evidence is obtained by any time in the future. In other words, an attainment of an evidence is *irrevocable*.

In order to present the view generator primitive, we start by introducing *reconfiguration lattice agreement* (RLA).

4.1 Reconfiguration Lattice Agreement (RLA)

The RLA primitive is extremely similar to the Byzantine lattice agreement [7, 8, 22] primitive. In the Byzantine lattice agreement (BLA) primitive, each process p starts with its proposal $pro_p \in \mathcal{V}$ and eventually decides $dec_p \in \mathcal{V}$. Values from the \mathcal{V} set form a join semi-lattice $L = (\mathcal{V}, \oplus)$ for a commutative join operation \oplus . That is, for any two $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$, $v_1 \leq v_2$ if and only if $v_1 \oplus v_2 = v_2$. If $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, $\bigoplus(V) = v_1 \oplus v_2 \oplus \dots \oplus v_n$. BLA that tolerates up to f Byzantine failures ensures:

- *Liveness*: Each correct process eventually outputs its decision value $dec \in \mathcal{V}$.
- *Stability*: Each correct process outputs a unique decision value.
- *Comparability*: Given any two correct processes p, q , either $dec_p \leq dec_q$ or $dec_q \leq dec_p$.
- *Inclusivity*: Given any correct process p , we have that $pro_p \leq dec_p$.
- *Non-Triviality*: Given any correct process p , we have that $dec_p \leq \bigoplus(X \cup B)$, where X is the set of proposed values of all correct processes ($X = \{pro_q \mid q \text{ is correct}\}$) and $B \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ satisfies $|B| \leq f$.

RLA considers a specific semi-lattice over sets, i.e., \mathcal{V} is a set of sets in RLA and \oplus is the union operation. More specifically, \mathcal{V} is a set of sets of objects of abstract type X , where the function `valid` is defined for each object of type X and each view. Finally, in contrast to BLA, not all correct processes are required to propose in RLA.

Each instance of the RLA primitive is associated with a single view. However, an RLA instance is not completely defined by its view (in contrast to instances of the view generator primitive), i.e., there can exist multiple instances of the RLA primitive associated with the same view. Therefore, each instance of the RLA primitive is also associated with a unique identifier. In summary, one instance of the RLA primitive is completely defined by its view and its identifier; the instance associated with view v and identifier id is denoted by $rla(v, id)$. As for the failure model assumed by RLA, (at least) a quorum of members of view v are assumed to be correct.

We now introduce the interface of an RLA instance.

1 Reconfiguration Lattice Agreement:

2 **instance** $rla(v, id)$, with v is View and id is Integer

4 Interface:

5 Requests:

6 • $\langle rla(v, id).Start \mid \text{Set}(X) \text{ } pro \rangle$: starts $rla(v, id)$ with proposal pro ; if $pro = \perp$, then $rla(v, id)$ is started without a proposal. If $pro \neq \perp$, then the server has proposed to $rla(v, id)$.

8 • $\langle rla(v, id).Stop \rangle$: stops $rla(v, id)$.

10 • $\langle rla(v, id).Propose \mid \text{Set}(X) \text{ } pro \rangle$: proposes pro to $rla(v, id)$.

12 Indications:

13 • $\langle rla(v, id).Decide \mid \text{Set}(X) \text{ } dec, \text{Certificate } \omega \rangle$: indicates that dec is decided with the certificate ω .

15 Rules:

- 16 1) No correct server $r \notin v.members()$ invokes any request to $rla(v, id)$.
 17 2) Every correct server invokes each request at most once.
 18 3) If a correct server invokes $\langle rla(v, id).Start \mid pro \neq \perp \rangle$, then the server does not invoke
 $\langle rla(v, id).Propose \rangle$.
 19 4) No correct server invokes $\langle rla(v, id).Stop \rangle$ or $\langle rla(v, id).Propose \rangle$ unless it has already
 invoked $\langle rla(v, id).Start \rangle$.
 20 5) A correct server invokes $\langle rla(v, id).Stop \rangle$ before halting.
 21 6) If a correct server invokes $\langle rla(v, id).Start \mid pro \neq \perp \rangle$ or $\langle rla(v, id).Propose \mid pro \rangle$, then
 (1) $pro = \{x\}$ ⁴, and (2) $valid(x, v) = \top$.

Listing 12. RLA - interface

If a (correct or faulty) process obtains (i.e., stores in its local memory) a certificate ω , where $verify_output(dec, rla(v, id), \omega) = \top$, for some set dec of objects of type X , then we say that dec is *committed* by $rla(v, id)$. Moreover, dec is committed at time t if and only if the certificate attainment happens at time $t' \leq t$. Note that we assume that an attainment of a certificate is irrevocable; hence, if dec is committed at time t , then dec is committed at any time $t' \geq t$. Finally, we present the properties of an RLA instance.

1 **Reconfiguration Lattice Agreement:**

2 **instance** $rla(v, id)$, with v is View and id is Integer

4 **Properties:**

- 5 - **Integrity:** No correct server $r \notin v.members()$ receives any indication from $rla(v, id)$.
 6 - **Decision Certification:** If a correct server decides dec with a certificate ω from $rla(v, id)$,
 then $verify_output(dec, rla(v, id), \omega) = \top$.
 7 - **Comparability:** If dec and dec' are committed by $rla(v, id)$, then either $dec \subseteq dec'$ or $dec \supset dec'$.
 8 - **Validity:** If dec is committed by $rla(v, id)$, $dec \neq \emptyset$, and, for every $x \in dec$, $valid(x, v) = \top$.
 9 - **Decision Permission:** If a set is committed by $rla(v, id)$, then at least $v.plurality()$ of
 correct members of v have previously started $rla(v, id)$.
 10 - **Bounded Decisions:** Let $DEC = \{dec \mid dec \text{ is committed by } rla(v, id)\}$. Then, $|DEC| < \infty$.
 11 - **Liveness:** If all correct servers $r \in v.members()$ start $rla(v, id)$, at least one correct server
 proposes to $rla(v, id)$ and no correct server stops $rla(v, id)$, then all correct servers $r \in v.members()$
 eventually decide from $rla(v, id)$.

Listing 13. RLA - properties

Implementation. We now give an implementation of the $rla(v, id)$ instance of the RLA primitive. Recall that the failure model of $rla(v, id)$ assumes (at least) a quorum of correct members of view v . Since $rla(v, id)$ is associated with view v , a correct server $r \in v.members()$ discards all messages sent by processes that are not members of v ; for brevity, this check is omitted from listings 14 and 15.

Moreover, we assume that there exists the reliable broadcast primitive that allows processes to “reliably” broadcast a message m to a fixed set of processes; we write “**reliably broadcast** m to S ”, where S is a set of processes. The reliable broadcast primitive can be implemented in static systems [5], i.e., in systems in which correct processes never

⁴The proposal contains a single element.

halt. However, any implementation of the primitive in a static environment implements the primitive in a dynamic system (in which correct processes might halt) if we assume that the properties of the primitive need to be ensured only if no correct process halts.

The presented implementation is highly inspired by the protocol given in [8]; the changes we introduce account for subtle differences between RLA and BLA. For the presentational purposes, we distinguish two roles of servers implementing $rla(v, id)$: *proposer* and *acceptor*. However, the following implementation assumes that each server takes *both* roles.

1 Reconfiguration Lattice Agreement:

```

2   instance  $rla(v, id)$ , with  $v$  is View and  $id$  is Integer

4   Proposer Implementation:
5       upon  $\langle rla(v, id).Init \rangle$ : // initialization of  $rla(v, id)$  for the proposer
6           Set(X)  $proposed\_value = \perp$ 
7           Integer  $init\_counter = 0$ 
8           Set(X)  $Proposed\_Set = \emptyset$ 
9           Set(Server)  $Ack\_Set = \emptyset$ 
10          Set(Message)  $\omega = \emptyset$ 
11          Set(X)  $Safe\_Set = \emptyset$ 
12          Set(Message)  $Waiting\_Msgs = \emptyset$ 
13          String  $state = "disclosing"$ 

15         // Disclosure Phase
16         upon  $\langle rla(v, id).Start \mid Set(X) \textit{proposal} \rangle$ :
17             if  $proposal \neq \perp$ :
18                  $proposed\_value = proposal$ 
19                  $Safe\_Set = Safe\_Set \cup proposed\_value$ 
20                  $Proposed\_Set = Proposed\_Set \cup proposed\_value$ 
21                 reliably broadcast [DISCLOSURE( $v, id$ ),  $proposed\_value$ ] to  $v.members()$ 
22             start processing protocol messages of  $rla(v, id)$ 

24         upon  $\langle rla(v, id).Propose \mid Set(X) \textit{proposal} \rangle$ :
25             if  $proposed\_value = \perp$ :
26                  $proposed\_value = proposal$ 
27                  $Safe\_Set = Safe\_Set \cup proposed\_value$ 
28                  $Proposed\_Set = Proposed\_Set \cup proposed\_value$ 
29                 reliably broadcast [DISCLOSURE( $v, id$ ),  $proposed\_value$ ] to  $v.members()$ 

31         upon  $\langle rla(v, id).Stop \rangle$ :
32             stop processing protocol messages of  $rla(v, id)$ 

34         upon reliably deliver Message  $m = [DISCLOSURE(v, id), Set(X) \textit{proposal}]$ :
```

```

35   if |proposal| = 1 and for all  $x \in proposal$ :  $valid(x, v) = \top$ :
36       Safe_Set = Safe_Set  $\cup$  proposal
37       init_counter = init_counter + 1
38       if state = "disclosing":
39           if proposed_value =  $\perp$ :
40               proposed_value = proposal
41               reliably broadcast [DISCLOSURE( $v$ ,  $id$ ), proposed_value] to  $v.members()$ 
42               Proposed_Set = Proposed_Set  $\cup$  proposal

44 // Deciding Phase
45 upon init_counter  $\geq v.quorum()$  and state = "disclosing":
46     state = "proposing"
47     broadcast [ACK_REQ( $v$ ,  $id$ ), Proposed_Set] to  $v.members()$ 

49     upon receipt of Message  $m$  such that  $m = [ACK\_CON(v, id), Set(X) proposed]$  or  $m = [NACK(v, id),$ 
Set(X) update, Set(X) proposed]:
50         Waiting_Msgs = Waiting_Msgs  $\cup$  { $m$ }

52     upon exists Message  $m \in Waiting\_Msgs$  such that  $Safe(m) = \top$  and state = "proposing" and
 $m = [ACK\_CON(v, id), Set(X) proposed]$  and  $proposed = Proposed\_Set$ :
53         Waiting_Msgs = Waiting_Msgs  $\setminus$  { $m$ }
54         if  $m.sender \notin Ack\_Set$ :
55             Ack_Set = Ack_Set  $\cup$  { $m.sender$ }
56              $\omega = \omega \cup \{m\}$ 

58     upon exists Message  $m \in Waiting\_Msgs$  such that  $Safe(m) = \top$  and state = "proposing" and
 $m = [NACK(v, id), Set(X) update, Set(X) proposed]$  and  $proposed = Proposed\_Set$ :
59         Waiting_Msgs = Waiting_Msgs  $\setminus$  { $m$ }
60         if update  $\cup$  Proposed_Set  $\neq$  Proposed_Set:
61             Proposed_Set = Proposed_Set  $\cup$  update
62             Ack_Set =  $\emptyset$ ;  $\omega = \emptyset$ 
63             broadcast [ACK_REQ( $v$ ,  $id$ ), Proposed_Set] to  $v.members()$ 

65     upon |Ack_Set|  $\geq v.quorum()$  and state = "proposing":
66         state = "decided"
67         trigger <rla( $v, id$ ).Decide | Proposed_Set,  $\omega$ >

69 function Safe(Message  $m$ ):
70     if  $m = [ACK\_CON(v, id), Set(X) proposed]$ :
71         return  $proposed \subseteq Safe\_Set$ 
72     if  $m = [NACK(v, id), Set(X) update, Set(X) proposed]$ :

```

```

73         return update  $\subseteq$  Safe_Set
74     return  $\perp$ 

```

Listing 14. RLA - proposer implementation

Next, we provide the acceptor implementation.

```

1 Reconfiguration Lattice Agreement:
2     instance rla(v, id), with v is View and id is Integer

4     Acceptor Implementation:
5     upon <rla(v, id).Init>: // initialization of rla(v, id) for the acceptor
6         Set(X) Accepted_Set =  $\emptyset$ 
7         Set(Message) Waiting_Msgs =  $\emptyset$ 
8         Set(X) Safe_Set // reference to Safe_Set in the corresponding proposer

10    upon receipt of Message m such that  $m = [\text{ACK\_REQ}(v, id), \text{Set}(X) \text{ proposal}]$ :
11        Waiting_Msgs = Waiting_Msgs  $\cup$  {m}

13    upon exists Message m  $\in$  Waiting_Msgs such that Safe(m) =  $\top$  and  $m = [\text{ACK\_REQ}(v, id), \text{Set}(X)$ 
14    proposal] and proposal  $\neq \emptyset$ :
15        Waiting_Msgs = Waiting_Msgs  $\setminus$  {m}
16        if Accepted_Set  $\subseteq$  proposal:
17            Accepted_Set = proposal
18            send [ACK_CON(v, id), Accepted_Set] to m.sender
19        else:
20            send [NACK(v, id), Accepted_Set, proposal] to m.sender
21            Accepted_Set = Accepted_Set  $\cup$  proposal

22    function Safe(Message m):
23        if  $m = [\text{ACK\_REQ}(v, id), \text{Set}(X) \text{ proposal}]$ :
24            return proposal  $\subseteq$  Safe_Set
25        return  $\perp$ 

```

Listing 15. RLA - acceptor implementation

In order to conclude the implementation of $rla(v, id)$, we need to define when $\text{verify_output}(dec, rla(v, id), \omega) = \top$.

```

1 function verify_output(Set(X) dec, Distributed_Primitive_Instance rla(v, id), Certificate  $\omega$ ):
2     if  $\omega$  is not Set(Message): return  $\perp$ 

4     Integer senders_num =  $|\{r \mid m \in \omega \text{ and } m.\text{sender} = r \text{ and } r \in v.\text{members}()\}|$ 
5     if senders_num < v.quorum(): return  $\perp$ 

```

7 **return** for every Message $m \in \omega$, $m = [\text{ACK_CON}(v, id), dec]$

Listing 16. The `verify_output` function for $rla(v, id)$

Proof of correctness. We are now ready to prove the correctness of the implementation given in listings 14 and 15. We start by proving the safety properties of $rla(v, id)$.

First, we prove the integrity property.

Theorem 1 (Integrity). Algorithm given in listings 14 and 15 satisfies integrity.

PROOF. Since a server $r \notin v.\text{members}()$ never starts $rla(v, id)$, it never starts processing protocol messages of $rla(v, id)$ (i.e., r never executes line 22 of Listing 14). Hence, the rule at line 65 of Listing 14 is never active at server r . Thus, r never decides from $rla(v, id)$ and the theorem holds. \square

Next, we prove decision certification.

Theorem 2 (Decision Certification). Algorithm given in listings 14 and 15 satisfies decision certification.

PROOF. Let a correct server r decide dec with a certificate ω . We know that ω is a set of messages (by line 10 of Listing 14) and that the number of distinct senders “contained” in ω is greater than or equal to $v.\text{quorum}()$ (by line 65 of Listing 14). Moreover, all messages that belong to ω are for $\text{Proposed_Set} = dec$ due to the check at line 52 of Listing 14 and due to the “flush” of the Ack_Set variable (at line 62 of Listing 14) once the value of Proposed_Set is updated. \square

We now prove comparability.

Theorem 3 (Comparability). Algorithm given in listings 14 and 15 satisfies comparability.

PROOF. Let dec_1 and let dec_2 be committed by $rla(v, id)$. Hence, at least $v.\text{quorum}()$ acceptors have sent the $\text{ACK_CON}(v, id)$ message for dec_1 . Similarly, $v.\text{quorum}()$ acceptors have sent the $\text{ACK_CON}(v, id)$ message for dec_2 . Hence, there exists at least a single correct acceptor that has sent both messages (due to the quorum intersection and the fact that at least $v.\text{quorum}()$ members of v are correct); let that acceptor be k .

Without loss of generality, we assume that k has first sent the $\text{ACK_CON}(v, id)$ message for dec_1 . At the moment t of sending the $\text{ACK_CON}(v, id)$ message for dec_1 , we have that $\text{Accepted_Set} = dec_1$ at server k (line 16 of Listing 15). On the other hand, at the moment $t' \geq t$ of sending the $\text{ACK_CON}(v, id)$ message for dec_2 , we have that $\text{Accepted_Set} = dec_2$ at k (line 16 of Listing 15). Hence, we investigate how Accepted_Set changes after time t at acceptor k .

Initially, at time t , $\text{Accepted_Set} = dec_1$. Hence, we set the induction hypothesis $dec_1 \subseteq \text{Accepted_Set}$. We investigate all possibilities for k to modify its Accepted_Set variable:

- line 16 of Listing 15: The hypothesis is preserved because of the check at line 15 of Listing 15.
- line 20 of Listing 15: The hypothesis is preserved because of the fact that the new value of Accepted_Set contains the old value of Accepted_Set and dec_1 is included in the old value of Accepted_Set .

Therefore, all values of the Accepted_Set variable at acceptor k after time t contain dec_1 . Thus, we have that $dec_1 \subseteq dec_2$, which concludes the theorem. \square

The following lemma proves that, if $x \in \text{Safe_Set}$ at a correct server, then $\text{valid}(x, v) = \top$.

Lemma 1. Let r be a correct server. If $x \in \text{Safe_Set}$ at r , then $\text{valid}(x, v) = \top$.

PROOF. We examine all possible ways for a correct server to modify its Safe_Set variable:

- line 19 of Listing 14: By rule 6 of $rla(v, id)$ (line 21 of Listing 12), a single element x is added to $Safe_Set$ and $valid(x, v) = \top$.
- line 27 of Listing 14: As in the previous case, a single element x is added to $Safe_Set$ and $valid(x, v) = \top$ (by rule 6 of $rla(v, id)$).
- line 36 of Listing 14: A single element x is added to $Safe_Set$ and $valid(x, v) = \top$ (by the check at line 35 of Listing 14).

The fact that, at all times, for every $x \in Safe_Set$, $valid(x, v) = \top$ concludes the theorem. \square

The following theorem proves validity.

Theorem 4 (Validity). Algorithm given in listings 14 and 15 satisfies validity.

PROOF. Let dec be committed by $rla(v, id)$. Since no correct acceptor ever sends the $[ACK_CON(v, id), \emptyset]$ message (due to the check at line 13 of Listing 15), $dec \neq \emptyset$.

Since dec is committed by $rla(v, id)$, there exists a correct acceptor $k \in v.members()$ that has sent the $ACK_CON(v, id)$ message for dec . At that time, we know that $dec \subseteq Safe_Set$ at server k (by line 13 of Listing 15). Therefore, the theorem conclusion follows from Lemma 1. \square

The next safety property we have to prove is the bounded decisions property. In order to do so, we first prove that $Accepted_Set \subseteq Safe_Set$ at a correct server at all times.

Lemma 2. At all times, $Accepted_Set \subseteq Safe_Set$ at a correct acceptor.

PROOF. Initially, $Accepted_Set = Safe_Set = \emptyset$. Thus, initially the invariant holds.

We now introduce the induction hypothesis $Accepted_Set \subseteq Safe_Set$. Let us investigate all places at which the $Accepted_Set$ variable or the $Safe_Set$ variable is changed:

- line 19 of Listing 14: Holds because of the induction hypothesis.
- line 27 of Listing 14: Holds because of the induction hypothesis.
- line 36 of Listing 14: Holds because of the induction hypothesis.
- line 16 of Listing 15: Holds because $proposal \subseteq Safe_Set$ (because of the $Safe()$ function; line 24 of Listing 15).
- line 20 of Listing 15: Holds because of the induction hypothesis and the fact that $proposal \subseteq Safe_Set$ (because of the $Safe()$ function).

Since the induction hypothesis is always preserved, the lemma holds. \square

We are now ready to prove the bounded decisions property.

Theorem 5 (Bounded Decisions). Algorithm given in listings 14 and 15 satisfies bounded decisions.

PROOF. Let dec be committed by $rla(v, id)$. We have that $Accepted_Set = dec$ at some correct server r (line 16 of Listing 15). By Lemma 2, we know that $dec \subseteq Safe_Set$ at server r at that time.

Let $proposals = \{proposal \mid proposal \subseteq Safe_Set \text{ at a correct server at some time and } |proposal| = 1\}$. We know that $|proposals| \leq |v.members()|$ due to the fact that each $proposal \in proposals$ is broadcast using the reliable broadcast primitive. Now, let $SAFE_SET = \bigcup_{proposal \in proposals} proposal$. Hence, at any point in time, we have that $Safe_Set \subseteq SAFE_SET$ at a correct server. That means that $dec \subseteq SAFE_SET$, for any committed dec . Since $SAFE_SET$ is finite, it has finitely many subsets. Therefore, the theorem holds. \square

The last safety property we need to prove is decision permission.

Theorem 6 (Decision Permission). Algorithm given in listings 14 and 15 satisfies decision permission.

PROOF. Assume that dec is committed by $rla(v, id)$. Hence, at least $v.plurality()$ of correct members of v have sent the $[ACK_CON(v, id), dec]$ message (by Listing 16). Since a correct server does not send any $ACK_CON(v, id)$ message before starting $rla(v, id)$ (ensured by the fact that a correct server starts processing protocol messages of $rla(v, id)$ only once it starts $rla(v, id)$; line 22 of Listing 14), the decision permission property is ensured. \square

Lastly, we prove liveness. Recall that liveness is guaranteed only if all correct servers start $rla(v, id)$, a correct server proposes to $rla(v, id)$ and no correct server stops $rla(v, id)$. We implicitly assume that these hold in the following lemmas.

First, we show that $Safe_Set$ variables of correct servers are eventually identical. This is ensured because of the properties of the reliable broadcast primitive.

Lemma 3. Eventually, $Safe_Set_r = Safe_Set_{r'}$, where r and r' are correct servers, $Safe_Set_r$ denotes the value of $Safe_Set$ at server r and $Safe_Set_{r'}$ denotes the value of $Safe_Set$ at server r' .

PROOF. A correct server updates its $Safe_Set$ variable at following places in Listing 14:

- line 19: The update is reliably broadcast at line 21 of Listing 14. By rule 6 of $rla(v, id)$, we know that $proposed_value = \{x\}$ and $valid(x, v) = \top$. Hence, whenever another correct server receives the $DISCLOSURE(v, id)$ message for $proposed_value$, the check at line 35 of Listing 14 passes and $proposed_value$ is included in $Safe_Set$.
- line 27: The update is reliably broadcast at line 29 of Listing 14. By rule 6 of $rla(v, id)$, we know that $proposed_value = \{x\}$ and $valid(x, v) = \top$. Hence, whenever another correct server receives the $DISCLOSURE(v, id)$ message for $proposed_value$, the check at line 35 of Listing 14 passes and $proposed_value$ is included in $Safe_Set$.
- line 36: The update is reliably delivered (at line 34 of Listing 14). Due to the check at line 35 of Listing 14, we know that $proposal = \{x\}$ and $valid(x, v) = \top$. Hence, whenever another correct server receives the $DISCLOSURE(v, id)$ message for $proposal$ (which happens because of the totality and agreement properties of the reliable broadcast primitive), the check at line 35 of Listing 14 passes and $proposal$ is included in $Safe_Set$.

Thus, every update to $Safe_Set$ of a correct server eventually reaches every other correct server due to the properties of the reliable broadcast primitive. The lemma holds. \square

Next, we prove that $Proposed_Set \subseteq Safe_Set$ at a correct server.

Lemma 4. At all times, $Proposed_Set \subseteq Safe_Set$ at a correct proposer.

PROOF. Initially, $Proposed_Set = Safe_Set = \emptyset$. Thus, initially the invariant holds.

We now introduce the induction hypothesis $Proposed_Set \subseteq Safe_Set$. Let us investigate all places at which either $Proposed_Set$ or $Safe_Set$ variables are changed in Listing 14:

- line 19: Holds because of the induction hypothesis.
- line 20: Holds because of the induction hypothesis and the fact that $proposed_value \subseteq Safe_Set$.
- line 27: Holds because of the induction hypothesis.
- line 28: Holds because of the induction hypothesis and the fact that $proposed_value \subseteq Safe_Set$.
- line 36: Holds because of the induction hypothesis.
- line 42: Holds because of the induction hypothesis and the fact that $proposal \subseteq Safe_Set$.

- line 61: Holds because of the induction hypothesis and the fact that $update \subseteq Safe_Set$ (because of the $Safe()$ function; line 73 of Listing 14).

Since the induction hypothesis is always preserved, the lemma holds. \square

Now, we show that every message sent by a correct server is eventually “safe” at all other correct servers.

Lemma 5. Any $ACK_CON(v, id)$, $NACK(v, id)$ or $ACK_REQ(v, id)$ message sent by a correct server is eventually safe (i.e., the $Safe()$ function returns \top) for any other correct server.

PROOF. Let us first consider a message $m = [ACK_CON(v, id), set]$ sent by a correct server r to a correct server r' . Since r has previously received the ACK_REQ message for set from r' , we know that $Proposed_Set = set$ at server r' at the moment of broadcasting this message (line 47 or line 63 of Listing 14). Hence, $set \subseteq Safe_Set$ at server r' (by Lemma 4), which ensures that the lemma holds in this case.

Now, let $m = [NACK(v, id), set, proposed]$ be sent by a correct server r . At the moment of sending m , we know that $Accepted_Set = set$ at server r (by line 19 of Listing 15). By Lemma 2, we know that $set \subseteq Safe_Set$ at server r . Eventually, by Lemma 3, we know that $set \subseteq Safe_Set$ at any other correct server. Hence, m eventually becomes safe.

Finally, let $m = [ACK_REQ(v, id), set, number]$ be broadcast by a correct server r . We know that $Proposed_Set = set$ (by lines 47 and 63 of Listing 14). By Lemma 4, we know that $set \subseteq Safe_Set$ at server r . Eventually, by Lemma 3, we know that $set \subseteq Safe_Set$ at any other correct server. Hence, m eventually becomes safe, which concludes the lemma. \square

Now, we show that a correct server modifies its proposal at most $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor$ times, where $n = |v.members()|$.

Lemma 6. A correct server r refines its proposal (i.e., executes line 63 of Listing 14) at most $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor$ times, where $n = |v.members()|$.

PROOF. The first proposal of server r includes proposals from (at least) $v.quorum()$ servers (lines 45 and 47 of Listing 14). Since $|Safe_Set|$ at r is at most n (due to rule 6 and the check at line 35 of Listing 14) and $n - v.quorum() = \lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor$, r can execute line 63 of Listing 14 at most $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor$ times. \square

The next lemma shows that a correct proposer never sends an ACK_REQ message for \emptyset .

Lemma 7. Let a correct server r send the $[ACK_REQ(v, id), proposal]$ message. Then, $proposal \neq \emptyset$.

PROOF. The first ACK_REQ message is sent for $proposal$ at line 47 of Listing 14, where $proposal = Proposed_Set$. By the check at line 35 of Listing 14, we know that $Proposed_Set \neq \emptyset$.

After the first sent ACK_REQ , other ACK_REQ messages are sent at line 63 of Listing 14 for $Proposed_Set$. Since $Proposed_Set$ is never updated to \emptyset and elements of $Proposed_Set$ are never removed, we conclude the lemma. \square

The next lemma shows that, if a correct proposer stops refining its proposal, then the proposer eventually decides.

Lemma 8. If there exists a time t after which a correct server r , which is in the proposing state, does not execute line 63 of Listing 14, then r eventually decides.

PROOF. Let $proposal$ be the last proposal for which r sends an $ACK_REQ(v, id)$ message in an execution. Since r does not execute line 63 of Listing 14 after this message has been sent, either r does not receive any $NACK(v, id)$ message or no received $NACK(v, id)$ message allows r to pass the check at line 60 of Listing 14. Since r is correct, its $[ACK_REQ(v, id), proposal]$ message eventually reaches every correct acceptor (by lemmas 5 and 7). Then, each correct

acceptor sends the $[ACK_CON(v, id), proposal]$ message to r . By contradiction, suppose that a correct acceptor sends $[NACK(v, id), update, proposed]$ to r , then:

- $update \not\subseteq proposal$ (by line 15 of Listing 15), and
- m would eventually be “safe” at r (due to Lemma 5) and, since r does not update its *Proposed_Set* variable, line 58 of Listing 14 eventually passes at r , and
- the check at line 60 of Listing 14 passes at r since $update \not\subseteq proposal$.

Therefore, r would refine its proposal, which contradicts the fact that r never refines *proposal*.

Hence, once r receives $ACK_CON(v, id)$ messages from all correct servers, these messages are safe for r (by Lemma 5) and, since *Proposed_Set* at server r does not change, the rule at line 65 of Listing 14 is active, which implies that r decides. \square

Finally, we prove the liveness property of $rla(v, id)$.

Theorem 7 (Liveness). Algorithm given in Listings 14 and 15 satisfies liveness.

PROOF. Let a correct server *proposer* propose to $rla(v, id)$. This means that every correct server r eventually obtains proposals of v .quorum() servers (line 45 of Listing 14) and sends an ACK_REQ message (line 47 of Listing 14). By Lemma 6, r refines its proposal only finitely many times. Once r stops refining its proposal, r decides (by Lemma 8). \square

4.2 View Generator - Implementation

Now that we have introduced RLA, we are ready to present our implementation of $vg(v)$. Recall that the failure model of $vg(v)$ assumes (at least) a quorum of correct members of view v .

Our implementation of $vg(v)$ consists of two RLA instances: $rla(v, 1)$ and $rla(v, 2)$. We provide the descriptions of both instances below:

- (1) $rla(v, 1)$ description: Sets of tuples (v', set', ϵ') , where v' is a view, set' is a set of views and ϵ' is an evidence, are processed by $rla(v, 1)$. Recall that such tuples are given as inputs to $vg(v)$.
- (2) $rla(v, 2)$ description: Sets of tuples (set', ϵ') are processed by $rla(v, 2)$, where set' is a set of views and ϵ' is an evidence (see Listing 17).

```

1 Set, Evidence:
2   instance (set',  $\epsilon'$ ), with set' is Set(View) and  $\epsilon'$  is Evidence

4   function construct(Set(View), Set, Evidence) set:
5     Set(Set(View)) SET = {set* | (v*, set*,  $\epsilon^*$ )  $\in$  set and set*  $\neq$   $\emptyset$ }
6     Set(View) VIEW = {v* | (v*, set*,  $\epsilon^*$ )  $\in$  set and set* =  $\emptyset$ }
7     Set(View) result_set =  $\perp$ 

9     if |VIEW| = 0: // no ``stand-alone'' views
10      result_set = max_cardinality5(SET) // get the set with the greatest cardinality
11   else:
12      Set(View) greatest_set = max_cardinality(SET) // get the set with the greatest cardinality

```

⁵We assume that the $\max_cardinality(set)$ deterministic function, where set is a set of sets, returns the set with the greatest cardinality that belongs to set ; if there are multiple sets that satisfy the condition, then any such set is returned.

Carbon: An Asynchronous Voting-Based Payment System for a Client-Server Architecture

```

13     View greatest_view =  $\emptyset$ 
14     if greatest_set  $\neq \perp$ :
15         greatest_view = max_cardinality(greatest_set) // get the view with the greatest cardinality6
16     View union_view =  $\bigcup_{v^* \in \text{VIEW}} v^*$ 
17     result_set = {greatest_view  $\cup$  union_view}
18     return result_set

20 // we need to define the valid function
21 function valid(Set, Evidence (set',  $\epsilon'$ ), View v):
22     if does not exist Set(View, Set, Evidence) set such that verify_output(set, rla(v, 1),  $\epsilon'$ )
    =  $\top$ :
23         return  $\perp$ 
24     return construct(set) = set'

```

Listing 17. (Set, Evidence) tuple

Finally, we give our implementation of $\text{vg}(v)$.

1 View Generator:

```

2     instance vg(v), with v is View

4     Implementation:

5     upon <vg(v).Init>: // initialization of vg(v)
6         Bool started1 =  $\perp$ 
7         Bool started2 =  $\perp$ 

9     upon <vg(v).Start | View, Set, Evidence (v', set',  $\epsilon'$ )>:
10         started1 =  $\top$ 
11         if (v', set',  $\epsilon'$ )  $\neq \perp$ :
12             trigger <rla(v, 1).Start | {(v', set',  $\epsilon'$ )}>
13         else:
14             trigger <rla(v, 1).Start |  $\perp$ >

16     upon <vg(v).Propose | View, Set, Evidence (v', set',  $\epsilon'$ )>:
17         trigger <rla(v, 1).Propose | {(v', set',  $\epsilon'$ )}>

19     upon <rla(v, 1).Decide | Set(View, Set, Evidence) dec, Certificate  $\omega$ >:
20         Set(View) proposal = construct(dec) // the function from Listing 17
21         started2 =  $\top$ 
22         trigger <rla(v, 2).Start | {(proposal,  $\omega$ )}>

24     upon <rla(v, 2).Decide | Set(Set, Evidence) dec, Certificate  $\omega$ >:

```

⁶Recall that a view is a set of changes.

```

25      Set(Set(View)) SET = {set* | (set*, e*) ∈ dec}
26      trigger <vg(v).Decide |  $\bigcup_{set^* \in SET} set^*, \omega$ >

28      upon <vg(v).Stop>:
29          if started1 =  $\top$ :
30              trigger <rla(v, 1).Stop>
31          if started2 =  $\top$ :
32              trigger <rla(v, 2).Stop>

```

Listing 18. View generator - implementation

In order to conclude the implementation of $vg(v)$, we need to define when $verify_output(set_res, vg(v), \omega) = \top$.

```

1 function verify_output(Set(View) set_res, Distributed_Primitive_Instance vg(v), Certificate  $\omega$ ):
2     if  $\omega$  is not Set(Message): return  $\perp$ 

4     if does not exist Set(Set, Evidence) set such that verify_output(set, rla(v, 2),  $\omega$ ) =  $\top$ :
5         return  $\perp$ 

7     Set(Set(View)) SET = {set* | (set*, e*) ∈ set}
8     return set_res =  $\bigcup_{set^* \in SET} set^*$ 

```

Listing 19. The verify_output function for $vg(v)$

Proof of correctness. Finally, we prove the correctness of $vg(v)$. We start by proving the integrity property.

Theorem 8 (Integrity). Algorithm given in Listing 18 satisfies integrity.

PROOF. By integrity of $rla(v, 2)$, a correct server $r \notin v.members()$ never decides from $rla(v, 2)$. Hence, the rule at line 24 of Listing 18 is never active at server r , which means that r never decides from $vg(v)$. Therefore, integrity is satisfied. \square

Next, we prove the comparability property.

Theorem 9 (Comparability). Algorithm given in Listing 18 satisfies comparability.

PROOF. Let set_1 and set_2 be committed by $vg(v)$. Hence, a set set_1^* , where (1) set_1^* is a set of tuples of the Set, Evidence type, and (2) $set_1 = \bigcup_{(set^*, e^*) \in set_1^*} set^*$, is committed by $rla(v, 2)$ (by Listing 19). Similarly, a set set_2^* , where (1) set_2^* is a set of tuples of the Set, Evidence type, and (2) $set_2 = \bigcup_{(set^*, e^*) \in set_2^*} set^*$, is committed by $rla(v, 2)$ (by Listing 19). By comparability of $rla(v, 2)$, either $set_1^* \subseteq set_2^*$ or $set_1^* \supset set_2^*$. We investigate all cases:

- $set_1^* = set_2^*$: In this case, $set_1 = set_2$ and the theorem holds.
- $set_1^* \subset set_2^*$: Therefore, every view $v_1 \in set_1$ belongs to set_2 . Hence, the theorem holds.
- $set_1^* \supset set_2^*$: The case is symmetrical to the previous one.

The theorem is satisfied in all possible cases, which concludes the proof. \square

Next, we prove validity. In order to do so, we prove that all sets committed by $rla(v, 1)$ at time t are subsets of Λ_{t-1}^v .

Lemma 9. Let dec be committed at $rla(v, 1)$ at time t . Then, $dec \subseteq \Lambda_{t-1}^v$.

PROOF. Suppose that there exists a tuple $(v', set', \epsilon') \in dec$ such that $\text{valid}((v', set', \epsilon'), v) = \perp$. In this case, the validity property of $rla(v, 1)$ is violated. Hence, $\text{valid}((v', set', \epsilon'), v) = \top$, for every $(v', set', \epsilon') \in dec$. Let $E_{dec} = \{\epsilon' \mid (v', set', \epsilon') \in dec\}$.

Since dec is committed at time t , there exists a (correct or faulty) process that obtains ω_{dec} at time $t' \leq t$ such that $\text{verify_output}(dec, rla(v, 1), \omega_{dec}) = \top$. We know that ω_{dec} is a set of $[\text{ACK_CON}(v, 1), dec]$ messages with $|\omega_{dec}| \geq v.\text{quorum}()$ (by Listing 16). Hence, a correct server $r_{dec} \in v.\text{members}()$ sends its ACK_CON message by time t (since ω_{dec} is obtained by time t) at line 17 of Listing 15. Therefore, dec is obtained before time t (at line 16 of Listing 15), which implies that every $\epsilon' \in E_{dec}$ is obtained before time t . Thus, the lemma holds. \square

Since $\Lambda_{t-1}^v \subseteq \Lambda_{t'}^v$, for any time $t' > t - 1$, we conclude that $dec \subseteq \Lambda_{t'}^v$, if dec is committed by $rla(v, 1)$ at time t . Next, we prove that all valid inputs of $rla(v, 2)$ “contain” sequences if the *preconditions* predicate is satisfied.

Lemma 10. Let a (correct or faulty) process obtain ϵ at time t , such that $o = (set, \epsilon)$ is a tuple of the Set, Evidence type and $\text{valid}(o, v) = \top$. Let $\text{preconditions}(v, t - 1) = \top$. Then, set is a sequence.

PROOF. Since $\text{valid}(o, v) = \top$, we conclude that a set set^* , where set^* is a set of tuples of the View, Set, Evidence type and $set = \text{construct}(set^*)$, is committed by $rla(v, 1)$ at time t (by Listing 17). Hence, $set^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t-1}^v$ (by Lemma 9). Let us take a closer look at the $\text{construct}(set^*)$ function:

- Let $|VIEW| = 0$. Since $\text{preconditions}(v, t - 1) = \top$ and $set^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t-1}^v$, we know that all sets from SET are sequences. Hence, set is a sequence.
- Let $|VIEW| \neq 0$. In this case, we have that $|set| = 1$. Hence, set is trivially a sequence.

The lemma holds. \square

The next lemma builds upon Lemma 10 by showing that all views that belong to two valid inputs of $rla(v, 2)$ are comparable.

Lemma 11. Let a (correct or faulty) process obtain ϵ_1 at time t_1 , such that $o_1 = (set_1, \epsilon_1)$ is a tuple of the Set, Evidence type and $\text{valid}(o_1, v) = \top$. Moreover, let a (correct or faulty) process obtain ϵ_2 at time $t_2 \geq t_1$, such that $o_2 = (set_2, \epsilon_2)$ is a tuple of the Set, Evidence type and $\text{valid}(o_2, v) = \top$. Let $v_1 \in set_1, v_2 \in set_2$ and $\text{preconditions}(v, t_2 - 1) = \top$. Then, either $v_1 \subseteq v_2$ or $v_1 \supset v_2$.

PROOF. Since $\text{valid}(o_1, v) = \top$, we conclude that a set set_1^* , where set_1^* is a set of tuples of the View, Set, Evidence type and $set_1 = \text{construct}(set_1^*)$, is committed by $rla(v, 1)$ at time t_1 (by Listing 17). Similarly, a set set_2^* , where set_2^* is a set of tuples of the View, Set, Evidence type and $set_2 = \text{construct}(set_2^*)$, is committed by $rla(v, 1)$ at time t_2 (by Listing 17). By comparability of $rla(v, 1)$, we know that either $set_1^* \subseteq set_2^*$ or $set_1^* \supset set_2^*$. Furthermore, we know that $set_1^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t_2-1}^v$ and $set_2^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t_2-1}^v$ (by Lemma 9). We investigate all three possibilities:

- $set_1^* = set_2^*$: In this case, $set_1 = set_2$. Now, if $|set_1| = |set_2| = 1$, the lemma is satisfied. However, if $|set_1| = |set_2| \neq 1$, we need to show that $set_1 = set_2$ is a sequence.
If $|set_1| = |set_2| \neq 1$, we know that $set_1 = set_2 = \text{max_cardinality}(SET)$ in the construct function (line 10 of Listing 17). Since $\text{preconditions}(v, t_2 - 1) = \top$, we know that all sets from SET are sequences. Therefore, $set_1 = set_2$ is a sequence. Thus, the lemma holds in this case.
- $set_1^* \subset set_2^*$: We further distinguish three cases:

- $|VIEW_1| = |VIEW_2| = 0$, where $|VIEW_1|$ is the number of “stand-alone” views in set_1^* (line 6 of Listing 17) and $|VIEW_2|$ is the number of “stand-alone” views in set_2^* (line 6 of Listing 17): We know that $set_1^*, set_2^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t_2-1}^v$. Since $preconditions(v, t_2 - 1) = \top$, we know that set_1 is the greatest set of SET_1 with respect to the containment relation (line 5 of Listing 17), i.e., $set \subseteq set_1$, for every $set \in SET_1$. Similarly, we know that set_2 is the greatest set of SET_2 with respect to the containment relation (line 5 of Listing 17), i.e., $set \subseteq set_2$, for every $set \in SET_2$. Since $preconditions(v, t_2 - 1) = \top$ and $set_1^* \subseteq set_2^*$, we know that (1) set_2 is a sequence, and (2) $set_1 \subseteq set_2$. Finally, the fact that $v_1 \in set_2$ ensures that $comparable(v_1, v_2) = \top$, which concludes the lemma in this case.
- $|VIEW_1| = 0$ and $|VIEW_2| \neq 0$: In this case, $set_2 = \{v_2\}$. Since $set_1^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t_2-1}^v$ and $preconditions(v, t_2 - 1) = \top$, we know that set_1 is the greatest set of SET_1 with respect to the containment relation (line 5 of Listing 17), i.e., $set \subseteq set_1$, for every $set \in SET_1$. Moreover, we know that set_1 is a sequence. Since $set_1^* \subseteq set_2^*$, we know that $set_1 \in SET_2$. Let set_2^{max} be the greatest set of SET_2 with respect to the containment relation (line 5 of Listing 17), i.e., $set \subseteq set_2^{max}$, for every $set \in SET_2$; because $set_2^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t_2-1}^v$ and $preconditions(v, t_2 - 1) = \top$, the greatest set set_2^{max} among SET_2 is indeed well defined. Moreover, set_2^{max} is a sequence. We conclude that $set_1 \subseteq set_2^{max}$. Therefore, $set_1.last() \subseteq greatest_view$, where $greatest_view = \max_cardinality(set_2^{max}) = set_2^{max}.last()$ (line 15 of Listing 17). This implies, since set_1 is a sequence, that $v_1 \subseteq v_2$, which concludes the lemma in this case.
- $|VIEW_1| \neq 0$ and $|VIEW_2| \neq 0$: Let max_1 be the greatest set of SET_1 with respect to the containment relation, i.e., $set \subseteq max_1$, for every $set \in SET_1$; since $set_1^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t_2-1}^v$ and $preconditions(v, t_2 - 1) = \top$, the greatest set max_1 among SET_1 is well defined. Similarly, let max_2 be the greatest set of SET_2 with respect to the containment relation, i.e., $set \subseteq max_2$, for every $set \in SET_2$; since $set_2^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t_2-1}^v$ and $preconditions(v, t_2 - 1) = \top$, the greatest set max_2 among SET_2 is well defined. If $max_1 \neq \perp$ and $max_2 \neq \perp$, we know that $max_1 \subseteq max_2$ (since $set_1^* \subseteq set_2^*$). Note that it is impossible that $max_1 \neq \perp$ and $max_2 = \perp$ due to the fact that $set_1^* \subseteq set_2^*$. Hence, $greatest_view_1 \subseteq greatest_view_2$, where $greatest_view_1$ (resp., $greatest_view_2$) is the value of the $greatest_view$ variable at line 17 of Listing 17 of the $construct(set_1^*)$ (resp., $construct(set_2^*)$) function. Similarly, we know that $\bigcup_{v^* \in VIEW_1} v^* \subseteq \bigcup_{v^{**} \in VIEW_2} v^{**}$ (by comparability of $rla(v, 1)$). Finally, $v_1 = greatest_view_1 \cup \bigcup_{v^* \in VIEW_1} v^*$ and $v_2 = greatest_view_2 \cup \bigcup_{v^{**} \in VIEW_2} v^{**}$, which proves that $v_1 \subseteq v_2$.
- $set_1^* \supseteq set_2^*$: This case is symmetrical to the previous one.

The lemma holds. □

The last lemma we prove prior to proving the validity property shows that a set set given as an input to $rla(v, 2)$ must satisfy $set.follows(v) = \top$.

Lemma 12. Let a (correct or faulty) process obtain ϵ at time t , such that $o = (set, \epsilon)$ is a tuple of the Set, Evidence type and $valid(o, v) = \top$. Let $preconditions(v, t - 1) = \top$. Then, $set.follows(v) = \top$.

PROOF. Since $valid(o, v) = \top$, we conclude that a set set^* , where set^* is a set of tuples of the View, Set, Evidence type and $set = construct(set^*)$, is committed by $rla(v, 1)$ at time t (by Listing 17).

By validity of $rla(v, 1)$, we know that $set^* \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, $set^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t-1}^v$ (by Lemma 9). Let us take a closer look at every tuple $(v', set', \epsilon') \in set^*$:

- If $set' = \emptyset$, we know that $v \subseteq v'$ (due to the fact that $preconditions(v, t - 1) = \top$).
- Otherwise, $set'.follows(v) = \top$ and $v' \in set'$ (due to the fact that $preconditions(v, t - 1) = \top$).

Finally, we consider the $\text{construct}(set^*)$ function:

- Let $|VIEW| = 0$. Since $\text{preconditions}(v, t - 1) = \top$ and $set^* \subseteq \Lambda_{t-1}^v$, we know that $set.\text{follows}(v) = \top$, which concludes the lemma.
- Let $|VIEW| \neq 0$. In this case, set contains a single view. Moreover, we have that $v \subset v'$, for every “stand-alone” view $v' \in VIEW$. Therefore, $set.\text{follows}(v) = \top$.

Hence, the lemma holds. \square

Finally, we are able to prove the validity property of $\text{vg}(v)$.

Theorem 10 (Validity). Algorithm given in Listing 18 satisfies validity.

PROOF. Let set be committed by $\text{vg}(v)$ at time t and let $\text{preconditions}(v, t - 1) = \top$. Since set is committed at time t by $\text{vg}(v)$, a set $set_{rla(v,2)}$ is committed by $rla(v, 2)$ at time t , where (1) $set_{rla(v,2)}$ is a set of tuples of the Set, Evidence type, and (2) $set = \bigcup_{(set^*, \epsilon^*) \in set_{rla(v,2)}} set^*$ (by Listing 19). By validity of $rla(v, 2)$, we know that $set_{rla(v,2)} \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, because of the construct function, we know that $set \neq \emptyset$.

Next, we show that set is a sequence. Suppose, by contradiction, that $v_1, v_2 \in set$ such that $\text{comparable}(v_1, v_2) = \perp$. Since $v_1 \in set$, we know that $v_1 \in set^*$, where $(set^*, \epsilon^*) \in set_{rla(v,2)}$. Similarly, we know that $v_2 \in set^{**}$, where $(set^{**}, \epsilon^{**}) \in set_{rla(v,2)}$. We distinguish two scenarios:

- Let $set^* = set^{**}$. We know that $\text{valid}((set^*, \epsilon^*), v) = \top$ (by validity of $rla(v, 2)$). Moreover, a process obtains ϵ^* at time $t' \leq t$. Since $\text{preconditions}(v, t - 1) = \top$, we conclude that $set^* = set^{**}$ is a sequence (by Lemma 10). Thus, $\text{comparable}(v_1, v_2)$ cannot return \perp .
- Let $set^* \neq set^{**}$. By validity of $rla(v, 2)$, we know that $\text{valid}((set^*, \epsilon^*), v) = \text{valid}((set^{**}, \epsilon^{**}), v) = \top$. Since set is committed at time t , we conclude that a (correct or faulty) process obtains ϵ^* (resp., ϵ^{**}) at time $t^* \leq t$ (resp., $t^{**} \leq t$). Finally, the fact that $\text{preconditions}(v, t - 1) = \top$ implies that it is impossible that $\text{comparable}(v_1, v_2) = \perp$ (by Lemma 11).

Therefore, set is indeed a sequence.

Finally, we show that $set.\text{follows}(v) = \top$. Suppose, by contradiction, that there exists a view $v^* \in set$ such that $v \not\subset v^*$. Hence, there exists $(set^*, \epsilon^*) \in set_{rla(v,2)}$ such that (1) $v^* \in set^*$, and (2) $\text{valid}((set^*, \epsilon^*), v) = \top$ (by validity of $rla(v, 2)$). Moreover, ϵ^* is obtained at time $t^* \leq t$ by a server. Since $\text{preconditions}(v, t - 1) = \top$, we know that $set^*.\text{follows}(v) = \top$ (by Lemma 12). Hence, $v^* \notin set^*$, which concludes the theorem. \square

The next theorem proves membership validity of $\text{vg}(v)$.

Theorem 11 (Membership Validity). Algorithm given in Listing 18 satisfies membership validity.

PROOF. Let $\text{preconditions}(v, t - 1) = \top$ and let $(+, r) \notin v$, for some server r . Let set be committed by $\text{vg}(v)$ at time t . By contradiction, suppose that $(-, r) \in set.\text{last}()$; recall that set is a sequence because of the validity property of $\text{vg}(v)$. Let $set.\text{last}() = v^*$.

Since set is committed at time t by $\text{vg}(v)$, a set $set_{rla(v,2)}$ is committed by $rla(v, 2)$ at time t , where (1) $set_{rla(v,2)}$ is a set of tuples of the Set, Evidence type, and (2) $set = \bigcup_{(set^*, \epsilon^*) \in set_{rla(v,2)}} set^*$ (by Listing 19). We conclude that there exists a tuple $(set^*, \epsilon^*) \in set_{rla(v,2)}$ such that $v^* \in set^*$. Moreover, we know that $\text{valid}((set^*, \epsilon^*), v) = \top$ (by the validity property of $rla(v, 2)$).

Since ϵ^* is obtained by time t , a set $set_{rla(v,1)}$ is committed by $rla(v, 1)$ at time t , where (1) $set_{rla(v,1)}$ is a set of tuples of the View, Set, Evidence type, and (2) $set^* = \text{construct}(set_{rla(v,1)})$ (by Listing 17). Hence, $set_{rla(v,1)} \subseteq \Lambda_{t-1}^v$ (by Lemma 9). Finally, we consider the $\text{construct}(set_{rla(v,1)})$ function:

- Let $|VIEW| = 0$. Since $preconditions(v, t-1) = \top$ and $set_{rla(v,1)} \subseteq \Lambda_{t-1}^v$, we know that $(-, r) \notin set^*.last()$. Since set^* is a sequence, that means that $v^* \notin set^*$.
- Let $|VIEW| \neq 0$. In this case, set contains a single view. We know that $(-, r) \notin greatest_view$ at line 17 of Listing 17 since $preconditions(v, t-1) = \top$. Moreover, we have that $(-, r) \notin v'$, for every “stand-alone” view $v' \in VIEW$ (since $preconditions(v, t-1) = \top$). Therefore, it is impossible that $v^* \in set^*$.

The theorem holds. \square

Next, we prove the safety property of $vg(v)$.

Theorem 12 (Safety). Algorithm given in Listing 18 satisfies safety.

PROOF. Let set be committed by $vg(v)$ at time t . In the rest of the proof, let $(v', \emptyset, \epsilon') \notin \Lambda_{t-1}^v$. In order to prove the theorem, we prove that $(v_{set}, set, \epsilon_{set}) \in \Lambda_{t-1}^v$ in this case, for some view v_{set} and some proof ϵ_{set} .

Since set is committed by $vg(v)$ at time t , we know that $set_{rla(v,2)}$ is committed by $rla(v, 2)$ at time t , where $set = \bigcup_{(set^*, \epsilon^*) \in set_{rla(v,2)}} set^*$ (by Listing 19).

Let $(set^*, \epsilon^*) \in set_{rla(v,2)}$. We know that $\text{valid}((set^*, \epsilon^*), v) = \top$ (by validity of $rla(v, 2)$). Hence, a set $set_{rla(v,1)}$ of tuples of the View, Set, Evidence type is committed by $rla(v, 1)$ at time t , where $set^* = \text{construct}(set_{rla(v,1)})$ (by Listing 17). By Lemma 9, we know that $set_{rla(v,1)} \subseteq \Lambda_{t-1}^v$.

Let us now take a closer look at the $\text{construct}(set_{rla(v,1)})$ function. Since $(v', \emptyset, \epsilon') \notin \Lambda_{t-1}^v$ and $preconditions(v, t-1) = \top$, we conclude that $set^* \in SET$ (because $|VIEW| = 0$). Hence, $(v^*, set^*, \epsilon^*) \in \Lambda_{t-1}^v$.

Because $preconditions(v, t-1) = \top$, either $set_1^* \subseteq set_2^*$ or $set_1^* \supset set_2^*$, where $(set_1^*, \epsilon_1^*), (set_2^*, \epsilon_2^*) \in set_{rla(v,2)}$. Hence, $set = set^{**}$, where $(set^{**}, \epsilon^{**}) \in set_{rla(v,2)}$. Therefore, $(v_{set}, set, \epsilon_{set}) \in \Lambda_{t-1}^v$, for some view v_{set} and some evidence ϵ_{set} , which concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

The next theorem proves the decision certification property.

Theorem 13 (Decision Certification). Algorithm given in Listing 18 satisfies decision certification.

PROOF. The theorem follows from the decision certification property of $rla(v, 2)$ and the fact that a correct server decides the union of all sets (at line 26 of Listing 18). \square

Next, we prove the decision permission property.

Theorem 14 (Decision Permission). Algorithm given in Listing 18 satisfies decision permission.

PROOF. Let set be committed by $vg(v)$. Hence, $set_{rla(v,2)}$ is committed by $rla(v, 2)$ (by line 4 of Listing 19). Hence, at least $v.plurality()$ of correct members of v have previously started $rla(v, 2)$ (by decision permission of $rla(v, 2)$). All those servers have started $rla(v, 2)$ at line 22 of Listing 18.

Therefore, $set_{rla(v,1)}$ is committed by $rla(v, 1)$ (by the decision certification of $rla(v, 1)$). Again, at least $v.plurality()$ of correct members of v have previously started $rla(v, 1)$ (by decision permission of $rla(v, 1)$). All those servers have started $rla(v, 1)$ at line 12 or at line 14 of Listing 18. Thus, all those servers have started $vg(v)$, which concludes the theorem. \square

Next, we prove the bounded decisions property of $vg(v)$.

Theorem 15 (Bounded Decisions). Algorithm given in Listing 18 satisfies bounded decisions.

PROOF. Follows directly from the bounded decisions property of $rla(v, 2)$ (by Listing 19). \square

Finally, we prove the liveness property of $vg(v)$.

Theorem 16 (Liveness). Algorithm given in Listing 18 satisfies liveness.

PROOF. If every correct server $r \in v.members()$ starts $vg(v)$, a correct server proposes to $vg(v)$ and no correct server $r' \in v.members()$ stops $vg(v)$, every correct server eventually decides from $rla(v, 1)$ (by liveness of $rla(v, 1)$). Then, every correct server starts $rla(v, 2)$ with a proposal. By liveness of $rla(v, 2)$, all correct servers eventually decide from $rla(v, 2)$. Thus, all correct servers eventually decide from $vg(v)$ at line 26 of Listing 18. \square

5 SERVER'S MODULES: STORAGE MODULE

As servers carry the most of the logic of Carbon, we separate the protocol executed by servers into a multiple *modules*. Each module of a server contains its own logic.

The first module of a server we present is the *storage module*. The storage module, as the name suggests, has the responsibility of storing fundamental information used by other modules. For example, the storage module keeps track of received messages.

“*Install*” messages. Servers exchange different types of messages in Carbon. The information about the evolution of the system membership is carried by INSTALL messages. We define these messages below.

```

1 Install_Message:
2   instance [INSTALL, source, set,  $\omega$ ], with source is View, set is Set(View) and  $\omega$  is Certificate such
   that verify_output(set, vg(source),  $\omega$ ) =  $\top$ 

4   function (Install_Message m).source():
5     let m = [INSTALL, source, set,  $\omega$ ]
6     return source

8   function (Install_Message m).destination():
9     let m = [INSTALL, source, set,  $\omega$ ]
10    return min_cardinality7(set) // get the view with the smallest cardinality8

12  function (Install_Message m).tail():
13    let m = [INSTALL, source, set,  $\omega$ ]
14    return set \ {m.destination()}

```

Listing 20. INSTALL message

⁷We assume that the $\text{min_cardinality}(set)$ deterministic function, where set is a set of sets, returns the set with the smallest cardinality that belongs to set ; if there are multiple sets that satisfy the condition, then any such set is returned.

⁸Recall that a view is a set of changes.

As it can be seen from Listing 20, *set* is a set of views. However, we prove in the rest of the paper that *set* is, actually, a sequence. Until we prove this claim, we treat *set* as a set of views (as written in Listing 20).

View-paths. Next, we introduce *view-paths*: ordered sets of “adjacent” INSTALL messages.

```

1 View_Path:
2   instance  $[m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k]$  with  $k \geq 1$  is Integer,  $m_i$  is Install_Message, for every  $i \in [1, k]$ ,
    $m_1.source() = genesis$  and  $m_j.source() = m_{j-1}.destination()$ , for every  $j \in [2, k]$ 

4   function (View_Path path).views():
5     let path =  $[m_1, \dots, m_k]$ 
6     return  $\{v \mid v = genesis \text{ or } v = m_i.destination(), \text{ where } m_i \in path\}$ 

8   function (View_Path path).destination():
9     let path =  $[m_1, \dots, m_k]$ 
10    return  $m_k.destination()$ 

12  function (View_Path path).tail():
13    let path =  $[m_1, \dots, m_k]$ 
14    return  $m_k.tail()$ 

```

Listing 21. View-path

By slightly abusing the notion, sometimes we write “ $path \subseteq set$ ”, where *path* is a view-path and *set* is a set of INSTALL messages, to mean that every message that belongs to *path* belongs to *set*, as well.

Storage module - implementation. We now give the implementation of the storage module.

```

1 Storage Module:
2   Implementation:
3     upon start: // initialization of the module; executed as soon as the start event is triggered
4       Set(Message) waiting_messages =  $\emptyset$  // all received messages that have not been processed

6       Set(View) history =  $\{genesis\}$  // we prove that history is actually a sequence; see §6.2.2
7       Set(Install_Message) install_messages =  $\emptyset$ 

9       Map(View  $\rightarrow$  View) source =  $\{genesis \rightarrow \perp\}$ 
10      // as we show in the rest of the paper, these are actually sequences (not “just” sets of views); see §6.2.2
11      Map(View  $\rightarrow$  Set(View)) sequence =  $\{genesis \rightarrow \perp\}$ 
12      Map(View  $\rightarrow$  View_Path) view_path =  $\{genesis \rightarrow \emptyset\}$ 

```

Listing 22. Storage module - initialization

```

1 Storage Module:
2   Implementation:
3     upon receipt of Message m:

```



```

4      waiting_messages = waiting_messages ∪ {m}

6      upon exists Install_Message m ∈ waiting_messages such that m = [INSTALL, v, set, ω] and
v ∈ history and m ∉ install_messages:
7          waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
8          install_messages = install_messages ∪ {m}
9          extract_requests_and_voting_proofs(m) // see Listing 28
10         View v' = m.destination()
11         history = history ∪ {v'}
12         gossip m // gossip the message
13         if source[v'] = ⊥ or source[v'] ⊃ v:
14             source[v'] = v
15             sequence[v'] = set
16             view_path[v'] = view_path[v]||m // || denotes the concatenation

```

Listing 23. Storage module - message processing

6 SERVER'S MODULES: RECONFIGURATION MODULE

This section is devoted to the *reconfiguration module* of a server. The reconfiguration module carries the reconfiguration logic of Carbon.

Valid views. Next, we give the formal definition of *valid views* (see Listing 2).

Definition 1 (Valid View). Let $\mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$ denote the set of INSTALL messages ever obtained by (correct or faulty) processes. A view v is *valid* if and only if:

- $v = \textit{genesis}$, or
- there exists a view-path $path$ such that $path \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$ and $path.\textit{destination}() = v$.

Recall that we assume that at least a quorum of members of a valid view is correct (see §2, paragraph “Failure model”).

Forever-alive views. Next important concept we introduce is a concept of *forever-alive views*. Intuitively, a view v is forever-alive if there exists a forever-correct process that “knows” a view-path to v and “shares” that information by gossiping it. We give the formal definition below.

Definition 2 (Forever-Alive View). We say that a valid view v is *forever-alive* if and only if:

- $v = \textit{genesis}$, or
- there exists a forever-correct process p such that (1) p obtains a view-path $path$ with $path.\textit{destination}() = v$, and (2) p gossips all messages that belong to $path$.

Observe that every forever-alive view is valid.

Properties. We now introduce a few properties that are satisfied by the reconfiguration (and storage) module. A correct process *updates* its current view to a view v if and only if it triggers the special update current view to view v event. Similarly, a correct process *installs* a view v if and only if it triggers the special install view v event. Finally,

a correct process *stops processing* in a view v if and only if it triggers the special stop processing in view v' event, where $v' \supseteq v$.

1 **Reconfiguration and Storage Module:**

2 **Properties:**

- 3 - **View Comparability:** All valid views are comparable.
- 4 - **Finitely Many Valid Views:** There exist only finitely many valid views.
- 5 - **Finality:** Let v_{final} be the greatest forever-alive view⁹. Then, (1) all correct members of v_{final} update their current view to v_{final} , (2) no correct member of v_{final} updates its current view to any view after updating it to v_{final} , (3) all correct members of v_{final} install v_{final} , (4) no correct member of v_{final} leaves, and (5) no correct member of v_{final} stops processing in v_{final} .

Listing 24. Reconfiguration and storage modules - properties

6.1 Reconfiguration Module - Implementation

We now give the implementation of the reconfiguration module. We start by introducing the evidence used as the input to the view generator primitive (see §4).

1 **View_Generator_Evidence:**

```

2  instance  $\epsilon_{vg} = \{$ 
3      View_Path  $path$ 
4      Map(Change  $\rightarrow$  Message)  $requests$ 
5      Map(Change  $\rightarrow$  Voting_Proof)  $voting\_proofs$ 
6  }
```

Listing 25. Evidence used as the input for the view generator primitive

Next, we define when are inputs of the view generator primitive deemed valid.

```

1 function valid(View, Set, Evidence ( $v', set', \epsilon'$ ), View  $v$ ):
2   if  $v = genesis$ :
3     if  $v \not\subseteq v'$  or  $set' \neq \emptyset$  or  $\epsilon'$  is not View_Generator_Evidence:
4       return  $\perp$ 
6     if  $\epsilon'.path \neq \perp$ :
7       return  $\perp$ 
9     if  $(+, r) \notin v$  and  $(-, r) \in v'$ , for some Server  $r$ :
10      return  $\perp$ 
12     for each Change  $c \in v'$ :
13       if  $c \notin genesis$ :
```

⁹Note that v_{final} is well-defined due to the fact that *genesis* is a forever-alive view, all forever-alive views are valid, there are finitely many valid views and all valid views are comparable (by the view comparability property).

Carbon: An Asynchronous Voting-Based Payment System for a Client-Server Architecture

```
14         if  $c = (+, r)$ , for some Server  $r$ :
15             Message  $m = requests[c]$ 
16             if  $m \neq [JOIN, Voting\_Proof \sigma_v]$  or  $m.sender \neq r$  or
verify_voting("add server  $r$ ",  $\sigma_v$ )  $\neq \top$ :
17                 return  $\perp$ 
18         else:
19             let  $c = (-, r)$ , for some Server  $r$ 
20             Message  $m = requests[c]$ 
21             Voting_Proof  $\sigma_v = voting\_proofs[c]$ 
22             if  $(m \neq [LEAVE])$  or  $m.sender \neq r$  and verify_voting("remove server  $r$ ",  $\sigma_v$ )  $\neq \top$ :
23                 return  $\perp$ 
24     return  $\top$ 

26 //  $v \neq genesis$ 
27 if  $set' \neq \emptyset$  and  $v' \notin set'$ :
28     return  $\perp$ 

30 if  $set' = \emptyset$  and  $v \notin v'$ :
31     return  $\perp$ 

33 if exists View  $v^* \in set'$  such that  $v \notin v^*$ :
34     return  $\perp$ 

36 if  $(+, r) \notin v$  and exists View  $v^* \in set'$  such that  $(-, r) \in v^*$ , for some Server  $r$ :
37     return  $\perp$ 

39 if  $(+, r) \notin v$  and  $(-, r) \in v'$ , for some Server  $r$ :
40     return  $\perp$ 

42 if  $e'$  is not View_Generator_Evidence:
43     return  $\perp$ 

45 if  $e'.path.destination() \neq v$  or  $e'.path.tail() \neq set'$ :
46     return  $\perp$ 

48 for each Change  $c \in v' \cup \bigcup_{v^* \in set'} v^*$ :
49     if  $c \notin genesis$ :
50         if  $c = (+, r)$ , for some Server  $r$ :
51             Message  $m = requests[c]$ 
52             if  $m \neq [JOIN, Voting\_Proof \sigma_v]$  or  $m.sender \neq r$  or
verify_voting("add server  $r$ ",  $\sigma_v$ )  $\neq \top$ :
```

```

53         return ⊥
54     else:
55         let  $c = (-, r)$ , for some Server  $r$ 
56         Message  $m = requests[c]$ 
57         Voting_Proof  $\sigma_v = voting\_proofs[c]$ 
58         if ( $m \neq [LEAVE]$  or  $m.sender \neq r$ ) and  $verify\_voting("remove\ server\ r", \sigma_v) \neq \top$ :
59             return ⊥
60     return ⊤

```

Listing 26. (View, Set, Evidence) tuple - the valid function

Finally, we give the implementation of the reconfiguration module.

```

1 Reconfiguration Module:
2 Implementation:
3 upon start: // initialization of the module; executed as soon as the start event is triggered
4     current_view = {
5         View view = ⊥
6         Bool installed = ⊥
7         Bool processing = ⊥
8         View_Path proof = ⊥
9     }
11     Bool joined = ⊥
12     View stop_processing_until = 0
13     Bool proposed = ⊥
15     reconfiguration = {
16         Set(Change) requested = 0
17         Map(Change → Message) requests = { $c \rightarrow \perp$ , for every Change  $c$ }
18         Map(Change → Voting_Proof) voting_proofs = { $c \rightarrow \perp$ , for every Change  $c$ }
20         View source = ⊥
21         View destination = ⊥
22         Set(View) sequence = ⊥ // we prove that this is actually a sequence; see §6.2.2
24         Bool prepared = ⊥
25         Bool discharged = ⊥
26     }
28     state_transfer = {
29         Bool in_progress = ⊥
30         Map(View → Set(State)) states = { $v \rightarrow \emptyset$ , for every View  $v$ }

```

Carbon: An Asynchronous Voting-Based Payment System for a Client-Server Architecture

```

31         Map(View → Set(Server)) states_from = {v → ∅, for every View v}
32     }

34     dischargement = {
35         View dischargement_view = ⊥
36         Map(View → Set(Server)) dischargements = {v → ∅, for every View v}
37     }

39     if r ∈ genesis.members():
40         current_view.view = genesis
41         trigger update current view to genesis // the server updates its current view to genesis

43         current_view.installed = ⊤
44         trigger install view genesis // the server installs genesis
45         installed(genesis) // see Listing 39
46         current_view.processing = ⊤

48         joined = ⊤
49         trigger joined // the server joins

51         // triggering events for joined servers
52         for each Server r ∈ genesis.members():
53             trigger r joined // server r joins

55         trigger <vg(genesis).Start | ⊥>

```

Listing 27. Reconfiguration module - initialization

1 Reconfiguration Module:

2 Implementation:

```

3     function extract_requests_and_voting_proofs(Install_Message m):
4         update reconfiguration.requests with requests from m
5         update reconfiguration.voting_proofs with voting proofs from m

```

Listing 28. Reconfiguration module - the extract_requests_and_voting_proofs function

1 Reconfiguration Module:

2 Implementation:

```

3     upon join with voting proof  $\sigma_v$ : // the server requests to join
4         gossip [JOIN,  $\sigma_v$ ]

6     upon exists Message  $m \in$  waiting_messages such that  $m =$  [JOIN, Voting_Proof  $\sigma_v$ ] and
    verify_voting("add server  $m.sender$ ",  $\sigma_v$ ) = ⊤ and  $(+, m.sender) \notin$  reconfiguration.requested:

```

```

7      waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
8      reconfiguration.requested = reconfiguration.requested ∪ {(+, m.sender)}
9      reconfiguration.requests[(+, m.sender)] = m

```

Listing 29. Reconfiguration module - joining

1 **Reconfiguration Module:**2 **Implementation:**

```

3      upon leave: // the server requests to leave
4          gossip [LEAVE]

6      upon exists Message m ∈ waiting_messages such that m = [LEAVE] and
          (-, m.sender) ∉ reconfiguration.requested:
7          waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
8          reconfiguration.requested = reconfiguration.requested ∪ {(-, m.sender)}
9          reconfiguration.requests[(-, m.sender)] = m

11     upon obtaining Voting_Proof σv such that
          verify_voting("remove server r", σv) = ⊤ and (-, r) ∉ reconfiguration.requested:
12         reconfiguration.requested = reconfiguration.requested ∪ {(-, r)}
13         reconfiguration.voting_proofs[(-, r)] = σv

```

Listing 30. Reconfiguration module - leaving

1 **Reconfiguration Module:**2 **Implementation:**

```

3      function to_propose():
4          Set(Change) proposal = ∅
5          for each Change change ∈ reconfiguration.requested such that change ∉ current_view.view:
6              if change = (+, r), for some Server r:
7                  proposal = proposal ∪ {change}
8              else if change = (-, r), for some Server r:
9                  if (+, r) ∈ current_view.view:
10                     proposal = proposal ∪ {change}
11      return proposal

13     upon to_propose() = proposal ≠ ∅ and current_view.installed = ⊤ and proposed = ⊥:
14         View_Generator_Evidence εvg
15         εvg.path = current_view.proof
16         εvg.requests = reconfiguration.requests
17         εvg.voting_proofs = reconfiguration.voting_proofs
18         trigger <vg(current_view.view).Propose | (current_view.view ∪ proposal, ∅, εvg)>
19         proposed = ⊤

```

```

21  upon <vg(current_view.view).Decide | Set(View) set, Certificate ω>:
22      Install_Message m = [INSTALL, current_view.view, set, ω] // create the INSTALL message
23      waiting_messages = waiting_messages ∪ {m}

```

Listing 31. Reconfiguration module - view generation

```

1  Reconfiguration Module:
2  Implementation:
3      upon {(joined = ⊥ and exists View v ∈ history such that r ∈ v.members() and r ∉ source[v].members())
4           or (joined = ⊤ and exists View v ∈ history such that current_view.view ⊂ v and
5           source[v] ⊆ current_view.view)} and reconfiguration.destination = ⊥:
6           reconfiguration.destination = v
7           reconfiguration.source = source[v]
8           reconfiguration.sequence = sequence[v]
9           View_Path path = view_path[v]
10
11          if r ∉ reconfiguration.destination.members():
12              reconfiguration.prepared = ⊤
13          else:
14              state_transfer.in_progress = ⊤
15              gossip [STATE-REQUEST, reconfiguration.source, reconfiguration.sequence] // ask for state
16
17          if r ∈ reconfiguration.destination.members():
18              reconfiguration.discharged = ⊤
19          else:
20              dischargement.dischargement_view = reconfiguration.destination
21              gossip [DISCHARGEMENT-REQUEST, reconfiguration.destination]
22
23          wait until reconfiguration.prepared = ⊤ and reconfiguration.discharged = ⊤
24
25          // stop the view generator of the previous view
26          if joined = ⊤:
27              trigger <vg(current_view.view).Stop>
28
29          if r ∈ reconfiguration.destination.members():
30              current_view.view = reconfiguration.destination
31              trigger update current view to reconfiguration.destination
32              current_view.proof = path
33          if joined = ⊥:
34              joined = ⊤

```

```

34      trigger joined // the server joins

36      reconfiguration.source =  $\perp$ 
37      reconfiguration.destination =  $\perp$ 

39      // reset state transfer
40      state_transfer.states[v] =  $\emptyset$ , for every View v
41      state_transfer.states_from[v] =  $\emptyset$ , for every View v

43      // reset dischargement
44      dischargement.dischargement_view =  $\perp$ 
45      dischargement.dischargements[v] =  $\emptyset$ , for every View v

47      // reset prepared and discharged
48      reconfiguration.prepared =  $\perp$ 
49      reconfiguration.discharged =  $\perp$ 

51      // reset proposed
52      proposed =  $\perp$ 

54      if r  $\notin$  reconfiguration.destination.members() :
55          trigger left // the server leaves
56          return // we assume that the server executes the special stop command as soon as it leaves

58      // triggering events for joined servers
59      for each Server r  $\in$  reconfiguration.destination.members() \ reconfiguration.source.members() :
60          trigger r joined // server r joins

62      // triggering events for left servers
63      for each Server r  $\in$  reconfiguration.source.members() \ reconfiguration.destination.members() :
64          trigger r left // server r leaves

66      // reconfiguration.sequence has a single element
67      if reconfiguration.sequence = {current_view.view} :
68          current_view.installed =  $\top$ 
69          trigger install view current_view.view // the server installs current_view.view
70          installed(genesis) // see Listing 39

72      if current_view.view  $\supset$  stop_processing_until :
73          stop_processing_until =  $\emptyset$ 
74          current_view.processing =  $\top$ 

```



```

75         else:
76             current_view.processing =  $\perp$ 
77             trigger <vg(current_view.view).Start |  $\perp$ >
78     else:
79         View_Generator_Evidence  $\epsilon_{vg}$ 
80          $\epsilon_{vg}.path = current\_view.proof$ 
81          $\epsilon_{vg}.requests = reconfiguration.requests$ 
82          $\epsilon_{vg}.voting\_proofs = reconfiguration.voting\_proofs$ 
83         trigger <vg(current_view.view).Start | (min_cardinality(current_view.proof.tail()),
current_view.proof.tail(),  $\epsilon_{vg}$ )>
84         reconfiguration.sequence =  $\perp$ 

```

Listing 32. Reconfiguration module - view transition

1 Reconfiguration Module:

2 Implementation:

```

3     upon exists Message  $m \in waiting\_messages$  such that  $m = [STATE-REQUEST, View source', Set(View)$ 
set'] such that  $source' \in history$  and  $[INSTALL, source', set', Certificate \omega'] \in install\_messages$ :
4         waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
5         let  $m' = [INSTALL, source', set', \omega']$ 
6         if  $m.sender \in m'.destination().members()$ : // otherwise, the message can safely be discarded
7             // the server does not need to have joined
8             if  $self \in source'.members()$  and  $(current\_view.view \subseteq source'$  or  $current\_view.view = \perp)$ :
9                 current_view.processing =  $\perp$ 
10                trigger stop processing in view source' // the server stops processing in source'
11                if  $source' \supset stop\_processing\_until$ :
12                    stop_processing_until = source'
13                // state is a variable defined in Listing 39
14                send [STATE-UPDATE, source', set', state, current_view.view] to m.sender
16
17     upon exists Message  $m \in waiting\_messages$  such that  $m = [STATE-UPDATE, View source', Set(View) set',$ 
State_Representation state, View view] such that  $source' = reconfiguration.source$  and
set' = reconfiguration.sequence and  $state.verify() = \top$  and  $state\_transfer.in\_progress = \top$ :
17         waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
18         Server  $r' = m.sender$ 
19         if  $r' \notin state\_transfer.states\_from[view]$  and  $r' \in view.members()$ :
20             state_transfer.states[view] = state_transfer.states[view]  $\cup \{state\}$  // store the state
21             state_transfer.states_messages[view] = state_transfer.states_messages[view]  $\cup \{m\}$  // store the sender
22             state_transfer.states_from[view] = state_transfer.states_from[view]  $\cup \{r'\}$  // store the sender
24
25         if  $r' \notin state\_transfer.states\_from[source']$  and  $r' \in source'.members()$ :
state_transfer.states[source'] = state_transfer.states[source']  $\cup \{state\}$  // store the state

```

```

26     state_transfer.states_messages[source'] = state_transfer.states_messages[source'] ∪ {m} // store the sender
27     state_transfer.states_from[source'] = state_transfer.states_from[source'] ∪ {r'} // store the sender

29     function enough_states_received(View v):
30         Set(State_Representation) states = ∅
31         for each Server rep ∈ v.members():
32             if exists View view such that view ⊇ v and rep ∈ state_transfer.states_from[view]:
33                 states = states ∪ {state}, where m = [STATE-UPDATE, reconfiguration.source,
reconfiguration.sequence, state, v] ∈ state_transfer.states[v] and m.sender = rep
34             if |states| < v.plurality():
35                 return ⊥
36             else:
37                 return states

39         // state received from a quorum of members of reconfiguration.source
40         upon |state_transfer.states_from[reconfiguration.source]| ≥ reconfiguration.source.quorum() and
state_transfer.in_progress = ⊤:
41             reconfiguration.prepared = ⊤
42             state_transfer.in_progress = ⊥
43             refine_state(state_transfer.states[reconfiguration.source])

45         // state received from at least one correct member of a view ``greater'' than reconfiguration.source
46         upon exists View v ∈ history such that reconfiguration.source ⊂ v and states = enough_states_received(
v) and states ≠ ⊥ and state_transfer.in_progress = ⊤:
47             reconfiguration.prepared = ⊤
48             state_transfer.in_progress = ⊥
49             refine_state(states)

```

Listing 33. Reconfiguration module - state transfer

1 **Reconfiguration Module:**2 **Implementation:**

```

3     upon exists Message m ∈ waiting_messages such that m = [DISCHARGEMENT-REQUEST, View v] and
joined = ⊤ and current_view.view ⊇ v:
4         waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
5         send [DISCHARGEMENT-CONFIRM, current_view.view]

7     upon exists Message m ∈ waiting_messages such that m = [DISCHARGEMENT-CONFIRM, View v] and
v ∈ history and m.sender ∈ v.members():
8         waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
9         dischargement.dischargements[v] = dischargement.dischargements[v] ∪ {m.sender}

```

```

11      upon exists View  $v$  such that  $dischagement.dischagement\_view \neq \perp$  and
       $v \supseteq dischagement.dischagement\_view$  and  $|dischagement.dischagements[v]| \geq v.quorum()$  :
12       $reconfiguration.discharged = \top$ 

```

Listing 34. Reconfiguration module - view dischagement

6.2 Proof of Correctness

We now prove the properties presented in Listing 24. We start by proving some intermediate results that play the crucial role in the proof (§6.2.1).

6.2.1 Intermediate Results. First, we show that a correct server that updates its $current_view.view$ variable to v has v in its $history$ variable.

Lemma 13. Let $current_view.view = v$ at a correct server r at time t . Then, $v \in history$ at server r at time t .

PROOF. If $v = genesis$, the lemma follows from line 6 of Listing 22 and the fact that no view is ever removed from the $history$ variable of a correct server.

Let $v \neq genesis$. Since $current_view.view = v$ at server r at time t and $v \neq genesis$, we know that line 29 of Listing 32 is executed by r at time $t_v \leq t$. Hence, $reconfiguration.destination = v$ at time t_v . Moreover, $v \in history$ at time t_v at server r (by line 3 of Listing 32 and the fact that no view is ever removed from the $history$ variable of a correct server). Therefore, the lemma holds in this case, as well. \square

Next, we show that, if $v \in history$ at a correct server, then the server has previously obtained a view-path to v .

Lemma 14. Let $v \in history$ at a correct server r at time t , where $v \neq genesis$. Then, there exists a view-path $path = [m_1, \dots, m_k]$ such that (1) $path.destination() = v$, and (2) $m_i \in install_messages$ at server r at time t , for every $i \in [1, k]$.

PROOF. In order to prove the lemma, we show that, if, at any point in time, $v^* \in history$ at a correct server r , then r has previously obtained a view-path to v^* (and the view-path consists of messages from the $install_messages$ variable). Note that no message is ever removed from the $install_messages$ variable of a correct server. We set the following invariant to hold at time $t^* \geq 0$: If $v^* \in history$ at time t^* , then r has previously included a view-path to v^* in $install_messages$. Observe that the invariant holds initially (i.e., at the time the server starts) since $history = \{genesis\}$ (line 6 of Listing 22) and $install_messages = \emptyset$ (line 7 of Listing 22).

We now prove that the invariant is preserved once the $history$ variable at server r is updated with a view v^{**} . The only place in which the $history$ variable can be modified is line 11 of Listing 23. Since $v \in history$ (by line 6 of Listing 23), we know that there exists a view-path to v , which is previously obtained and included in $install_messages$ (because of the invariant hypothesis). Hence, there is a view-path to v^{**} since the received INSTALL message is included in $install_messages$ (line 8 of Listing 23). Thus, the lemma holds. \square

Lemma 15 proves that any view v that belongs to the $history$ variable of a correct server is valid.

Lemma 15. Let $v \in history$ at a correct server. Then, v is a valid view.

PROOF. If $v = genesis$, Definition 1 is satisfied for v . Otherwise, Definition 1 holds for v because of Lemma 14. \square

Finally, we show that correct servers “transit” only to valid views, i.e., if $current_view.view = v$ at a correct server, then v is a valid view.

Lemma 16. Let $current_view.view = v$ at a correct server r at some time $t \geq 0$. Then, v is a valid view.

PROOF. We know that $v \in history$ at server r (by Lemma 13). Hence, v is valid by Lemma 15. \square

We now give a brief explanation of the upcoming steps in proving the properties from Listing 24.

Explanation. We fix some time t in an execution of Carbon. At time t , we observe all INSTALL messages obtained by (correct or faulty) processes. Then, we introduce a set of invariants concerned with all obtained INSTALL messages (this set of invariants is satisfied at time 0). The introduced invariants allow us to identify all possible “new” INSTALL messages that can be obtained after time t . Finally, we prove that the invariants are preserved after such INSTALL messages are indeed obtained by processes after time t .

Fix a time $t \geq 0$ in an execution. Let $\mathcal{I}_p(t)$ denote all INSTALL messages obtained by a (correct or faulty) process p by time t ; note that obtaining of an INSTALL message is irrevocable, i.e., $\mathcal{I}_p(t') \subseteq \mathcal{I}_p(t)$, for any time $t' \leq t$. Moreover, $\mathcal{I}_p(0) = \emptyset$, for every process p . Let $\mathcal{I}^*(t) = \bigcup_{p \in C \cup \mathcal{R}} \mathcal{I}_p(t)$. Observe that $\mathcal{I}^*(t') \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(t)$, for any time $t' < t$.

We say that a view v is *well-founded* at time t if and only if:

- $v = genesis$, or
- there exists a view-path $path$ such that $path \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(t)$ and $path.destination() = v$.

Now, we prove that, if a process has obtained an INSTALL message (see Listing 20) associated with a view $source$ by time t and $source$ is not well-founded at time t , then $source$ is not a valid view.

Lemma 17. Let a (correct or faulty) process obtain $m = [INSTALL, source, set, \omega]$ at some time $t > 0$. Moreover, let $source$ not be well-founded at time $t - 1$. Then, $source$ is not a valid view.

PROOF. Note that $source \neq genesis$, since $genesis$ is well-founded at any time. We prove the lemma by contradiction. Hence, let $source$ be a valid view.

Since $source$ is a valid view, that means that (at least) a quorum of members of $source$ are correct (by the failure model). Moreover, we know that set is committed by $vg(source)$ (by Listing 20). Because of the fact that ω contains messages from at least $source.quorum()$ distinct members of $source$ (see Listing 19), there exists a correct server r that sets its $current_view.view$ variable to $source$ before time t at line 29 of Listing 32 (since $source \neq genesis$ and $vg(source)$ is started by r , which follows from the decision permission property of $vg(source)$). By Lemma 13, $source \in history$ before time t . Furthermore, Lemma 14 shows that r has obtained a view-path to $source$ before time t . Therefore, $source$ is well-founded at time $t - 1$, which implies contradiction. \square

Finally, we introduce a few concepts that describe the state of the system at some fixed time t . First, we denote by $V(t)$ the set of well-founded views at time t , i.e., $V(t) = \{v \mid v \text{ is well-founded at time } t\}$.

For every view $v \in V(t)$, we define a logical predicate $\alpha_t(v)$ such that $\alpha_t(v) = \top$ if and only of:

- $v = genesis$, or
- $[INSTALL, v', \{v\}, \omega] \in \mathcal{I}^*(t)$, where $v' \in V(t)$; in other words, $m \in \mathcal{I}^*(t)$, where $m.source() \in V(t)$, $m.destination() = v$ and $m.tail() = \emptyset$.

Otherwise, $\alpha_t(v) = \perp$. If $\alpha_t(v) = \top$, we say that v is *installable* at time t .

Moreover, for every view $v \in V(t)$, we define $\beta_t(v)$ such that $set \in \beta_t(v)$ if and only if $m = [\text{INSTALL}, v', set' = \{v\} \cup set, \omega] \in \mathcal{I}^*(t)$, where $v' \in V(t)$, $m.\text{destination}() = v$, and $set \neq \emptyset$; in other words, $m \in \mathcal{I}^*(t)$, where $m.\text{source}() \in V(t)$, $m.\text{destination}() = v$ and $m.\text{tail}() = set \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, $\beta_t(v) = \emptyset$.

Finally, for every view $v \in V(t)$, we define $\rho_t(v)$ such that $set \in \rho_t(v)$ if and only if $[\text{INSTALL}, v, set, \omega] \in \mathcal{I}^*(t)$.

First, we prove that every view $v \in V(t)$ is valid.

Lemma 18. Let $v \in V(t)$. Then, v is a valid view.

PROOF. Follows from the definition of well-founded views and Definition 1. \square

We now introduce the first invariant.

Invariant 1. Let $v \in V(t)$. If $set \in \rho_t(v)$, then (1) $set \neq \emptyset$, (2) set is a sequence, and (3) $set.\text{follows}(v) = \top$.

Since $\mathcal{I}^*(0) = \emptyset$, we conclude that $V(0) = \{\text{genesis}\}$ and Invariant 1 holds at time 0. Now, we show that any information obtained by a process by time t is captured in $V(t)$, ρ_t and β_t .

Lemma 19. Let a (correct or faulty) process p obtain a view-path $path = [m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k]$ by time t , where $k \geq 1$. Then, the following holds:

- $path.\text{views}() \subseteq V(t)$;
- Let $destination = path.\text{destination}()$. If $path.\text{tail}() \neq \emptyset$, then $path.\text{tail}() \in \beta_t(destination)$.

PROOF. Since p obtains $path$ by time t , we conclude that $m_i \in \mathcal{I}^*(t)$, for every $i \in [1, k]$. We know that $genesis \in V(t)$, by the definition of well-founded views. All other views that belong to $path.\text{views}()$, therefore, are included in $V(t)$ (including $destination$ and $m_k.\text{source}()$). Hence, if $path.\text{tail}() \neq \emptyset$, then $path.\text{tail}() \in \beta_t(destination)$. \square

Next, we show that any two sets that belong to $\rho_t(v)$, where $v \in V(t)$, are “comparable”.

Lemma 20. Let $v \in V(t)$ and let $set_1, set_2 \in \rho_t(v)$. Then, either $set_1 \subseteq set_2$ or $set_1 \supset set_2$.

PROOF. Since $v \in V(t)$, we know that v is a valid view (by Lemma 18). Moreover, we know that set_1 and set_2 are committed by $\text{vg}(v)$ (by Listing 20). Hence, the lemma follows from the comparability property of $\text{vg}(v)$. \square

We now define an invariant that explains how installable views are “instantiated”.

Invariant 2 (Creation of Installable Views). For every $v \in V(t)$ such that (1) $\alpha_t(v) = \top$, and (2) $v \neq \text{genesis}$, there exists a view $v' \in V(t)$ such that:

- $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, and
- $seq \in \rho_t(v')$, where $seq = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v$, ($x \geq 0$)¹⁰, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v$.

Note that Invariant 2 is satisfied at time 0 since $V(0) = \{\text{genesis}\}$. Next, we define what it means for a view to *lead* to another view.

Definition 3 (Leading to a View). Consider views $v, v' \in V(t)$ such that:

¹⁰Recall that all sets that belong to $\rho_t(v)$, for any view $v \in V(t)$, are sequences (by Invariant 1).

- $\alpha_t(v) = \alpha_t(v') = \top$, and
- $seq \in \rho_t(v')$, where $seq = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v$.

We say that v' leads to v at time t .

We now show that $v' \subset v$ if v' leads to v .

Lemma 21. Let $v' \in V(t)$ lead to $v \in V(t)$ at time t . Then, $v' \subset v$.

PROOF. By Definition 3, $seq \in \rho_t(v')$, where $seq = \dots \rightarrow v$. Since $seq.follows(v') = \top$ (by Invariant 1), the lemma holds. \square

Now, we introduce another invariant that we assume holds at time t : *genesis* is a subset of every other installable view.

Invariant 3. For every view $v \in V(t)$ such that (1) $\alpha_t(v) = \top$, and (2) $v \neq genesis$, $genesis \subset v$.

Invariant 3 holds at time 0 since $V(0) = \{genesis\}$. Now, we show that, for every installable view different from *genesis*, there exists a view that leads to it at time t (follows directly from Invariant 2).

Lemma 22. Let $v' \in V(t)$ such that (1) $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, and (2) $v' \neq genesis$. Then, there exists a view $v \in V(t)$ such that v leads to v' at time t .

PROOF. According to Invariant 2, there exists a view $v \in V(t)$ such that:

- $\alpha_t(v) = \top$, and
- $seq \in \rho_t(v)$, where $seq = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v'$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v'$.

By Definition 3, v leads to v' at time t , which concludes the proof. \square

We now prove that no view leads to *genesis* at time t .

Lemma 23. No view $v \in V(t)$ leads to *genesis* at time t .

PROOF. We prove the lemma by contradiction. Let there exist a view $v \in V(t)$ such that v leads to *genesis* at time t . By Lemma 21, $v \subset genesis$. However, this contradicts Invariant 3, which concludes the proof. \square

A view can lead to (at most) one other view. The following lemma proves this statement.

Lemma 24. Let $v \in V(t)$ such that $\alpha_t(v) = \top$. If v leads to $v' \in V(t)$ at time t and v leads to $v'' \in V(t)$ at time t , then $v' = v''$.

PROOF. According to Definition 3, $seq' \in \rho_t(v)$, where seq' is a sequence (by Invariant 1) and $seq' = \dots \rightarrow v'$. Similarly, $seq'' \in \rho_t(v)$, where seq'' is a sequence (by Invariant 1) and $seq'' = \dots \rightarrow v''$. According to Lemma 20, either $seq' \subseteq seq''$ or $seq' \supseteq seq''$. Let us analyze two possible cases:

- $seq' = seq''$: In this case, we have that $v' = v''$ and the lemma holds.

- $seq' \neq seq''$: Without loss of generality, let $seq' \subset seq''$. Therefore, $v' \in seq''$ and $v' \subseteq v''$. If $v' \subset v''$, Definition 3 is not satisfied for v'' (since $\alpha_t(v') = \top$). Hence, $v' = v''$.

The lemma holds. \square

Now, we prove that there exists exactly one view that does not lead to any view. Recall that we assume that only finitely many valid views exist (see §6, paragraph “Failure model & assumptions”). Since all views that belong to $V(t)$ are valid (by Lemma 18), we conclude that $|V(t)| < \infty$.

Lemma 25. There exists *exactly* one view $v \in V(t)$ such that (1) $\alpha_t(v) = \top$, and (2) v does not lead to any view at time t .

PROOF. Let there be x installable views at time t . Because of lemmas 22 and 23, we conclude that *exactly* $x - 1$ installable views (all installable views except *genesis*; *genesis* is installable at any time) have views that lead to them at time t . According to Lemma 24, each installable view leads to at most one view at time t . Hence, at least $x - 1$ views lead to a view at time t .

In order to prove the lemma, it is sufficient to show that it is impossible for all x installable views to lead to some view at time t . We prove this statement by contradiction.

Let INS denote the set of all installable views at time t ; note that $|INS| < \infty$ (since $|V(t)| < \infty$ and $INS \subseteq V(t)$). Consider the following construction:

- (1) Start with $V \leftarrow \{genesis\}$, $last \leftarrow genesis$ and $R \leftarrow INS \setminus \{genesis\}$.
- (2) Repeat until $V \neq INS$:
 - (a) Select a view $v \in INS$ such that $last$ leads to v at time t .
 - (b) Update $V \leftarrow V \cup \{v\}$, $last \leftarrow v$ and $R \leftarrow R \setminus \{v\}$.
 - (c) If $V \neq INS$, go to step 2.
 - (d) Otherwise, select a view $v \in INS$ such that $last$ leads to v at time t .

Note that V represents a sequence (because of the construction and Lemma 21). Hence, $last$ represents the greatest (with respect to the containment relation) element of V . Therefore, a view v , where $last$ leads to v at time t , must belong to R (otherwise, we would contradict Lemma 21). Thus, the V set is constantly “growing” and the R set is constantly “shrinking”.

Once $V = INS$ in step 2(c), we conclude that $R = \emptyset$. Hence, $last$ cannot lead to any view. Thus, we reach contradiction with the fact that $last$ leads to a view, which concludes the proof. \square

The next lemma shows that at most one view can lead to a view v at time t .

Lemma 26. Let $v \in V(t)$ such that $\alpha_t(v) = \top$. If $v' \in V(t)$ leads to v at time t and $v'' \in V(t)$ leads to v at time t , then $v' = v''$.

PROOF. Let there be x installable views at time t . Because of lemmas 22 and 23, we conclude that exactly $x - 1$ installable views (all installable views except *genesis*) have views that lead to them. According to Lemma 24, each view leads to at most one view. Lemma 25 shows that there exists an installable view that does not lead to any view at time t . Hence, there are exactly $x - 1$ installable views and exactly $x - 1$ “lead-to” relations. Thus, only one view leads to v at time t and the lemma holds. \square

Finally, we show that all installable views are comparable.

Lemma 27. Let $v, v' \in V(t)$ such that $\alpha_t(v) = \alpha_t(v') = \top$. Then, either $v \subseteq v'$ or $v \supset v'$.

PROOF. Let \mathcal{INS} denote the set of all installable views at time t . In order to prove the lemma, we prove that \mathcal{INS} is a sequence. Let $x = |\mathcal{INS}| < \infty$. According to Lemma 25, exactly $x - 1$ installable views lead to some view at time t . Consider the construction similar to the one from the proof of Lemma 25:

- (1) Start with $V \leftarrow \{\textit{genesis}\}$ and $\textit{last} \leftarrow \textit{genesis}$.
- (2) Repeat until \textit{last} does not lead to any view at time t :
 - (a) Select a view $v \in \mathcal{INS}$ such that \textit{last} leads to v at time t .
 - (b) Update $V \leftarrow V \cup \{v\}$ and $\textit{last} \leftarrow v$.

Because of the construction and Lemma 21, V is a sequence. In order to conclude the lemma, it suffices to prove that $V = \mathcal{INS}$. We prove this statement by contradiction.

Suppose that $V \neq \mathcal{INS}$. Because of the construction, we know that $V \subset \mathcal{INS}$. Let $|V| = p < x$. This means that there exist $x - p$ views in $R = \mathcal{INS} \setminus V$. The following holds for each view $v \in R$:

- v leads to a view $v' \in \mathcal{INS}$ at time t : This statement holds because $x - 1$ installable views lead to some view at time t (by Lemma 25). By construction, we have that $p - 1$ views of V lead to some view at time t . Given that $|R| = x - p$ and $x - 1 - (p - 1) = x - p$, the statement is true.
- v leads to a view $v' \in R$ at time t : Suppose that v leads to a view $v' \in V$ at time t . If $v' = \textit{genesis}$, Lemma 23 is contradicted. If $v' \neq \textit{genesis}$, Lemma 26 is contradicted (since v' has more than one view leading to it). Thus, the statement is correct.

Finally, we model the set R with a graph G with $x - p$ vertices ($x - p$ installable views) and $x - p$ edges ($x - p$ “lead-to” relations). Thus, G has a cycle. However, that is not possible given Lemma 21. Hence, $V = \mathcal{INS}$ and the lemma holds. \square

The next lemma proves that only the greatest installable view at time t does not lead to any view at time t . Recall that all installable views are comparable (by Lemma 27).

Lemma 28. A view $v \in V(t)$, where $\alpha_t(v) = \top$, does not lead to any view at time t if and only if v is the greatest installable view at time t .

PROOF. We prove the lemma by proving both directions of the statement.

Let v be the view that does not lead to any view at time t ; such view exists due to Lemma 25. By contradiction, suppose that v is not the greatest installable view at time t . Let v_{max} be the greatest installable view at time t . According to Lemma 25, v_{max} leads to some view v' at time t . By Lemma 21, we have that $v_{max} \subset v'$, which contradicts the fact that v_{max} is the greatest installable view at time t . Thus, the lemma holds in this direction.

Suppose that v is the greatest installable view at time t and that, by contradiction, it leads to a view $v' \in V(t)$ at time t . According to Lemma 21, $v \subset v'$. This is contradiction with the fact that v is the greatest installable view at time t . The lemma holds in this direction, as well. \square

Now, we introduce an invariant that explains how non-installable views are “instantiated”.

Invariant 4 (Creation of Non-Installable Views). For every $v \in V(t)$ such that $\alpha_t(v) = \perp$, there exists a view $v' \in V(t)$ such that:

- $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, and
- $\textit{seq} \in \rho_t(v')$, where $\textit{seq} = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0, y \geq 1$), and

- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

Invariant 4 holds at time 0 since $V(0) = \{\text{genesis}\}$ and $\alpha_0(\text{genesis}) = \top$. Next, we define *auxiliary views*.

Definition 4 (Auxiliary View). Consider views $v, v' \in V(t)$ such that:

- $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, and
- $\alpha_t(v) = \perp$, and
- $seq \in \rho_t(v')$, where $seq = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0, y \geq 1$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

We say that v is an *auxiliary view* for v' at time t .

The following lemma shows that any non-installable view is an auxiliary view for some installable view.

Lemma 29. Let $v \in V(t)$ such that $\alpha_t(v) = \perp$. Then, v is an auxiliary view for a view $v' \in V(t)$ at time t .

PROOF. The lemma follows from Invariant 4 and Definition 4. □

If v is an auxiliary view for v' at time t , then $v' \subset v$. The following lemma proves this claim.

Lemma 30. Let $v \in V(t)$ be an auxiliary view for a view $v' \in V(t)$ at time t . Then, $v' \subset v$.

PROOF. According to Definition 4, $seq \in \rho_t(v')$, where $seq = \dots \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($y \geq 1$). By Invariant 1, we know that $seq.\text{follows}(v') = \top$, which implies that $v' \subset v$. □

If v is an auxiliary view for a view v' and v' leads to a view v'' , then $v \subset v''$.

Lemma 31. Let $v \in V(t)$ be an auxiliary view for a view $v' \in V(t)$ at time t . Let v' lead to $v'' \in V(t)$ at time t . Then, $v \subset v''$.

PROOF. According to Definition 4, $seq \in \rho_t(v')$, where $seq = \dots \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($y \geq 1$). By Definition 3, $seq'' \in \rho_t(v'')$, where $seq'' = \dots \rightarrow v''$. Invariant 1 ensures that (1) seq and seq'' are sequences, and (2) $seq.\text{follows}(v') = seq''.\text{follows}(v'') = \top$. By Lemma 20, there are three possible scenarios:

- $seq = seq''$: In this case, we have that $v \subset v''$. The lemma holds.
- $seq \subset seq''$: In this case, we know that $v \in seq''$. Thus, $v \subset v''$ and the lemma holds.
- $seq \supset seq''$: Hence, $v'' \in seq$. We conclude that $v \subset v''$ because, otherwise, either (1) $\alpha_t(v) = \top$ (if $v = v''$), or (2) v is not an auxiliary view for v' at time t since $\alpha_t(v'') = \top$ (if $v'' \subset v$).

The lemma holds since the claim is correct in all possible cases. □

The following lemma shows that if v leads to v' , then there does not exist an installable view v'' such that $v \subset v'' \subset v'$.

Lemma 32. Let $v \in V(t)$ lead to $v' \in V(t)$ at time t . There does not exist a view $v'' \in V(t)$ such that (1) $\alpha_t(v'') = \top$, and (2) $v \subset v'' \subset v'$.

PROOF. Let $INS = \{v \mid v \in V(t) \wedge \alpha_t(v) = \top\}$. According to Lemma 27, INS is a sequence. Moreover, $|INS| < \infty$.

We prove the lemma by contradiction. Hence, suppose that there exists a view v'' such that (1) $v'' \in INS$, and (2) $v \subset v'' \subset v'$.

Since v leads to v' at time t , we know that $v \subset v'$ (by Lemma 21). We consider the following construction:

- (1) Start with $V \leftarrow \{v, v'\}$ and $first \leftarrow v$.
- (2) Repeat until $first = genesis$:
 - (a) Select a view $v_i \in \mathcal{INS}$ such that v_i leads to $first$.
 - (b) Update $V \leftarrow V \cup \{v_i\}$ and $first \leftarrow v_i$.

According to the construction and Lemma 21, V is a sequence. Moreover, $first$ represents the first (i.e., smallest) view of V . Therefore, a view v_i , where v_i leads to $first$, must belong to $\mathcal{INS} \setminus V$ (otherwise, we would contradict Lemma 21). Thus, V is “growing” with each iteration. Finally, an execution of the construction eventually terminates since (1) $|\mathcal{INS}| < \infty$, (2) Lemma 22 holds, (3) Lemma 23 stands, and (4) $genesis \in \mathcal{INS}$.

Since $v \subset v''$, we conclude that $v'' \notin V$ and $v'' \neq genesis$. Therefore, there exists a view that leads to v'' (by Lemma 22). Let $R = \mathcal{INS} \setminus V$. Hence, $v'' \in R$. Now, we consider the following construction:

- (1) Start with $V' \leftarrow \{v''\}$ and $first \leftarrow v''$.
- (2) Select a view $v_i \in \mathcal{INS}$ such that v_i leads to $first$.
- (3) If $v_i \in V$, then terminate.
- (4) Update $V' \leftarrow V' \cup \{v_i\}$ and $first \leftarrow v_i$.
- (5) Go to step 2.

By construction and Lemma 21, V' is a sequence. Hence, for every view $view \in V'$, $view \subseteq v''$. Importantly, an execution of this construction eventually terminates because (1) $|\mathcal{INS}| < \infty$, (2) Lemma 22, (3) Lemma 23, and (4) $genesis \in V$. Thus, once the execution terminates, we either contradict Lemma 21 (if $v_i = v'$; since $view \subseteq v''$, for every $view \in V'$) or Lemma 24 (if $v_i \neq v'$). Therefore, the lemma holds. \square

Now, we prove that a view can be an auxiliary view for a single installable view.

Lemma 33. Let $v \in V(t)$ be an auxiliary view for a view $v' \in V(t)$ at time t . Moreover, let v be an auxiliary view for a view $v'' \in V(t)$ at time t . Then, $v' = v''$.

PROOF. By contradiction, suppose that $v' \neq v''$. Lemma 27 shows that either $v' \subset v''$ or $v' \supset v''$. Without loss of generality, let $v' \subset v''$. Given Lemma 30, we conclude that $v' \subset v$ and $v'' \subset v$.

Let v' lead to a view $v_i \in V(t)$ at time t (such view v_i exists since $v' \subset v''$ and lemmas 25 and 28). We know, by Lemma 27, that either $v_i \subseteq v''$ or $v_i \supset v''$. We conclude that $v_i \subseteq v''$ (otherwise, the statement of Lemma 32 would be violated).

Lemma 31 shows that $v \subset v_i$. Given that $v_i \subseteq v''$, we conclude that $v \subset v''$. This represents contradiction with $v'' \subset v$, which concludes the proof. \square

The next lemma proves that, if a process obtains an evidence ϵ for $set \neq \emptyset$ and view v' by time t , then $set \in \beta_t(v)$.

Lemma 34. Let a (correct or faulty) process obtain an evidence ϵ' by time t such that $\text{valid}((v', set', \epsilon'), v) = \top$, where $set' \neq \emptyset$. Then, $v \in V(t)$ and $set' \in \beta_t(v)$.

PROOF. First, we conclude that $v \neq genesis$ since $\text{valid}((v', set' \neq \emptyset, \epsilon'), genesis)$ must return \perp (because of the check at line 3 of Listing 26). Moreover, we know that $\epsilon'.path.destination() = v$ and $\epsilon'.path.tail() = set'$ (by the check at line 45 of Listing 26). By Lemma 19, we know that $v \in V(t)$ and $set' \in \beta_t(v)$, which concludes the proof. \square

Similarly, if a process obtains an evidence ϵ for $set = \emptyset$ by time t , then $\alpha_t(v) = \top$.

Lemma 35. Let a (correct or faulty) process obtain an evidence ϵ' by time t such that $\text{valid}((v', \emptyset, \epsilon'), v) = \top$, Then, $v \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v) = \top$.

PROOF. If $v = \text{genesis}$, the lemma trivially holds. Otherwise, we know that $\epsilon'.\text{path.destination}() = v$ and $\epsilon'.\text{path.tail}() = \emptyset$ (by the check at line 45 of Listing 26). By Lemma 19, $v \in V(t)$. Let m be the last message in the ordered set of $\epsilon'.\text{path}$. We know that $m.\text{tail}() = \emptyset$ and $m.\text{destination}() = v$ (by Listing 21). Moreover, $m \in \mathcal{I}^*(t)$ and $m.\text{source}() \in V(t)$ (by Lemma 19). Hence, $\alpha_t(v) = \top$. \square

We now introduce the last invariant we assume holds at time t .

Invariant 5. Let $v \in V(t)$. If $\text{set} \in \beta_t(v)$, where $\text{set} = \{v'_1, \dots, v'_y\}$ and $y \geq 1$, then:

- $\text{seq}' \in \rho_t(v')$, where $v' \in V(t)$, $\alpha_t(v') = \top$ and $\text{seq}' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $\text{seq}_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $\text{seq}_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

Since $\mathcal{I}^*(0) = \emptyset$ at time 0, we know that $V(0) = \{\text{genesis}\}$ and $\beta_0(\text{genesis}) = \emptyset$. Hence, Invariant 5 is satisfied at time 0.

Lemma 36. $\beta_t(\text{genesis}) = \emptyset$.

PROOF. By contradiction, let $\beta_t(\text{genesis}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\text{set} \in \beta_t(\text{genesis})$, where $\text{set} = \{v'_1, \dots, v'_y\}$ and $y \geq 1$. According to Invariant 5, there exists an installable view $v \in V(t)$ such that $\text{seq}' \in \rho_t(v)$, where $\text{seq}' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow \text{genesis} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$ and $x \geq 0$. By Invariant 1, we know that $\text{seq}'.\text{follows}(v) = \top$, which implies that $v \subset \text{genesis}$. However, this statement contradicts Invariant 3, which concludes the proof. \square

We prove that, if $\text{set} \in \beta_t(v)$, then set is a sequence and $\text{set}.\text{follows}(v) = \top$.

Lemma 37. Let $v \in V(t)$. If $\text{set} \in \beta_t(v)$, then (1) set is a sequence, and (2) $\text{set}.\text{follows}(v) = \top$.

PROOF. Let $\text{set} = \{v'_1, \dots, v'_y\}$, where $y \geq 1$. By Invariant 5, there exists a view $v' \in V(t)$ such that (1) $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, and (2) $\text{seq}' \in \rho_t(v')$, where $\text{seq}' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, where $x \geq 0$. Therefore, set is a sequence and $\text{set}.\text{follows}(v) = \top$. \square

The next lemma shows that, if $\text{seq} \in \beta_t(v)$, where v is an installable view, and seq “comes from” an installable view v' , then v' leads to v . Recall that all sets in $\beta_t(v)$ are sequences according to Lemma 37.

Lemma 38. Let $\text{seq} \in \beta_t(v)$, where $\text{seq} = v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($y \geq 1$) and $\alpha_t(v) = \top$. Then, $\text{seq}' \in \rho_t(v')$, where $\text{seq}' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0$) and v' leads to v at time t .

PROOF. By Invariant 5, we know that:

- $\text{seq}' \in \rho_t(v')$, where $\alpha_t(v') = \top$ and $\text{seq}' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $\text{seq}_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $\text{seq}_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

In order to conclude the proof, we need to prove that v' indeed leads to v at time t .

By Invariant 1, we have that $v' \subset v$. By contradiction, suppose that v' leads to $v'' \neq v$ at time t (such view v'' exists since $v' \subset v$ and lemmas 25 and 28). Therefore, by Definition 3, $\text{seq}'' \in \rho_t(v')$, where $\text{seq}'' = \dots \rightarrow v''$. Let us analyze all three possible cases according to Lemma 20:

- $seq' = seq''$: Hence, $v \subset v''$ and Definition 3 is not satisfied for v'' (since $\alpha_t(v) = \top$).
- $seq' \subset seq''$: Hence, $v \in seq''$. Thus, $v \subset v''$ and Definition 3 is not satisfied for v'' (since $\alpha_t(v) = \top$).
- $seq' \supset seq''$: Hence, $v'' \in seq'$. If $v'' \subset v$, Invariant 5 is violated since $\alpha_t(v'') = \top$. If $v \subset v''$, then we have the following: (1) v' leads to v'' , and (2) $v' \subset v \subset v''$, where $\alpha_t(v) = \top$. Hence, Lemma 32 is contradicted.

The lemma holds. \square

The next lemma shows that, if $seq \in \beta_t(v)$, where v is non-installable, and seq “comes from” an installable view v' , then v is an auxiliary view for v' .

Lemma 39. Let $seq \in \beta_t(v)$, where $seq = v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($y \geq 1$) and $\alpha_t(v) = \perp$. Then, $seq' \in \rho_t(v')$, where $seq' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0$), views from the $\{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$ set are not installable at time t and v is an auxiliary view for v' at time t .

PROOF. By Invariant 5, we know that:

- $seq' \in \rho_t(v')$, where $\alpha_t(v') = \top$ and $seq' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

Hence, Definition 4 is satisfied and v is an auxiliary view for v' at time t . Moreover, views from the $\{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$ set are not installable at time t , which concludes the proof. \square

The next lemma shows that, if $seq_1, seq_2 \in \beta_t(v)$, then seq_1 and seq_2 are comparable.

Lemma 40. Let $v \in V(t)$. If $seq_1, seq_2 \in \beta_t(v)$, then either $seq_1 \subseteq seq_2$ or $seq_1 \supset seq_2$.

PROOF. Let $\alpha_t(v) = \top$. For every $seq \in \beta_t(v)$, where $seq = v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($y \geq 1$), $seq' \in \rho_t(v')$, where $seq' = \dots \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$ and v' leads to v at time t (according to Lemma 38). By Lemma 26, only view v' leads to v at time t . Thus, the lemma follows from Lemma 20.

Let $\alpha_t(v) = \perp$. For every $seq \in \beta_t(v)$, where $seq = v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($y \geq 1$), $seq' \in \rho_t(v')$, where $seq' = \dots \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$ and v is an auxiliary view for v' at time t (according to Lemma 39). According to Lemma 33, v is an auxiliary view only for view v' at time t . Thus, the lemma follows from Lemma 20. \square

Let $[\text{INSTALL}, v, set, \omega]$ be the first INSTALL message obtained by a (correct or faulty) process after time t such that $v \in V(t)$. We prove that either $set \in \beta_t(v)$ or $\alpha_t(v) = \top$. Note that we do not consider INSTALL messages with $v \notin V(t)$ since, in that case, v is not a valid view (by Lemma 17).

Importantly, if multiple new INSTALL messages are obtained at the same time $t' > t$, the notion of the “first” INSTALL message is not defined. However, in that case, we order the messages in any arbitrary way. In other words, we “artificially” select the “first” INSTALL message and observe its properties, as well as the properties after this message has been processed (i.e., added to the set of all obtained INSTALL messages). Importantly, we process all messages from time t' before moving on to processing messages from some time $t'' > t'$. We are allowed to “separately” process the INSTALL messages from time t' because, after all these INSTALL messages are processed, we obtain the exact same system state as we would obtain if all the messages were processed “together”.

Lemma 41. Let $[\text{INSTALL}, v, set, \omega] \notin \mathcal{I}^*(t)$ be the first INSTALL message obtained by a (correct or faulty) process after time t such that $v \in V(t)$; let that time be $t' > t$. Then, $set \in \beta_t(v)$ or $\alpha_t(v) = \top$.

PROOF. By Lemma 18, v is a valid view. Moreover, $\text{preconditions}(v, t' - 1) = \top$ (since t' is the first time after time t at which an INSTALL message is obtained and by lemmas 34, 37 and 40). By safety of $\text{vg}(v)$, we have that $(v^*, \emptyset, \epsilon^*) \in \Lambda_{t'-1}^v$ or $(v^*, \text{set}, \epsilon^*) \in \Lambda_{t'-1}^v$. If $(v^*, \emptyset, \epsilon^*) \in \Lambda_{t'-1}^v$, then $\alpha_t(v) = \top$ (by Lemma 35). If $(v^*, \text{set}, \epsilon^*) \in \Lambda_{t'-1}^v$, then $\text{set} \in \beta_t(v)$ (by Lemma 34). Therefore, the lemma holds. \square

Next, we prove some properties of set .

Lemma 42. Let $[\text{INSTALL}, v, \text{set}, \omega] \notin \mathcal{I}^*(t)$ be the first INSTALL message obtained by a (correct or faulty) process after time t such that $v \in V(t)$; let that time be $t' > t$. Then, (1) $\text{set} \neq \emptyset$, (2) set is a sequence, and (3) $\text{set.follows}(v) = \top$.

PROOF. By Lemma 18, v is a valid view. Moreover, $\text{preconditions}(v, t' - 1) = \top$ (since t' is the first time after time t at which an INSTALL message is obtained and by lemmas 34, 37 and 40). Hence, the lemma follows from validity of $\text{vg}(v)$. \square

Finally, we prove that all well-founded views at time t are comparable. This lemma is the crucial ingredient for proving the view comparability property (see Listing 24).

Lemma 43. Let $v, v' \in V(t)$. Then, either $v \subseteq v'$ or $v \supset v'$.

PROOF. If $v = v'$, the lemma holds. Otherwise, we consider four possible cases:

- (1) $\alpha_t(v) = \alpha_t(v') = \top$: In this case, the lemma follows from Lemma 27.
- (2) $\alpha_t(v) = \top$ and $\alpha_t(v') = \perp$: Let v' be the auxiliary view for a view v_i at time t (such view v_i exists due to Lemma 29). According to Lemma 27, $v \subseteq v_i$ or $v \supset v_i$. We analyze all three possibilities:
 - $v = v_i$: In this case, the lemma holds since $v \subset v'$ (by Lemma 30).
 - $v \subset v_i$: We have that $v_i \subset v'$ (by Lemma 30). Hence, $v \subset v'$ and the lemma holds.
 - $v \supset v_i$: Let v_i lead to a view v'' at time t (such view v'' exists due to lemmas 25 and 28). Because of Lemma 27 and Lemma 32, we have that $v'' \subseteq v$. We conclude that $v' \subset v$ since $v' \subset v''$ (by Lemma 31).
- (3) $\alpha_t(v) = \perp$ and $\alpha_t(v') = \top$: Analogous to the previous case.
- (4) $\alpha_t(v) = \alpha_t(v') = \perp$: Let v be an auxiliary view for v_i and let v' be an auxiliary view for v'_i (by Lemma 29). According to Lemma 27, we have three possibilities to examine:
 - $v_i = v'_i$: By Definition 4, we have that $\text{seq}, \text{seq}' \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $\text{seq} = \dots \rightarrow v \rightarrow \dots$ and $\text{seq}' = \dots \rightarrow v' \rightarrow \dots$. The lemma follows from Lemma 20, Invariant 1 and the definition of a sequence.
 - $v_i \subset v'_i$: Let v_i lead to a view v'' at time t (such view v'' exists by lemmas 25 and 28). Because of Lemma 27 and Lemma 32, we have that $v'' \subseteq v'_i$. We conclude that $v \subset v'$ since $v \subset v''$ (by Lemma 31).
 - $v_i \supset v'_i$: Analogous to the case $v_i \subset v'_i$.

The lemma holds since it holds in all four possibilities. \square

Let $[\text{INSTALL}, v, \text{set}, \omega]$ be the first INSTALL message obtained by a (correct or faulty) process after time t such that $v \in V(t)$. Let that happen at time t' . The following lemma proves that set comes from a view that is installable at time t' .

Lemma 44. Let $[\text{INSTALL}, v, \text{seq} = v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y, \omega] \notin \mathcal{I}^*(t)$, where $y \geq 1$, be the first INSTALL message obtained by a (correct or faulty) process after time t such that $v \in V(t)$; let that be at time $t' > t$. Then:

- $\text{seq}' \in \rho_{t'}(v')$, where $v' \in V(t')$, $\alpha_{t'}(v') = \top$ and $\text{seq}' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t')$ and $\alpha_{t'}(v_i) = \perp$, and

- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_{t'}(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

PROOF. If $\alpha_t(v) = \top$, then $\alpha_{t'}(v) = \top$ (since $\mathcal{I}^*(t) \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(t')$). Moreover, we have that $seq \in \rho_{t'}(v)$, which concludes the lemma.

Let $\alpha_t(v) = \perp$. According to Lemma 41, $seq \in \beta_t(v)$. Since Invariant 5 holds at time t , we conclude that:

- $seq' \in \rho_t(v')$, where $v' \in V(t)$, $\alpha_t(v') = \top$ and $seq' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

At time t' , the previous statements still hold (since $\mathcal{I}^*(t) \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(t')$). Moreover, $seq \in \rho_{t'}(v)$, which concludes the lemma. \square

Finally, we show that all invariants are preserved after a new INSTALL message is obtained.

Theorem 17. Let $[\text{INSTALL}, v, seq = v', \omega] \notin \mathcal{I}^*(t)$ be the first INSTALL message obtained by a (correct or faulty) process after time t such that $v \in V(t)$; let that be at time $t' > t$. Let $v' \notin V(t)$. Then, all invariants hold at time t' .

PROOF. We prove the preservation of invariants one by one.

Invariant 1: Invariant 1 holds for v' at time t' since $\rho_{t'}(v') = \emptyset$. Let us prove this statement. By contradiction, suppose that a process has obtained an INSTALL message associated with view v' before time t' . Since $v' \notin V(t)$, we know that v' is not a valid view (by Lemma 17). However, since $v' \in V(t')$, v' is a valid view according to Lemma 18. Thus, contradiction.

The invariant holds for all views $v_t \in V(t)$, where $v_t \neq v$, because $\rho_{t'}(v_t) = \rho_t(v_t)$ and the invariant holds at time t . Finally, the invariant holds for v at time t' because of Lemma 42 and the fact that the invariant holds at time t .

Invariant 2: We conclude that $\alpha_{t'}(v') = \top$. By Lemma 44, there exists a view $v^* \in V(t')$ such that:

- $\alpha_{t'}(v^*) = \top$, and
- $seq' \in \rho_{t'}(v^*)$, where $seq' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v'$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t')$ and $\alpha_{t'}(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_{t'}(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v'$.

Hence, Invariant 2 holds for v' at time t' .

Since $v' \notin V(t)$ and Invariant 2 holds at time t , we conclude that Invariant 2 holds for all views $v_t \in V(t)$. Thus, Invariant 2 holds at time t' .

Invariant 3: Since $v^* \in V(t)$ and Invariant 3 holds at time t , we know that $genesis \subseteq v^*$. We know that $seq' \in \rho_{t'}(v^*)$. Since Invariant 1 holds at time t' , we know that $v^* \subset v'$. Hence, $genesis \subset v'$, which proves the invariant preservation at time t' .

Invariant 4: Since $v' \notin V(t)$, $\alpha_{t'}(v') = \top$ and Invariant 4 holds at time t , Invariant 4 holds at time t' .

Invariant 5: Since $v' \notin V(t)$, $\beta_{t'}(v') = \emptyset$ and Invariant 5 holds at time t , Invariant 5 holds at time t' . \square

Now, we analyze the second possibility.

Theorem 18. Let $[\text{INSTALL}, v, seq = v', \omega] \notin \mathcal{I}^*(t)$ be the first INSTALL message obtained by a (correct or faulty) process after time t such that $v \in V(t)$; let that be at time $t' > t$. Let $v' \in V(t)$. Then, all invariants hold at time t' .

PROOF. We separate the proof into two cases.

(1) Let $\alpha_t(v') = \top$.

Invariant 1: Invariant 1 holds for all views $v_t \in V(t) \setminus \{v\}$ at time t' since it holds at time t . The invariant holds for v at time t' because of Lemma 42 and the fact that the invariant holds at time t .

Invariant 2: Since $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, all views installable at time t are installable at time t' . The fact that Invariant 2 holds at time t implies that the invariant holds at time t' .

Invariant 3: Since $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, all views installable at time t are installable at time t' . Hence, Invariant 3 holds at time t' since it holds at time t .

Invariant 4: Since $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, all views installable at time t are installable at time t' . Hence, the invariant holds at time t' since it holds at time t .

Invariant 5: Since $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, all views installable at time t are installable at time t' . Moreover, $\beta_{t'}(v_t) = \beta_t(v_t)$, for every view $v_t \in V(t)$ (note that $V(t') = V(t)$). Hence, the invariant holds at time t' since it holds at time t .

(2) Let $\alpha_t(v') = \perp$.

Invariant 1: Invariant 1 holds for all views $v_t \in V(t) \setminus \{v\}$ at time t' since it holds at time t . The invariant holds for v at time t' because of Lemma 42 and the fact that the invariant holds at time t .

Invariant 2: By Lemma 44, there exists a view $v^* \in V(t')$ such that:

- $\alpha_{t'}(v^*) = \top$, and
- $seq' \in \rho_{t'}(v^*)$, where $seq' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v'$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t')$ and $\alpha_{t'}(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_{t'}(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v'$.

Hence, Invariant 2 holds for v' at time t' .

Consider now a view $v_{ins} \in V(t)$ such that (1) $v_{ins} \neq genesis$, and (2) $\alpha_t(v_{ins}) = \top$. Since Invariant 2 holds at time t and $v_{ins} \neq genesis$, there is a view v_{lead} that leads to v_{ins} at time t (by Lemma 22). By Definition 3, we have:

- $\alpha_t(v_{lead}) = \top$, and
- $seq_{ins} \in \rho_t(v_{lead})$, where $seq_{ins} = v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y \rightarrow v_{ins}$ and $y \geq 0$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v'_1, \dots, v'_y\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v'_1, \dots, v'_y\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v'_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y \rightarrow v_{ins}$.

If $v' \notin seq_{ins}$, Invariant 2 is satisfied for v_{ins} at time t' .

Otherwise, let $seq_{ins} = v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_z \rightarrow v' \rightarrow v''_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v''_q \rightarrow v_{ins}$, where $z \geq 0$ and $q \geq 0$. The following holds at time t' :

- $\alpha_{t'}(v') = \top$, and
- $seq_v \in \rho_{t'}(v')$, where $seq_v = v''_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v''_q \rightarrow v_{ins}$ (recall that $seq_v \in \rho_t(v')$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v''_1, \dots, v''_q\}$, $v_i \in V(t')$ and $\alpha_{t'}(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v''_1, \dots, v''_q\}$, $seq'_i \in \rho_{t'}(v'_i)$, where $seq'_i = v''_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v''_q \rightarrow v_{ins}$.

Therefore, Invariant 2 is, even in this case, satisfied for v_{ins} at time t' .

Invariant 3: Since $v^* \in V(t)$ and Invariant 3 holds at time t , $genesis \subseteq v^*$. Moreover, $seq' \in \rho_{t'}(v^*)$. Since Invariant 1 holds at time t' , $v^* \subset v'$. Hence, $genesis \subset v'$, which proves the invariant preservation at time t' .

Invariant 4: Consider a view $v_{aux} \in V(t)$ such that (1) $\alpha_t(v_{aux}) = \perp$, and (2) $v_{aux} \neq v'$. Since all invariants hold at time t , we have (by Definition 4):

- $\alpha_t(v_{ins}) = \top$, for some view $v_{ins} \in V(t)$, and

- $seq_{aux} \in \rho_t(v_{ins})$, where $seq_{aux} = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v_{aux} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, $x \geq 0$ and $y \geq 1$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v_{aux} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

If $v' \notin \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, Invariant 4 is satisfied for v_{aux} at time t' .

Otherwise, let $seq_{aux} = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_{z-1} \rightarrow v' \rightarrow v_{z+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v_{aux} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, where $z \geq 0$. The following holds at time t' :

- $\alpha_{t'}(v') = \top$, and
- $seq_{v'} \in \rho_{t'}(v')$, where $seq_{v'} = v_{z+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v_{aux} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$ (recall that $seq_{v'} \in \rho_t(v')$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_{z+1}, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t')$ and $\alpha_{t'}(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_{z+1}, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_{t'}(v_i)$, where $seq'_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v_{aux} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

Therefore, Invariant 4 is, even in this case, satisfied for v_{aux} at time t' .

Invariant 5: We have that $\beta_{t'}(v_t) = \beta_t(v_t)$, for every view $v_t \in V(t')$ (recall that $V(t') = V(t)$). Consider a view $v^{**} \in V(t')$ such that $set \in \beta_t(v^{**})$ and $set = \{v'_1, \dots, v'_y\}$, where $y \geq 1$. We know that $set \in \beta_{t'}(v^{**})$. Since Invariant 5 holds at time t , we have the following:

- $seq^{**} \in \rho_t(v_{ins})$, where $\alpha_t(v_{ins}) = \top$ and $seq^{**} = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v^{**} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t)$ and $\alpha_t(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_t(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v^{**} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

Now, if $v' \notin \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, Invariant 5 is satisfied for v^{**} at time t' .

Otherwise, let $seq^{**} = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_{z-1} \rightarrow v' \rightarrow v_{z+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v^{**} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, where $z \geq 0$. The following holds at time t' :

- $\alpha_{t'}(v') = \top$, and
- $seq_{v'} \in \rho_{t'}(v')$, where $seq_{v'} = v_{z+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v^{**} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$ (recall that $seq_{v'} \in \rho_t(v')$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_{z+1}, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t')$ and $\alpha_{t'}(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_{z+1}, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_{t'}(v_i)$, where $seq'_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v^{**} \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

Therefore, Invariant 5 is, even in this case, satisfied for v^{**} at time t' . \square

Next, we analyze the third possible case.

Theorem 19. Let $[\text{INSTALL}, v, seq = v' \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y, \omega] \notin I^*(t)$ be the first INSTALL message obtained by a (correct or faulty) process after time t such that $v \in V(t)$; let that be at time $t' > t$. Let $v' \notin V(t)$ ¹¹ and $y \geq 1$. Then, all invariants hold at time t' .

PROOF. We prove the preservation of the invariants one by one.

Invariant 1: Invariant 1 holds for v' at time t' since $\rho_{t'}(v') = \emptyset$. Let us prove this statement. By contradiction, suppose that a process has obtained an INSTALL message associated with view v' before time t' . Since $v' \notin V(t)$, we know that v' is not a valid view (by Lemma 17). However, since $v' \in V(t')$, v' is a valid view according to Lemma 18. Thus, contradiction.

The invariant holds for all views $v_t \in V(t)$, where $v_t \neq v$, because $\rho_{t'}(v_t) = \rho_t(v_t)$ and the invariant holds at time t . Finally, the invariant holds for v at time t' because of Lemma 42 and the fact that the invariant holds at time t .

Invariant 2: The set of installable views at time t' is identical to the set of installable views at time t . Thus, the invariant is preserved since it is satisfied at time t .

¹¹Observe that v' is the destination of the message since seq is a sequence (by Lemma 42) and v' is the smallest view of the sequence.

Invariant 3: The set of installable views at time t' is identical to the set of installable views at time t . Thus, the invariant is preserved since it is satisfied at time t .

Invariant 4: By Lemma 44, there exists a view $v^* \in V(t')$ such that:

- $\alpha_{t'}(v^*) = \top$, and
- $seq' \in \rho_{t'}(v^*)$, where $seq' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v' \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t')$ and $\alpha_{t'}(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_{t'}(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v' \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

Hence, Invariant 4 is satisfied at time t' for v' . Moreover, since the set of installable views at time t' is identical to the set of installable views at time t and Invariant 4 holds at time t , the invariant is preserved at time t' .

Invariant 5: We have that $\beta_{t'}(v') = \{v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y\}$. By Lemma 44, there exists a view $v^* \in V(t)$ such that:

- $\alpha_{t'}(v^*) = \top$, and
- $seq' \in \rho_{t'}(v^*)$, where $seq' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v' \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$, ($x \geq 0$), and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $v_i \in V(t')$ and $\alpha_{t'}(v_i) = \perp$, and
- for every $v_i \in \{v_1, \dots, v_x\}$, $seq_i \in \rho_{t'}(v_i)$, where $seq_i = v_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x \rightarrow v' \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y$.

Hence, Invariant 5 is satisfied for v' at time t' .

For every view $v_t \in V(t)$, $\beta_{t'}(v_t) = \beta_t(v_t)$. Therefore, Invariant 5 is satisfied for v_t at time t' since it holds at time t and the set of installable views at time t' is identical to the set of installable views at time t . \square

Lastly, we analyze the fourth possible case.

Theorem 20. Let $[\text{INSTALL}, v, seq = v' \rightarrow v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v'_y, \omega] \notin \mathcal{I}^*(t)$ be the first INSTALL message obtained by a (correct or faulty) process after time t such that $v \in V(t)$; let that be at time $t' > t$. Let $v' \in V(t)$ ¹² and $y \geq 1$. Then, all invariants hold at time t' .

PROOF. We distinguish two cases:

(1) Let $\alpha_t(v') = \top$.

Invariant 1: Invariant 1 holds for all views $v_t \in V(t) \setminus \{v\}$ at time t' since it holds at time t . The invariant holds for v at time t' because of Lemma 42 and the fact that the invariant holds at time t .

Invariant 2: Since $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, all views installable at time t are installable at time t' . The fact that Invariant 2 holds at time t implies that the invariant holds at time t' .

Invariant 3: Since $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, all views installable at time t are installable at time t' . Hence, Invariant 3 holds at time t' since it holds at time t .

Invariant 4: Since $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, all views installable at time t are installable at time t' . Hence, the invariant holds at time t' since it holds at time t .

Invariant 5: Since $\alpha_t(v') = \top$, all views installable at time t are installable at time t' . Moreover, $\beta_{t'}(v_t) = \beta_t(v_t)$, for every view $v_t \in V(t) \setminus \{v'\}$ (note that $V(t') = V(t)$). Hence, the invariant holds at time t' for v_t since it holds at time t . Furthermore, Invariant 5 holds for v' at time t' because of Lemma 44 and the fact that the invariant holds at time t . Thus, the invariant is preserved at time t' .

(2) Let $\alpha_t(v') = \perp$.

¹²Note that v' is the destination of the message since seq is a sequence (by Lemma 42) and v' is the smallest view of the sequence.

Invariant 1: Invariant 1 holds for all views $v_t \in V(t) \setminus \{v\}$ at time t' since it holds at time t . The invariant holds for v at time t' because of Lemma 42 and the fact that the invariant holds at time t .

Invariant 2: The set of views installable at time t is identical to the set of views installable at time t' . Given that the invariant holds at time t , the invariant is preserved at time t' .

Invariant 3: The set of views installable at time t is identical to the set of views installable at time t' . Given that the invariant holds at time t , the invariant is preserved at time t' .

Invariant 4: The set of views installable at time t is identical to the set of views installable at time t' . Given that the invariant holds at time t , the invariant is preserved at time t' .

Invariant 5: We have that $\beta_{t'}(v_t) = \beta_t(v_t)$, for every view $v_t \in V(t') \setminus \{v'\}$ (note that $V(t') = V(t)$). Therefore, the invariant is ensured at time t' for v_t since it holds at time t . Moreover, Invariant 5 is ensured for v' at time t' because of Lemma 44 and the fact that the invariant holds at time t . Thus, the invariant is preserved at time t' . \square

Epilogue. We have shown that, at all times, all the invariants we have introduced hold. Now, we give some results that represent consequences of the introduced invariants.

We start by proving that all valid views belong to $V(\infty)$.

Lemma 45 (Valid Views are in $V(\infty)$). Let a view v be valid. Then, $v \in V(\infty)$.

PROOF. Follows from Definition 1 and the definition of $V(\infty)$. \square

Since all invariants hold at all times, we have the following for each valid view $v \in V(\infty)$:

- If $set \in \rho_\infty(v)$, then (1) $set \neq \emptyset$, (2) set is a sequence, and (3) $set.follows(v) = \top$ (due to the fact that Invariant 1 holds at time ∞).
- If $\alpha_\infty(v) = \perp$ and $seq \in \rho_\infty(v)$, where $set = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x$ ($x \geq 1$), then $seq' \in \rho_\infty(v')$, where $seq' = \dots \rightarrow v \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x$ and v is an auxiliary view for v' at time ∞ (due to lemmas 39 and 41).
- $preconditions(v, t) = \top$, for any time t (this follows from the fact that $preconditions(v, \infty) = \top$, which is a result of lemmas 34, 37 and 40).

Next, any obtained INSTALL message associated with a valid view “carries” a sequence that follows the associated view.

Lemma 46. Let a (correct or faulty) process obtain the $m = [\text{INSTALL}, source, set, \omega]$ message, where $source = m.source()$ is a valid view. Then, (1) $set \neq \emptyset$, (2) set is a sequence, and (3) $set.follows(source) = \top$.

PROOF. Since $source$ is a valid view, $source \in V(\infty)$ (by Lemma 45). Moreover, $m \in \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$. Hence, $set \in \rho_\infty(source)$. Therefore, the lemma holds since Invariant 1 holds at time ∞ . \square

Let $m = [\text{INSTALL}, v, seq, \omega]$, where v is a valid view. According to Lemma 46, $seq \neq \emptyset$, seq is a sequence and $seq.follows(v) = \top$. Moreover, $m.destination() = seq.first()$ and $m.tail() = seq \setminus \{seq.first()\}$.

The next lemma proves that a view v leads to a view v' at time ∞ if and only if v' is the smallest installable view greater than v .

Lemma 47. Let $v, v' \in V(\infty)$ such that $\alpha_\infty(v) = \alpha_\infty(v') = \top$ and $v \subset v'$. Then, v leads to v' at time ∞ if and only if there does not exist a view $v'' \in V(\infty)$ such that $\alpha_\infty(v'') = \top$ and $v \subset v'' \subset v'$.

PROOF. In order to prove the lemma, we prove the both directions of the statement.

First, if v leads to v' , then there does not exist a view v'' such that $\alpha_\infty(v'') = \top$ and $v \subset v'' \subset v'$. This statement is true due to Lemma 32.

Now, suppose that such view v'' does not exist. We need to prove that v leads to v' at time ∞ . By contradiction, suppose that v does not lead to v' at time ∞ . Since $v \subset v'$, v leads to a view $v_i \neq v'$ at time ∞ (by lemmas 25 and 28). By Lemma 21, $v \subset v_i$. By lemmas 27 and 32, $v_i \subseteq v'$. Since $v_i \neq v'$, $v_i \subset v'$. However, this contradicts the fact that an installable view greater than v and smaller than v' does not exist. Thus, the lemma holds. \square

Similarly to Lemma 47, a view v' is an auxiliary view for a view v at time ∞ if and only if v is the greatest installable view smaller than v' .

Lemma 48. Let $v, v' \in V(\infty)$ such that $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$, $\alpha_\infty(v') = \perp$ and $v \subset v'$. Then, v' is an auxiliary view for v at time ∞ if and only if there does not exist a view $v'' \in V(\infty)$ such that $\alpha_\infty(v'') = \top$ and $v \subset v'' \subset v'$.

PROOF. In order to prove the lemma, we prove the both directions of the statement.

First, if v' is an auxiliary view for v at time ∞ , then there does not exist a view v'' such that $\alpha_\infty(v'') = \top$ and $v \subset v'' \subset v'$. By contradiction, let there exist such view v'' . By lemmas 25 and 28, v leads to a view v_i at time ∞ . Moreover, $v_i \subseteq v''$ (by lemmas 27 and 32). Since v' is an auxiliary view for v at time ∞ , $v' \subset v_i$ (by Lemma 31). Hence, $v' \subset v''$, which contradicts that $v'' \subset v'$. This direction of the statement is satisfied.

Now, suppose that such view v'' does not exist. We need to prove that v' is an auxiliary view for v at time ∞ . By contradiction, suppose that v' is not an auxiliary view for v at time ∞ . Let v' be an auxiliary view for a view $v^* \neq v$ (such view v^* exists due to Lemma 29). By Lemma 30, $v^* \subset v'$. By Lemma 27, either $v \subseteq v^*$ or $v \supset v^*$. Since $v \neq v^*$ and no installable view “between” v and v^* exists, $v^* \subset v$. Let v^* lead to a view v_i (by lemmas 25 and 28). By lemmas 27 and 32, $v_i \subseteq v$. By Lemma 31, $v' \subset v_i$. Hence, $v' \subset v$, which represents contradiction with $v \subset v'$. Thus, the lemma holds. \square

The next lemma shows that all valid views are greater than or equal to *genesis*.

Lemma 49. Let a view v be valid. Then, *genesis* $\subseteq v$.

PROOF. By Lemma 45, we know that $v, \textit{genesis} \in V(\infty)$. By Lemma 43, we know that either *genesis* $\subseteq v$ or *genesis* $\supset v$. For the sake of contradiction, let $v \subset \textit{genesis}$.

Since Invariant 3 holds at time ∞ , $\alpha_\infty(v) = \perp$. Therefore, v is an auxiliary view for some view v^* at time ∞ (by Lemma 29). By Lemma 30, $v^* \subset v$, which implies that $v^* \subset \textit{genesis}$. However, this is impossible due to Invariant 3. The lemma holds. \square

The next lemma shows that views that “belong” to a view-path are ordered.

Lemma 50. Let $\textit{path} = [m_1, \dots, m_k]$, where $k \geq 1$, be a view-path. Then:

- (1) $m_{i-1}.\textit{source}() \subset m_i.\textit{source}()$, for every $i \in [2, k]$, and
- (2) $m_k.\textit{source}() \subset m_k.\textit{destination}()$.

PROOF. Note that $\textit{path}.\textit{views}() \subseteq V(\infty)$ (by Lemma 45). Since $m_i.\textit{source}() = m_{i-1}.\textit{destination}()$, for every $i \in [2, k]$ (see Listing 21), the first claim of the lemma follows from Invariant 1. Moreover, Invariant 1 ensures that the second claim of the lemma is true, as well. \square

Next, we show that it is impossible that $(+, r) \notin v$ and $(-, r) \in v$, where v is a valid view and r is a server.

Lemma 51. Let v be a valid view such that $(-, r) \in v$, where r is a server. Then, $(+, r) \in v$.

PROOF. By contradiction, let $(-, r) \in v$ and $(+, r) \notin v$. First, $v \neq \textit{genesis}$ due to the fact that *genesis* does not contain “negative” changes (see §2, paragraph “Constants”). Thus, there exists a view-path $path \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$ such that $path.\textit{destination}() = v$ (by Definition 1).

By Lemma 50, $v' \subset v$, where $v' = m.\textit{source}()$, $v = m.\textit{destination}()$ and m is the last message of $path$. Thus, $(+, r) \notin v'$, which means that the membership validity property of $vg(v')$ is violated (recall that v' is a valid view, by Lemma 19, and $\textit{preconditions}(v', \infty) = \top$). Hence, the lemma holds. \square

We now show that there are finitely many valid views (see Listing 24).

Theorem 21 (Finitely Many Valid Views). There exist only finitely many valid views.

PROOF. Consider any valid view v . We prove that $|C_v^+ = \{(+, r) \mid (+, r) \in v\}| < \infty$. We distinguish two possible cases:

- Let $v = \textit{genesis}$. In this case, $|C_v^+| < \infty$ due to the definition of *genesis* (see §2, paragraph “Constants”).
- Let $v \neq \textit{genesis}$. By Definition 1, there exists a view-path $path \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$ such that $path.\textit{destination}() = v$. Let $m \in path$ be the INSTALL message such that $m.\textit{destination}() = v$; note that $m.\textit{source}()$ is a valid view. Now, for every $(+, r) \in C_v^+$, the JOIN message is sent by r (see Listing 26); hence, r has previously started. Due to the assumption that only finitely many servers start, $|C_v^+| < \infty$.

Now, let $C_v^- = \{(-, r) \mid (-, r) \in v\}$. Because of Lemma 51 and $|C_v^+| < \infty$, we conclude that $|C_v^-| < \infty$. Therefore, $|v| < \infty$. Recall that every valid view belongs to $V(\infty)$ (by Lemma 45). Since all valid views have finitely many changes, all valid views belong to $V(\infty)$ and all views from $V(\infty)$ are comparable (by Lemma 43), the theorem holds. \square

Moreover, we prove that there are finitely many sequences in $\rho_\infty(v)$, where v is a valid view.

Lemma 52 (Finitely Many Sequences). Let view v be valid. Then, $|\rho_\infty(v)| < \infty$.

PROOF. Follows directly from the bounded decisions property of $vg(v)$. \square

For the sake of brevity, we might use the result of Lemma 52 without explicitly stating it in the rest of the paper.

6.2.2 *Safety Properties.* We start by proving the view comparability property specified in Listing 24.

Theorem 22 (View Comparability). View comparability is satisfied.

PROOF. All valid views belong to $V(\infty)$ (by Lemma 45). Hence, the theorem follows from Lemma 43. \square

The direct consequence of the view comparability property is that the *history* variable (initialized at line 6 of Listing 22) of a correct server is a sequence. The indirect consequences of the property are:

- (1) The *sequence* variable (initialized at line 11 of Listing 22) of a correct server contains sequences.
- (2) The *reconfiguration.sequence* variable (initialized at line 22 of Listing 27) of a correct server is a sequence (or \perp).

We are ready to prove the join safety property (see §3.3, paragraph “Properties of Carbon”).

Theorem 23 (Join Safety). Join safety is satisfied.

PROOF. Let a server r join and let $r \notin \text{genesis.members}()$. We prove that r is voted in, i.e., that a process obtains a voting proof σ_v such that $\text{verify_voting}(\text{"add server } r", \sigma_v) = \top$.

Since r joins and $r \notin \text{genesis.members}()$, there exists a correct server that executes line 34 of Listing 32 (if r is correct, then r itself executes this line; see §3.3, paragraph “Validators”) or line 60 of Listing 32 (if r is faulty, a correct server executes this line). Hence, there exists a valid view $v \neq \text{genesis}$ such that $r \in v.\text{members}()$.

Since $v \neq \text{genesis}$ is valid, there exists a view-path $\text{path} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$ such that $\text{path.destination}() = v$ (by Definition 1). All views that belong to $\text{path.views}()$ are valid (by Lemma 19). Hence, there exists an INSTALL message m such that $m.\text{source}()$ is a valid view and $r \in m.\text{destination}().\text{members}()$. Finally, the theorem holds because the evidence handed to the view generator primitive contains JOIN messages with the voting proofs for every $(+, r')$ “proposed” change (by line 16 or line 52 of Listing 26), where r' is a server. \square

The next theorem proves the leave safety property of Carbon (see §3.3, paragraph “Properties of Carbon”).

Theorem 24 (Leave Safety). Leave safety is satisfied.

PROOF. Let a correct server r leave. Hence, r executes line 55 of Listing 32. Therefore, there exist valid views v_1 and v_2 such that (1) $r \in v_1.\text{members}()$, and (2) $r \notin v_2.\text{members}()$ (by line 3 of Listing 32).

Since $r \in v_1.\text{members}()$, $(+, r) \in v_1$ (see Listing 2). Moreover, since $v_1 \subset v_2$ and $r \notin v_2.\text{members}()$, $(+, r), (-, r) \in v_2$. Hence, $v_2 \neq \text{genesis}$ (since genesis does not contain “negative” changes; see §2, paragraph “Constants”). By Definition 1, there exists a view-path $\text{path} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$ such that $\text{path.destination}() = v_2$. Similarly to the proof of join safety (Theorem 23), there exists an INSTALL message m such that $m.\text{source}()$ is a valid view and $(-, r) \in m.\text{destination}()$. Furthermore, the evidence handed to the view generator primitive contains either voting proofs or LEAVE messages for every $(-, r')$ “proposed” change (by line 22 or line 58 of Listing 26), where r' is a server. Therefore, r either sent the LEAVE message or is voted out. Finally, if r sent the LEAVE message, then r has previously requested to leave (because the LEAVE message is sent at line 4 of Listing 30). The theorem holds. \square

6.2.3 Liveness Properties. We now prove the finality property specified in Listing 24. Then, we show the join liveness, leave liveness and removal liveness properties of Carbon.

We start by showing that a correct server always hand “valid” proposals to a view generator instance.

Lemma 53. Let a correct server r propose $(v', \text{set}', \epsilon')$ to $\text{vg}(v)$. Then, $\text{valid}((v', \text{set}', \epsilon'), v) = \top$.

PROOF. There are two places for r to propose to $\text{vg}(v)$. We take a look at both places:

- line 18 of Listing 31: We separate two possibilities:
 - Let $v = \text{genesis}$. First, $v \subset v'$ (ensured by the `to_propose` function; line 3 of Listing 31). Moreover, $\epsilon'.\text{path} = \perp$ (by line 8 of Listing 27). The check at line 9 of Listing 26 passes due to the `to_propose` function. Finally, for each change that belongs to the `reconfiguration.requested` variable, server r stores the JOIN (at line 9 of Listing 29) or the LEAVE message (at line 9 of Listing 30) or the corresponding voting proof (at line 13 of Listing 30) in the `reconfiguration.requests` or `reconfiguration.voting_proofs` variable. Thus, the lemma holds in this scenario.
 - Let $v \neq \text{genesis}$. First, $v \subset v'$ (ensured by the `to_propose` function; line 3 of Listing 31). Then, the check at line 39 of Listing 26 passes due to the `to_propose` function. The check at line 45 of Listing 26 passes since $\epsilon'.\text{path} = \text{current_view.proof}$. Finally, for each change that belongs to the `reconfiguration.requested` variable, server r stores the JOIN (at line 9 of Listing 29) or the LEAVE message (at line 9 of Listing 30) or the corresponding

voting proof (at line 13 of Listing 30) in the *reconfiguration.requests* or *reconfiguration.voting_proofs* variable. Therefore, the lemma holds in this scenario.

- line 83 of Listing 32: We know that $\epsilon'.path.tail() = set'$. Furthermore, $set' \in \beta_\infty(v)$. By Lemma 36, $v \neq genesis$. The check at line 27 of Listing 26 passes since $v' \in set'$. Next, the check at line 33 of Listing 26 passes because of Lemma 37.

Now, if $(+, r) \notin v$, then no view $v^* \in set'$ exists such that $(-, r) \in v^*$. Let us prove this claim. Since $set' \in \beta_\infty(v)$, $seq'' \in \rho_\infty(v'')$, where $\alpha_\infty(v'') = \top$, $seq'' = \dots \rightarrow v \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x$, ($x \geq 1$) and $set' = v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_x$ (by Invariant 5). Since $seq''.follows(v'') = \top$ (by Invariant 1), $v'' \subset v$. Hence, $(+, r) \notin v''$. Therefore, no view that belongs to set' contains $(-, r)$ due to membership validity of $vg(v'')$ (since v'' is a valid view and $preconditions(v'', \infty) = \top$). Thus, the checks at lines 36 and 39 of Listing 26 pass.

The check at line 45 of Listing 26 passes since $\epsilon'.path = current_view.proof$. Finally, for each change that belongs to a view of set' , server r stores the JOIN or the LEAVE message or the corresponding voting proof in the *reconfiguration.requests* or *reconfiguration.voting_proofs* variable because of the `extract_requests_and_voting_proofs` function invoked after an INSTALL message is processed (line 9 of Listing 23).

The lemma is satisfied since it holds in both possible scenarios. \square

The next lemma shows that installable views cannot be “skipped”. Specifically, we show that any view-path to a view v' “contains” a view v , where v is the greatest installable view smaller than v' ; observe that such installable view always exists since any view-path contains at least a single message and the source of the first message is *genesis*, which is the smallest valid view (by Lemma 49).

Lemma 54. Let $path \subseteq I^*(\infty)$ such that $path.destination() = v'^{13}$. Let v be the greatest view smaller than v' with $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$. Then, $v \in path.views()$.

PROOF. Let m^* be the last message of $path$; note that $m^*.destination() = v'$. Let $v^* = m^*.source()$. If $v^* = v$, the lemma holds. Otherwise, we prove that $v \subset v^*$.

By contradiction, suppose that $v^* \subset v$. We distinguish two possibilities:

- Let $\alpha_\infty(v^*) = \top$. Since $v^* \subset v$, v^* leads to a view v_i at time ∞ (by lemmas 25 and 28). By lemmas 27 and 32, $v_i \subseteq v$. Since $m^* \in path$, $seq \in \rho_\infty(v^*)$, where $seq = v' \rightarrow \dots$. By Definition 3, $seq_i \in \rho_\infty(v^*)$, where $seq_i = \dots \rightarrow v_i$. By Lemma 20, either $seq \subseteq seq_i$ or $seq \supset seq_i$. Therefore, $v' \subseteq v_i$, which implies that $v' \subseteq v$. However, this contradicts the fact that $v' \supset v$. In this case, $v \subset v^*$.
- Let $\alpha_\infty(v^*) = \perp$. By Lemma 29, v^* is an auxiliary view for a view v_i . By Lemma 30, $v_i \subset v^*$. Since $v^* \subset v$, $v_i \subset v$. Therefore, v_i leads to a view v'_i at time ∞ (by lemmas 25 and 28). Lemmas 27 and 32 show that $v'_i \subseteq v$. Since $m^* \in path$, $seq \in \rho_\infty(v^*)$, where $seq = v' \rightarrow \dots$. Moreover, $seq' \in \rho_\infty(v_i)$, where $seq' = \dots \rightarrow v^* \rightarrow v' \rightarrow \dots$ (by lemmas 39 and 41 and the fact that v^* is an auxiliary view for v_i). On the other hand, $seq'_i \in \rho_\infty(v_i)$, where $seq'_i = \dots \rightarrow v'_i$ (since v_i leads to v'_i at time ∞ and Definition 1). By Lemma 20, either $seq' \subseteq seq'_i$ or $seq' \supset seq'_i$. Therefore, $v' \subseteq v'_i$, which implies that $v' \subseteq v$. This statement contradicts the fact that $v' \supset v$. Thus, $v \subset v^*$ in this case, as well.

Since $v \subset v^*$, we reach the starting point of the lemma. The recursion eventually stops since $path$ “contains” finitely many views (by Theorem 21 and the fact that all views from $path$ are valid), the smallest view that belongs to $path.views()$ is *genesis* (see Listing 21 and Lemma 50) and $v \supseteq genesis$ (by Lemma 49). \square

¹³Note that $v' \supset genesis$ since view-paths have at least a single message (see Listing 21) and Invariant 1 holds.

A direct consequence of Lemma 54 is that all installable views smaller than the destination of a view-path are “contained” in the view-path.

Lemma 55. Let $path \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$ such that $path.destination() = v'$. Consider a view $v \subset v'$ such that $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$. Then, $v \in path.views()$.

PROOF. Follows directly from Lemma 54. □

A direct consequence of Lemma 55 is that there does not exist an INSTALL message m such that (1) $m.source()$ is a valid view, and (2) $m.source() \subset v \subset m.destination()$, where v is a view installable at time ∞ . We prove this result below.

Lemma 56. Let a view v be installable at time ∞ (i.e., $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$). Then, $[INSTALL, v', seq' = v'' \rightarrow \dots, \omega] \notin \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$, where (1) v' is a valid view, and (2) $v' \subset v \subset v''$.

PROOF. Let $m = [INSTALL, v', seq' = v'' \rightarrow \dots, \omega]$. By contradiction, let $m \in \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$. Since v' is a valid view, $v' = genesis$ or there exists a view-path $path \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$ such that $path.destination() = v'$ (by Definition 1). Let us consider both cases:

- Let $v' = genesis$. Let $path' = [m]$. Hence, $path'$ is a view-path (see Listing 21) and $path'.destination() = v''$. Moreover, $path' \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$.
- Let $v' \neq genesis$. Let $path' = path||m$. Hence, $path'$ is a view-path (see Listing 21) and $path'.destination() = v''$. Moreover, $path' \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$.

Hence, $path' \subseteq \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$ exists such that $path'.destination() = v'' \supset v$ and $v \notin path'.views()$. This contradicts Lemma 55, which concludes the proof. □

Next, we prove that *install_messages* variables of two forever-correct servers are eventually identical.

Lemma 57. Let servers r and r' be forever-correct. Then, $install_messages_r = install_messages_{r'}$, where $install_messages_r$ (resp., $install_messages_{r'}$) denotes the value of the *install_messages* variable at server r (resp., r') at time ∞ .

PROOF. First, $|install_messages_r| < \infty$ and $|install_messages_{r'}| < \infty$, which follows from the fact that only finitely many valid views exist (by Theorem 21) and from the fact that $|\rho_\infty(v)| < \infty$, for every valid view v (by Lemma 52). Then, the lemma follows from the fact that all messages inserted into the *install_messages* variable at a correct server are gossiped (at line 12) of Listing 23). □

Now, we prove that a correct server eventually gets “prepared” for a view, i.e., a correct server eventually sets its *reconfiguration.prepared* variable to \top . The next lemma assumes that all correct servers send the “valid” state according to the *verify* function (see line 16 of Listing 33). We prove that this is indeed the case in Lemma 81.

Lemma 58 (Eventual Preparedness). Let a correct server r enter the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32. Eventually, $reconfiguration.prepared = \top$ at server r .

PROOF. By contradiction, suppose that *reconfiguration.prepared* is never set to \top at server r . Hence, r gossips the STATE – REQUEST message at line 13 of Listing 32. Moreover, since r has entered the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32, there exists a valid view v_r such that $r \in v_r.members()$. Hence, the JOIN message was sent by r (by checks at lines 16 and 52 of Listing 26), which implies that r has requested to join. Since r is correct, r does not halt before leaving (see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”). Because *reconfiguration.prepared* is never set to \top by server r (by the assumption), r never

leaves. Therefore, r never halts, which means that r is forever-correct. Now, suppose that $reconfiguration.source = v$ and $reconfiguration.sequence = seq$ at server r .

Eventually, the rule at line 3 of Listing 33 is active at every forever-correct server (follows from Lemma 57). We now separate two possibilities:

- If $v.quorum()$ correct members of v are forever-correct, then these servers send the STATE – UPDATE message to r at line 14 of Listing 33 and these messages are received by r . Therefore, the rule at line 40 of Listing 33 is eventually active at server r and r sets its $reconfiguration.prepared$ variable to \top in this case.
- Otherwise, a correct member of v halts; let $r' \in v.members()$ be a correct server that halts. Since $r' \in v.members()$, r' has requested to join (by checks at lines 16 and 52 of Listing 26). Therefore, r' leaves (see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”), which implies that r' executes line 55 of Listing 32. Prior to leaving, $reconfiguration.discharged = \top$ (line 22 of Listing 32) and $dischagement.dischagement_view = v'$, for some valid view $v' \supset v$, at server r' . This means that r' has, before leaving, received DISCHAGEMENT – CONFIRM messages associated with a view v^* , where $v^* \supseteq v'$ and v^* is a valid view, from a quorum of members of v^* (line 11 of Listing 34). Let C denote the subset of servers from which r' has received the [DISCHAGEMENT – CONFIRM, v^*] messages such that, for every server $c \in C$, c is correct; note that $|C| \geq v^*.plurality()$. We separate two cases:
 - At least $v^*.plurality()$ of servers that belong to C are forever-correct. In this case, these servers eventually send the STATE – UPDATE message while their $current_view.view$ variable is greater than or equal to v^* (this holds due to the fact that these servers eventually set their $current_view.view$ variable to v^* and the $current_view.view$ variable of a correct server is only updated with greater values). Moreover, $v^* \in history$ at server r eventually (due to Lemma 57). Hence, the rule at line 46 of Listing 33 is eventually active at server r , which ensures that r sets its $reconfiguration.prepared$ variable to \top .
 - Otherwise, there exists a server $c \in C$ that leaves (i.e., executes line 11 of Listing 34). Prior to leaving, $reconfiguration.discharged = \top$ (line 22 of Listing 32) and $dischagement.dischagement_view = v''$, for some valid view $v'' \supset v^*$. Since $v^* \supset v$, $v'' \supset v$. Hence, we apply the same reasoning as done towards v' . Such recursion eventually stops due to the fact that there exist only finitely many valid views (by Theorem 21), which means that r eventually sets its $reconfiguration.prepared$ variable to \top .

Since we reach contradiction, $reconfiguration.prepared = \top$ at server r eventually and the lemma holds. \square

The next two results show that some specific views are forever-alive (Definition 2). Recall that, given definitions 1 and 2, all forever-alive views are valid.

Lemma 59. Let a correct server $r \in v.members()$ set its $current_view.view$ variable to v . Then, a view $v' \supseteq v$ is forever-alive.

PROOF. If $v = genesis$, v is forever-alive by Definition 2. Hence, the lemma trivially holds in this case.

Let $v \neq genesis$. Since r sets its $current_view.view$ variable to v , $v \in history$ at server r (by Lemma 13). By Lemma 14, there exists a view-path $path \subseteq install_messages$ (at server r) such that $path.destination() = v$. Moreover, all messages that belong to $path$ are gossiped at line 12 of Listing 23. If r is forever-correct, Definition 2 is satisfied for v . Thus, the lemma holds in this case.

Otherwise, server r halts. Since $r \in v.members()$ and v is a valid view (since $v \in history$ at server r , v is valid according to Lemma 15), server r leaves (see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”) at line 55 of Listing 32. Moreover, $v \supset genesis$ (by

Lemma 49). This means that r learns from a correct server r' that r' 's `current_view.view` variable is set to some valid view $v' \supset v$ (see listings 32 and 34), where $r \notin v'.members()$ and $r' \in v'.members()$.

By Lemma 13, $v' \in history$ at server r' . By Lemma 14, there exists a view-path $path' \subseteq install_messages$ (at server r') such that $path'.destination() = v'$. Moreover, all messages that belong to $path'$ are gossiped at line 12 of Listing 23 by server r' . If r' is forever-correct, Definition 2 is satisfied for $v' \supset v$ and the lemma holds. Otherwise, server r' halts and we apply the same reasoning as done towards server r . The recursion eventually stops due to the fact that only finitely many valid views exist (by Theorem 21), which implies that a view greater than v is forever-alive if server r halts (and leaves). Thus, the lemma holds. \square

Lemma 60. Let a correct server r enter the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 with $joined = \top$. Then, a view $v' \supseteq v$ is forever-alive¹⁴.

PROOF. We start by observing that $v \neq genesis$. This statement follows from the fact that $genesis$ is the smallest valid view (by Lemma 49). If $r \in v.members()$, then eventually `current_view.view` = v at server r (by Lemma 58). Therefore, the lemma follows from Lemma 59.

Otherwise, we distinguish two possibilities:

- If r never leaves, then r is forever-correct (see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”). Since $v \in history$ at server r (due to the check at line 3 of Listing 32), Lemma 14 shows (since $v \neq genesis$) that there exists a view-path $path \subseteq install_messages$ (at server r) such that $path.destination() = v$. Since all messages that belong to $path$ are gossiped (at line 12 of Listing 23) by server r , v is forever-alive (by Definition 2). Therefore, the lemma holds in this case.
- If r leaves, there exists a correct server $r' \in v'.members()$, where $v' \supseteq v$, that sets its `current_view.view` variable to v' (see listings 32 and 34). Hence, the lemma follows from Lemma 59.

The proof is concluded since the lemma holds in all possible cases. \square

The next lemma proves that a correct member of a forever-alive view sets its `current_view.view` variable to that view or there exists a greater view which is forever-alive.

Lemma 61. Let v be a forever-alive view. Then, a correct server $r \in v.members()$ eventually sets its `current_view.view` variable to v or a view $v' \supset v$ is forever-alive.

PROOF. If $v = genesis$, the lemma trivially holds since all correct members of $v = genesis$ set their `current_view.view` variable to $genesis$ (at line 40 of Listing 27).

Let $v \neq genesis$. Since v is a forever-alive view, v is a valid view (by definitions 1 and 2). Because $r \in v.members()$, r has requested to join (by checks at lines 16 and 52 of Listing 26). Therefore, r does not halt unless it has previously left (see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”). Finally, since v is a forever-alive view, every forever-correct process eventually obtains a view-path to v (due to the validity property of the gossip primitive).

The lemma is satisfied if one of the following statements is true:

- (1) Server r sets its `current_view.view` variable to v .
- (2) Server r sets its `current_view.view` variable to $v' \supset v$. In this case, we know that a view $v^* \supseteq v'$ is forever-alive (by Lemma 59). Since $v^* \supset v$, the lemma is indeed satisfied.

¹⁴View v is the view specified at line 3 of Listing 32.

- (3) Server r enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 with $joined = \top$, where the “destination” view v^* (i.e., view v from the line 3 of Listing 32; note that $v^* \neq v$) is greater than v , i.e., $v \subset v^*$. By Lemma 60, a view greater than or equal to v^* is forever-alive. Since $v \subset v^*$, the lemma is satisfied.

By contradiction, suppose that none of the three statements is true. Hence, r never halts (since it never leaves due to the fact that the third statement is not true). Hence, r is forever-correct and r eventually obtains a view-path to v .

First, we prove that r eventually joins. If $r \in genesis.members()$, r joins at line 49 of Listing 27. Otherwise, since r eventually receives a view-path to v and $r \notin genesis.members()$, the rule at line 3 of Listing 32 becomes eventually active and r joins (because of Lemma 58). Once r joins, r sets its `current_view.view` variable to v_r , where $r \in v_r.members()$. Moreover, $v_r \subset v$ (since the aforementioned statements are assumed to not be true).

Next, server r eventually enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 since r eventually obtains a view-path to v and $v_r \subset v$. Let v'_r be the “destination” view (i.e., `reconfiguration.destination` = v'_r upon entering the pseudocode; set at line 4 of Listing 32). Since the third statement is not true, $v'_r \subseteq v$. Suppose that $v'_r = v$. By Lemma 58, r eventually sets its `current_view.view` variable to v . This is impossible due to the fact that the first statement is not true. Hence, $v'_r \subset v$.

We know that $v_r \subset v'_r$ (ensured by the check at line 3 of Listing 32). Since $r \in v_r.members()$, $r \in v.members()$ and $v_r \subset v'_r \subset v$, $r \in v'_r.members()$. Hence, r eventually sets its `current_view.view` variable to $v'_r \subset v$ (by Lemma 58).

We reach the same point as we have reached after r has joined (and set its `current_view.view` variable to v_r). Thus, we apply the same argument. Such recursion eventually stops due to the fact that only finitely many valid views exist (by Theorem 21), which implies that only finitely many valid views smaller than v exist. Therefore, r eventually enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 with the “destination” view greater than or equal to v . Once this happens, either the first of the third statement is proven to be true, thus concluding the proof of the lemma. \square

The next lemma shows that all correct members of a forever-alive and installable view eventually “transit” to that view.

Lemma 62. Let v be a forever-alive view such that $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$. Then, a correct server $r \in v.members()$ eventually sets its `current_view.view` variable to v .

PROOF. If $v = genesis$, the lemma trivially holds since all correct members of $v = genesis$ set their `current_view.view` variable to `genesis` (at line 40 of Listing 27).

Let $v \neq genesis$. Since v is forever-alive, v is a valid view (by definitions 1 and 2). Because $r \in v.members()$, r has requested to join (by checks at lines 16 and 52 of Listing 26). Hence, r does not halt unless it has previously left (see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”). Finally, since v is forever-alive, every forever-correct process eventually obtains a view-path to v (due to the validity property of the gossip primitive).

First, we prove that r eventually joins. If $r \in genesis.members()$, r joins at line 49 of Listing 27 in this case. Let $r \notin genesis.members()$. By contradiction, suppose that r does not join. Hence, r does not leave, which implies that r does not halt. Therefore, r is forever-correct, which means that r eventually obtains a view-path to v . Furthermore, the rule at line 3 of Listing 32 becomes eventually active (since $r \notin genesis.members()$) and r joins (by Lemma 58). Once r joins, r sets its `current_view.view` variable to v_r , where $r \in v_r.members()$.

Next, we prove that $v_r \subseteq v$. By contradiction, suppose that $v_r \supset v$ (note that both v_r and v are valid and, thus, comparable; Theorem 22). Let $vr' = source[v_r]$ at the moment of entering the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32. Since $v'_r \subset v_r$, $r \in v_r.members()$ and $r \notin v'_r.members()$, $v'_r \subset v$. Hence, Lemma 56 is contradicted. Therefore, $v_r \subseteq v$.

If $v_r = v$, the lemma holds. Otherwise, $v_r \subset v$. We prove that r eventually enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32. By contradiction, suppose that this does not happen. Hence, r does not leave, which implies that r does not halt (i.e., r is forever-correct). Therefore, r eventually obtains a view-path to v , which means that r eventually enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32, which represents contradiction.

Let v'_r be the “destination” view once r enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32. By Lemma 56, $v'_r \subseteq v$. Since $r \in v_r.\text{members}()$, $r \in v.\text{members}()$ and $v_r \subset v'_r \subseteq v$, $r \in v'_r.\text{members}()$. By Lemma 58, r eventually sets its `current_view.view` variable to v'_r .

If $v'_r = v$, the lemma holds. Otherwise, we reach the same point as we have reached after r has joined (and set its `current_view.view` variable to v_r). Thus, we apply the same argument. Such recursion eventually stops due to the fact that only finitely many valid views exist (by Theorem 21), which implies that only finitely many valid views smaller than v exist. Therefore, r eventually sets its `current_view.view` variable to v , thus concluding the proof. \square

Recall that v_{final} denotes the greatest forever-alive view. The greatest forever-alive view is well-defined since (1) *genesis* is a forever-alive view (by Definition 2; hence, $v_{final} \neq \perp$), (2) all forever-alive views are valid (by definitions 1 and 2), (3) all valid views are comparable (by the view comparability property; Theorem 22), and (4) there exist only finitely many valid views (by Theorem 21). We now show that $\alpha_\infty(v_{final}) = \top$.

Lemma 63. $\alpha_\infty(v_{final}) = \top$.

PROOF. Since v_{final} is valid, $v_{final} \in V(\infty)$ (by Lemma 45). By contradiction, let $\alpha_\infty(v_{final}) = \perp$. Hence, $genesis \neq v_{final}$ (since $\alpha_\infty(genesis) = \top$).

By Lemma 61, all correct members of v_{final} eventually set their `current_view.view` variable to v_{final} (since v_{final} is the greatest forever-alive view). Since $v_{final} \neq genesis$, this is done at line 29 of Listing 32. Furthermore, every correct member of v_{final} starts $vg(v_{final})$ with a proposal at line 83 of Listing 32 (since v_{final} is not installable at time ∞ ; similarly to Lemma 19). Moreover, the proposal is valid (by Lemma 53).

Suppose that a correct member of v_{final} enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 after setting its `current_view.view` variable to v_{final} . By Lemma 60, v_{final} is not the greatest forever-alive view. Thus, contradiction and no correct member of v_{final} enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 after setting its `current_view.view` variable to v_{final} .

Therefore, no correct member of v_{final} stops $vg(v_{final})$ (since $vg(v_{final})$ can only be stopped at line 26 of Listing 32). Because of the liveness property of $vg(v_{final})$, a correct member of v_{final} decides set_{final} from $vg(v_{final})$ (line 21 of Listing 31). By the validity property of $vg(v_{final})$, $set_{final} \neq \emptyset$, set_{final} is a sequence and $set_{final}.\text{follows}(v_{final}) = \top$ (since $\text{preconditions}(v_{final}, \infty) = \top$). Thus, a correct member of v_{final} enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 (because of the INSTALL message “created” using set_{final}). Therefore, we reach contradiction, which implies that $\alpha_\infty(v_{final}) = \top$. \square

Next, we show that, if a view v is forever-alive, then all installable views smaller than or equal to v are forever-alive.

Lemma 64. For every view v^* such that $\alpha_\infty(v^*) = \top$ and $v^* \subseteq v_{final}$, v^* is forever-alive.

PROOF. Follows directly from Lemma 55 and the definition of v_{final} . \square

Finally, we are able to prove the finality property.

Theorem 25 (Finality). Finality is satisfied.

PROOF. By Lemma 61, all correct members of v_{final} eventually set their `current_view.view` variable to v_{final} (since v_{final} is the greatest forever-alive view). Hence, all correct members of v_{final} update their current view to v_{final} .

Next, we prove that no correct member of v_{final} enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 after setting its $current_view.view$ variable to v_{final} (which is already proven in the proof of Lemma 63). If a correct member of v_{final} does enter the pseudocode, v_{final} is not the greatest forever-alive view (by Lemma 60). Therefore, no correct member of v_{final} enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 after setting its $current_view.view$ variable to v_{final} .

Now, consider a correct server $r \in v_{final}.members()$. We aim to prove that r installs v_{final} . If $v_{final} = genesis$, r installs v_{final} at line 44 of Listing 27. Suppose that $v_{final} \neq genesis$. By contradiction, assume that r does not install v_{final} . Since r does not install v_{final} , r starts $vg(v_{final})$ with a proposal at line 83 of Listing 32. Moreover, the proposal is valid (by Lemma 53). Since no correct member of v_{final} enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 after setting its $current_view.view$ variable to v_{final} , no correct member of v_{final} stops $vg(v_{final})$ (since $vg(v_{final})$ can only be stopped at line 26 of Listing 32). Because of the liveness property of $vg(v_{final})$, r decides set_{final} from $vg(v_{final})$ (line 21 of Listing 31). By the validity property of $vg(v_{final})$, $set_{final} \neq \emptyset$, set_{final} is a sequence and $set_{final}.follows(v_{final}) = \top$ (since $preconditions(v_{final}, \infty) = \top$). Thus, r enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 (because of the INSTALL message “created” using set_{final}). Therefore, we reach contradiction, which implies that r indeed installs v_{final} .

Since r never enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 after setting its $current_view.view$ variable to v_{final} , r does not update its current view after updating it to v_{final} . Similarly, r does not leave.

Finally, by contradiction, suppose that r stops processing in v_{final} (i.e., r executes line 10 of Listing 33 for some view $v_{stop} \supseteq v_{final}$). By the check at line 3 of Listing 33, $v_{stop} \in history$ at server r . By Lemma 15, v_{stop} is a valid view. Moreover, $set' \neq \emptyset^{15}$ is a sequence and $set'.follows(v_{stop}) = \top$ (since $set' \in \rho_{\infty}(v_{stop})$ and Invariant 1). Since $v_{final} \subseteq v_{stop}$ and $set'.follows(v_{stop}) = \top$, $v_{final} \subset set'.first()$. Furthermore, $set'.first() \in history$ (see listings 20 and 23). Hence, by Lemma 14, r has obtained a view-path $path \subseteq install_messages$ (at server r) to $set'.first()$ (note that $set'.first() \neq genesis$ since $set'.first() \supset v_{final}$ and $v_{final} \supseteq genesis$). Finally, since r never leaves and r has gossiped all messages that belong to $path$ (at line 12 of Listing 23), Definition 2 is satisfied for $set'.first()$. Hence, $set'.first() \supset v_{final}$ is forever-alive. Thus, we reach contradiction with the fact that v_{final} is the greatest forever-alive view, which implies that r does not stop processing in v_{final} . Therefore, the theorem holds. \square

The next important intermediate result we prove is that there exists a view v such that $r \in v.members()$ (resp., $r \notin v.members()$) and $\alpha_{\infty}(v) = \top$ if a correct server r requests to join (resp., leave). First, we introduce the next two lemmas that help us prove the aforementioned result.

Lemma 65. Let $r \in v_{final}.members()$ be a correct server. Moreover, let $(+, r') \in reconfiguration.requested$ at server r . Then, $(+, r') \in v_{final}$.

PROOF. By contradiction, suppose that $(+, r') \notin v_{final}$. By Lemma 51, $(-, r') \notin v_{final}$.

Consider any correct server $r^* \in v_{final}.members()$. By the finality property:

- r^* eventually updates its current view to v_{final} ,
- r^* never updates its current view afterwards,
- r^* installs v_{final} , and
- r^* does not leave.

Since $(+, r') \notin v_{final}$, the rule at line 13 of Listing 31 is eventually active at server r . Hence, r proposes to $vg(v_{final})$ at line 18 of Listing 31. By Lemma 53, the proposal is valid. Every correct member of v_{final} starts $vg(v_{final})$ and no correct member of v_{final} stops $vg(v_{final})$ (due to the finality property). Because of the liveness property of $vg(v_{final})$, a correct

¹⁵ set' is the set of views specified at line 3 of Listing 33.

member of v_{final} decides set_{final} from $vg(v_{final})$ (line 21 of Listing 31). By the validity property of $vg(v_{final})$, $set_{final} \neq \emptyset$, set_{final} is a sequence and $set_{final}.follows(v_{final}) = \top$ (since $preconditions(v_{final}, \infty) = \top$). Thus, a correct member of v_{final} enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 (because of the INSTALL message “created” using set_{final}). By Lemma 60, v_{final} is not the greatest forever-alive view. Thus, we reach contradiction, which implies that $(+, r') \in v_{final}$. \square

Lemma 66. Let $r \in v_{final}.members()$ be a correct server. Moreover, let $(-, r') \in reconfiguration.requested$ at server r and let $(+, r') \in v_{final}$. Then, $(-, r') \in v_{final}$.

PROOF. By contradiction, suppose that $(-, r') \notin v_{final}$.

Consider any correct server $r^* \in v_{final}.members()$. By the finality property:

- r^* eventually updates its current view to v_{final} ,
- r^* never updates its current view afterwards,
- r^* installs v_{final} , and
- r^* does not leave.

Since $(-, r') \notin v_{final}$ and $(+, r') \in v_{final}$, the rule at line 13 of Listing 31 is eventually active at server r . Hence, r proposes to $vg(v_{final})$ at line 18 of Listing 31. By Lemma 53, the proposal is valid. Every correct member of v_{final} starts $vg(v_{final})$ and no correct member of v_{final} stops $vg(v_{final})$. Because of the liveness property of $vg(v_{final})$, a correct member of v_{final} decides set_{final} from $vg(v_{final})$ (line 21 of Listing 31). By the validity property of $vg(v_{final})$, $set_{final} \neq \emptyset$, set_{final} is a sequence and $set_{final}.follows(v_{final}) = \top$ (since $preconditions(v_{final}, \infty) = \top$). Thus, a correct member of v_{final} enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 (because of the INSTALL message “created” using set_{final}). By Lemma 60, v_{final} is not the greatest forever-alive view. Thus, we reach contradiction, which implies that $(-, r') \in v_{final}$. \square

The next lemma proves that there cannot exist an INSTALL message m such that $(-, r) \in m.destination()$ and $(+, r) \notin m.source()$, where $m.source()$ is a valid view and m is a server.

Lemma 67. Let $m \in \mathcal{I}^*(\infty)$, where $m.source()$ is a valid view. Let $(+, r) \notin m.source()$, for some server r . Then, $(-, r) \notin m.destination()$.

PROOF. Follows from the membership validity property of $vg(m.source())$ (since $m.source()$ is a valid view and $preconditions(m.source(), \infty) = \top$). \square

Finally, we prove that there exists an installable view $v_r \subseteq v_{final}$ such that $r \in v_r.members()$, where r is a correct server that requested to join.

Lemma 68. Let a correct server r request to join. Then, there exists a view $v_r \subseteq v_{final}$ such that $\alpha_\infty(v_r) = \top$ and $r \in v_r.members()$.

PROOF. Since r requests to join, $r \notin genesis.members()$ (see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”). Therefore, $(+, r) \notin genesis$. First, we prove that $(+, r) \in v_{final}$. By contradiction, assume that $(+, r) \notin v_{final}$. Hence, r does not join (by Lemma 59 and the fact that v_{final} is the greatest forever-alive view), which implies that r does not leave. Hence, r never halts (see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”), which means that r is forever-correct.

Since r is forever-correct, the JOIN message gossiped by r (at line 4 of Listing 29) is received by a correct member of v_{final} (due to the validity property of the gossip primitive). Hence, $(+, r)$ is included into the $reconfiguration.requested$ variable of that server (due to the fact that r broadcasts the voting proof; see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”). By

Lemma 65, $(+, r) \in v_{final}$, which represents the contradiction with $(+, r) \notin v_{final}$. Therefore, our starting assumption was not correct, hence $(+, r) \in v_{final}$.

If $(-, r) \notin v_{final}$, the lemma holds since $\alpha_\infty(v_{final}) = \top$ (by Lemma 63).

Hence, let $(-, r) \in v_{final}$. In this case, $v_{final} \neq genesis$ (since *genesis* does not contain “negative” changes; see §2, paragraph “Constants”). Therefore, there exists a view v_i such that v_i is the greatest view smaller than v_{final} that is installable at time ∞ . By Lemma 47, v_i leads to v_{final} at time ∞ . Furthermore, $seq_i \in \rho_\infty(v_i)$, where $seq_i = \dots \rightarrow v_{final}$ (by Definition 3). By the membership validity property of $vg(v_i)$ (since $preconditions(v_i, \infty) = \top$), $(+, r) \in v_i$. Therefore, we reach the point we reached with v_{final} : (1) $\alpha_\infty(v_i) = \top$, and (2) $(+, r) \in v_i$. The recursion eventually stops due to (1) the fact that there are only finitely many valid views (by Theorem 21), which implies existence of only finitely many views installable at time ∞ , (2) *genesis* is the smallest installable view (since *genesis* is installable by definition and *genesis* is the smallest valid view, by Lemma 49), and (3) $(+, r) \notin genesis$. Therefore, the lemma holds. \square

Next, we prove that $(+, r), (-, r) \in v_{final}$, where r is a correct server that requested to leave.

Lemma 69. Let a correct server r request to leave. Then, $(+, r), (-, r) \in v_{final}$.

PROOF. Since r requests to leave, r has previously joined (see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”). Hence, $(+, r) \in v_{final}$ (by Lemma 59 and the fact that v_{final} is the greatest forever-alive view). By contradiction, let $(-, r) \notin v_{final}$. Thus, r never leaves (by Lemma 60 and the fact that v_{final} is the greatest forever-alive view), which means that r is forever-correct.

Since r is forever-correct, the LEAVE message gossiped by r (at line 4 of Listing 30) is received by a correct member of v_{final} (due to the validity property of the gossip primitive; see §2). Hence, $(-, r)$ is included into the *reconfiguration.requested* variable of that server. By Lemma 66, $(-, r) \in v_{final}$, which represents the contradiction with $(-, r) \notin v_{final}$. Therefore, our starting assumption was not correct, hence $(-, r) \in v_{final}$. The lemma holds. \square

Before we are able to prove the join and leave liveness defined in §3.3, we show that a correct server eventually “discharges” a view.

Lemma 70 (Eventual Dischargement). Let a correct server r enter the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32. Eventually, *reconfiguration.discharged* = \top at server r .

PROOF. By contradiction, suppose that the *reconfiguration.discharged* variable is not set to \top at server r . Hence, r never halts (since it never leaves), which makes r forever-correct. Then, $[\text{INSTALL}, v', seq = v \rightarrow \dots, \omega] \in \text{install_messages}$ at server r , where $r \notin v.\text{members}()$. By Lemma 60, a view $v^* \supseteq v$ is forever-alive. Since $v^* \subseteq v_{final}$, $v \subseteq v_{final}$.

Since r is forever-correct, the DISCHARGEMENT – REQUEST gossiped by r (at line 20 of Listing 32) is received by every member of v_{final} while their *current_view.view* variable is equal to v_{final} (holds because of the validity property of the gossip primitive and the finality property). Moreover, r eventually includes v_{final} into its *history* variable (since r is forever-correct). Therefore, r eventually receives $[\text{DISCHARGEMENT} - \text{CONFIRM}, v_{final}]$ messages from all correct members of v_{final} . Once that happens, the rule at line 11 of Listing 34 is active and r sets its *reconfiguration.discharged* variable to \top . Thus, the lemma holds. \square

Finally, we are ready to prove the join liveness property defined in §3.3.

Theorem 26 (Join Liveness). Join liveness is satisfied.

PROOF. Let r be a correct server that requests to join. By Lemma 68, there exists a view $v_r \subseteq v_{final}$ such that (1) $\alpha_\infty(v_r) = \top$, and (2) $r \in v_r.\text{members}()$. By Lemma 64, v_r is forever-alive. Then, r joins due to Lemma 62. \square

Next, we prove the leave liveness property defined in §3.3.

Theorem 27 (Leave Liveness). Leave liveness is satisfied.

PROOF. Let r be a correct server that requests to leave. Therefore, r has previously joined (see §3.3, paragraph “Server’s rules”). By Lemma 69, $(+, r), (-, r) \in v_{final}$; hence, $r \notin v_{final}.members()$.

By contradiction, suppose that r never leaves. Hence, r never halts, which means that r is forever-correct. Since r has joined, the *current_view.view* variable at r is not equal to \perp ; let *current_view.view* variable have its final value v_r (the final value is indeed defined since *current_view.view* variable of a correct server is set only to valid views, it only “grows” and there exist finitely many valid views, by Theorem 21). By Lemma 59, $v_r \subseteq v_{final}$. Since $r \in v_r.members()$ and $r \notin v_{final}.members()$, $v_r \subset v_{final}$.

Since r is forever-correct, r eventually enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 due to the fact that r eventually obtains a view-path to v_{final} and $v_r \subset v_{final}$. Let the “destination” view be v'_r . If $r \notin v'_r.members()$, then r eventually leaves (by Lemma 70). This is impossible due to the fact that r never leaves. Hence, $r \in v'_r.members()$. Therefore, r updates its *current_view.view* variable to $v'_r \supset v_r$ (by Lemma 58). Thus, we reach contradiction with the fact that v_r is the final value of *current_view.view* at server r , which means that our starting assumption was not correct and r leaves. \square

Lastly, we prove the removal liveness property defined in §3.3. In order to prove the removal liveness property, we prove that a correct forever-validator is a member of v_{final} .

Lemma 71. Let r be a correct forever-validator. Then, $r \in v_{final}.members()$.

PROOF. Since r is correct forever-validator, r has joined (see §3.3, paragraph “Validators”). By Lemma 59, $(+, r) \in v_{final}$. By contradiction, suppose that $(-, r) \in v_{final}$.

Since r has joined, the *current_view.view* variable at r is not equal to \perp ; let *current_view.view* variable have its final value v_r . By Lemma 59, $v_r \subseteq v_{final}$. Since $r \in v_r.members()$ and $r \notin v_{final}.members()$, $v_r \subset v_{final}$.

Since r is forever-correct (because it does not leave), r eventually enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 due to the fact that r eventually obtains a view-path to v_{final} and $v_r \subset v_{final}$. Let the “destination” view be v'_r . If $r \notin v'_r.members()$, then r eventually leaves (by Lemma 70). This is impossible due to the fact that r never leaves. Hence, $r \in v'_r.members()$. Therefore, r updates its *current_view.view* variable to $v'_r \supset v_r$ (by Lemma 58). Thus, we reach contradiction with the fact that v_r is the final value of *current_view.view* at server r , which means that our starting assumption was not correct and $(-, r) \notin v_{final}$. Hence, $r \in v_{final}.members()$. \square

The next theorem proves the removal liveness property.

Theorem 28 (Removal Liveness). Removal liveness is satisfied.

PROOF. Let r^* be a correct forever-validator that obtains a voting proof σ_v that a server r is voted out. By Lemma 71, $r^* \in v_{final}.members()$. Since r is a validator at time t , that means that r joined by time t . We aim to prove that $(+, r) \in v_{final}$. Let us consider both possible cases:

- Let r be a correct server. Hence, $(+, r) \in v_{final}$ due to Lemma 59.
- Let r be a faulty server. Hence, a correct server triggered the special r joined event (at line 53 of Listing 27 or at line 60 of Listing 32). Hence, $(+, r) \in v_{final}$ due to Lemma 59.

Therefore, $(+, r) \in v_{final}$. By Lemma 66, $(-, r) \in v_{final}$, as well. Since $(-, r) \in v_{final}$, $genesis \neq v_{final}$ (see §2, paragraph “Constants”).

Again, we separate two possible cases:

- Let r be a correct server. By contradiction, suppose that r does not leave. Since r has joined, the *current_view.view* variable at r is not equal to \perp ; let *current_view.view* variable have its final value v_r (the final value of the *current_view.view* variable exists since there are only finitely many valid views, by Theorem 21, and a correct server updates the variable only with greater values, by the check at line 3 of Listing 32). By Lemma 59, $v_r \subseteq v_{final}$. Since $r \in v_r.members()$ and $r \notin v_{final}.members()$, $v_r \subset v_{final}$. Since r is forever-correct (because it does not leave), r eventually enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 due to the fact that r eventually obtains a view-path to v_{final} and $v_r \subset v_{final}$. Let the “destination” view be v'_r . If $r \notin v'_r.members()$, then r eventually leaves (by Lemma 70). This is impossible due to the fact that r never leaves. Hence, $r \in v'_r.members()$. Therefore, r updates its *current_view.view* variable to $v'_r \supset v_r$ (by Lemma 58). Thus, we reach contradiction with the fact that v_r is the final value of *current_view.view* at server r , which means that our starting assumption was not correct and r leaves.
- Let r be a faulty server. By the finality property, r^* eventually sets its *current_view.view* variable to $v_{final} \neq genesis$. Hence, r^* enters the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 with the “source” view v_s and with the “destination” view v_{final} . We know that $(+, r), (-, r) \in v_{final}$. By the membership validity property of $vg(v_s)$ (since v_s is a valid view and $preconditions(v_s, \infty) = \top$), $(+, r) \in v_s$. If $(-, r) \notin v_s$, then r leaves since r^* triggers the special r left event (at line 64 of Listing 32). Otherwise, $(+, r), (-, r) \in v_s$ and $v_s \neq genesis$ (since *genesis* does not contain “negative” changes; see §2, paragraph “Constants”). Now, we consider a correct server $r_s \in v_s.members()$ that sets its *current_view.view* variable to v_s at line 29 of Listing 32; such server exists due to the fact that the INSTALL message m is obtained, where $m.source() = v_s$ and $m.destination() = v_{final}$, and due to the decision permission property of $vg(v_s)$. Hence, we apply the same reasoning as with v_{final} . Such recursion eventually stops due to (1) the fact that there are only finitely many valid views (by Theorem 21), (2) *genesis* is the smallest valid view (by Lemma 49), and (3) $(-, r) \notin genesis$. Therefore, r leaves.

The theorem holds since r leaves in all possible cases. □

7 CLIENT’S IMPLEMENTATION

This section is devoted to the implementation of the client. As we have already mentioned in §3, clients are the users of Carbon, i.e., clients are the entities that are able to issue transactions. Before we give the implementation of a client, we define the commitment proof of a transaction. Specifically, we define when $verify_commit(tx \in \mathcal{T}, \sigma_c \in \Sigma_c) = \top$.

```

1 function verify_commit(Transaction tx, Commitment_Proof  $\sigma_c$ ):
2   if  $\sigma_c$  is not Set(Message):
3     return  $\perp$ 
4   if does not exist View  $v$  such that  $m = [COMMITTED, tx, v, View\_Path\ path]$  and  $v = path.destination()$ 
   , for every Message  $m \in \sigma_c$ :
5     return  $\perp$ 
7   Set(Server) senders = { $m.sender \mid m \in \sigma_c$ }

```



```

8   if senders  $\not\subseteq$  v.members():
9       return  $\perp$ 
10  return |senders|  $\geq$  v.plurality()

12 function (Commitment_Proof  $\sigma_c$ ).signers:
13     return {m.sender | m  $\in$   $\sigma_c$ }

```

Listing 35. The verify_commit function

Intuitively, $\text{verify_commit}(tx, \sigma_c) = \top$ if and only if σ_c contains $v.\text{plurality}()$ COMMITTED messages, where v is a valid view. Finally, we give the implementation of a client. We assume that each transaction is signed by its issuer, i.e., a transaction tx is signed by $tx.\text{issuer}$. Hence, only $tx.\text{issuer}$ can issue tx . For the sake of brevity, we omit this logic in the pseudocode given below.

```

1 Client:
2   Implementation:
3     upon start: // executed as soon as the start event is triggered
4         Set(Message) waiting_messages =  $\emptyset$ 

6         // reconfiguration variables
7         View current_view = genesis
8         Sequence history = genesis
9         Set(Install_Message) install_messages =  $\emptyset$ 

11        String state = "idle"

13        // transaction variables
14        Transaction current_transaction =  $\perp$ 
15        Map(View  $\rightarrow$  Set(Server)) acks_from = {v  $\rightarrow$   $\emptyset$ , for every View v}
16        Map(View  $\rightarrow$  Set(Message)) acks = {v  $\rightarrow$   $\emptyset$ , for every View v}
17        Set(Message) certificate =  $\perp$ 

19        // query variables
20        Integer query_id = 0
21        Map(View  $\rightarrow$  Set(Server)) responses_from = {v  $\rightarrow$   $\emptyset$ , for every View v}
22        Map(View  $\rightarrow$  Set(Integer)) responses = {v  $\rightarrow$   $\emptyset$ , for every View v}

24    upon receipt of Message m:
25        waiting_messages = waiting_messages  $\cup$  {m}

27    upon exists Install_Message m  $\in$  waiting_messages such that m = [INSTALL, v, set,  $\omega$ ] and
    v  $\in$  history and m  $\notin$  install_messages:
28        waiting_messages = waiting_messages  $\setminus$  {m}

```

```

29     install_messages = install_messages  $\cup$  {m}
30     gossip m
31     View v' = m.destination()
32     if v' ∉ history:
33         history = history  $\cup$  {v'}

35     upon exists View v  $\in$  history such that current_view  $\subset$  v:
36         current_view = v
37         if state = "query":
38             broadcast [QUERY, query_id, current_view.view] to current_view.view.members()
39         if state = "certificate collection":
40             broadcast [PREPARE, current_transaction, current_view] to current_view.members()
41         if state = "commitment proof collection":
42             broadcast [COMMIT, current_transaction, certificate, current_view] to current_view.members()

44     upon issue Transaction tx: // the client issues a transaction tx
45         // reset transaction variables
46         acks_from = {v  $\rightarrow$   $\emptyset$ , for every View v}
47         acks = {v  $\rightarrow$   $\emptyset$ , for every View v}
48         certificate =  $\perp$ 

50         state = "certificate collection" // set state to "certificate collection"
51         current_transaction = tx // remember the transaction
52         // broadcast the prepare message to all members of current_view
53         broadcast [PREPARE, tx, current_view] to current_view.members()

55     upon query market: // the client requests to learn the total amount of money
56         // reset transaction variables
57         responses_from = {v  $\rightarrow$   $\emptyset$ , for every View v}
58         responses = {v  $\rightarrow$   $\emptyset$ , for every View v}

60         state = "query" // set state to "query"
61         query_id = query_id + 1
62         // broadcast the query message to all members of current_view
63         broadcast [QUERY, query_id, current_view] to current_view.members()

65     upon exists Message m  $\in$  waiting_messages such that m = [ACK, Transaction tx, View v, View_Path
    path] and tx = current_transaction and path.destination() = v and m.sender  $\in$  v.members() and
    state = "certificate collection":
66         waiting_messages = waiting_messages  $\setminus$  {m}
67         Server r = m.sender

```

Carbon: An Asynchronous Voting-Based Payment System for a Client-Server Architecture

```
68     if  $r \notin \text{acks\_from}[v]$ :
69          $\text{acks\_from}[v] = \text{acks\_from}[v] \cup \{r\}$ 
70          $\text{acks}[v] = \text{acks}[v] \cup \{m\}$ 

72     upon exists View  $v$  such that  $|\text{acks\_from}[v]| \geq v.\text{quorum}()$  and  $\text{state} = \text{"certificate collection"}$ :
73          $\text{state} = \text{"commitment proof collection"}$  // set state to "commitment proof collection"
74          $\text{certificate} = \text{acks}[v]$  // update the certificate
75         // broadcast the commit message to all members of  $\text{current\_view}$ 
76         broadcast [COMMIT,  $tx$ ,  $\text{certificate}$ ,  $\text{current\_view}$ ] to  $\text{current\_view}.\text{members}()$ 

78     upon obtaining Commitment_Proof  $\sigma_c$  such that  $\text{verify\_commit}(\text{Transaction } tx, \sigma_c) = \top$ :
79         trigger committed  $tx$  // the client learns that  $tx$  is committed
80         if  $tx = \text{current\_transaction}$ :
81              $\text{state} = \text{"idle"}$ 
82              $\text{current\_transaction} = \perp$ 

84     upon exists Message  $m \in \text{waiting\_messages}$  such that  $m = [\text{QUERY-RESPONSE}, \text{Integer } \text{response}, \text{Integer } qid, \text{View } v, \text{View\_Path } \text{path}]$  and  $\text{query\_id} = qid$  and  $\text{state} = \text{"query"}$  and  $\text{path}.\text{destination}() = v$  and  $m.\text{sender} \in v.\text{members}()$ :
85          $\text{waiting\_messages} = \text{waiting\_messages} \setminus \{m\}$ 
86         Server  $r = m.\text{sender}$ 
87         if  $r \notin \text{responses\_from}[v]$ :
88              $\text{responses\_from}[v] = \text{responses\_from}[v] \cup \{r\}$ 
89              $\text{responses}[v] = \text{responses}[v] \cup \{\text{response}\}$ 

91     upon exists View  $v$  such that  $|\text{responses\_from}[v]| \geq v.\text{quorum}()$  and  $\text{state} = \text{"query"}$ :
92          $\text{state} = \text{"idle"}$ 
93         trigger total money median( $\text{responses}[v]$ )
```

Listing 36. Client - implementation

Let us emphasize that the *history* variable of a client is indeed a sequence since all views that belong to *history* are valid (follows from line 27 of Listing 36).

8 SERVER'S MODULES: TRANSACTION MODULE

This section is devoted to the *transaction module* of a server. The transaction module contains the logic for processing transactions issued by clients.

We start by specifying what constitutes as a “valid” transaction certificate (see Listing 37). Then, we give the implementation used for representing the *state* of a server, i.e., all transactions processed by the server (paragraph “State representation”). Lastly, we present the implementation of the transaction module (paragraph “Transaction module - implementation”).

```
1 function verify_transaction_certificate(Transaction  $tx$ , Set(Message)  $\text{certificate}$ ):
```

```

2   if does not exist View  $v$  such that  $m = [\text{ACK}, tx, v, \text{View\_Path } path]$  and  $v = path.destination()$ , for
   every Message  $m \in certificate$ :
3     return  $\perp$ 
4   return  $|m.sender \mid m \in certificate \text{ and } m.sender \in v.members()| \geq v.quorum()$ 

```

Listing 37. Transaction certificate - verification

A transaction certificate *certificate* is “valid” for a transaction *tx* if and only if `verify_transaction_certificate(tx, certificate) = \top` . Intuitively, this is the case if *certificate* contains a quorum of ACK messages for *tx*.

State representation. We give below the implementation for representing the state of a server. This part of the pseudocode is important since servers exchange their state representations during the state transfer periods.

```

1 State_Representation:
2   instance state = {
3     Map(Transaction  $\rightarrow$  Message) log
4     Map(Client, Integer  $\rightarrow$  Set(Transaction)) allowed_acks
5   }
6
7   function verify_transaction_proof(Transaction tx, Message proof):
8     return proof = [COMMIT, tx, Set(Message) certificate, View v] such that
   verify_transaction_certificate(tx, certificate) =  $\top$  // see Listing 37
9
10  function (State_Representation state).extract_log():
11    Log log =  $\emptyset$ 
12    for each Transaction tx such that state.log[tx]  $\neq \perp$ :
13      if verify_transaction_proof(tx, state.log[tx]) =  $\top$ :
14        log = log  $\cup$  {tx}
15      else:
16        return  $\perp$ 
17    return log
18
19  function (State_Representation state).verify_log():
20    Log log = state.extract_log()
21    if log =  $\perp$ :
22      return  $\perp$ 
23    return admissible(log) // see Listing 6
24
25  function (State_Representation state).verify_allowed_acks():
26    for each Client c and Integer i such that state.allowed_acks[c][i]  $\neq \perp$ :
27      for each Transaction tx  $\in$  state.allowed_acks[c][i]:
28        if tx.issuer  $\neq$  c or tx.sn  $\neq$  i:
29          return  $\perp$ 
30    return  $\top$ 

```

```

32  function (State_Representation state).verify():
33      return state.verify_log() and state.verify_allowed_acks()

35  function merge_logs(State_Representation state1, State_Representation state2):
36      if state1.verify() = ⊥ or state2.verify() = ⊥:
37          return ⊥

39      Map(Transaction → Message) new_log = {tx → ⊥, for every Transaction tx}
40      new_log = state1.log
41      for each Transaction tx such that state2.log[tx] ≠ ⊥:
42          new_log[tx] = state2.log[tx]

44      return new_log

```

Listing 38. State representation

Transaction module - implementation. Finally, we give the implementation of the transaction module of a server.

```

1 Transaction Module:
2 Implementation:
3     upon start: // executed as soon as the start event is triggered
4         Log log = ∅
5         Map(Transaction → Bool) quasi_committed = {tx → ⊥, for every Transaction tx}
6         Map(Transaction → Bool) confirmed = {tx → ⊥, for every Transaction tx}
7         Map(Client → Integer) log_height = {c → 0, for every Client c}
8         Map(Client → Integer) log_quasi_committed_height = {c → 0, for every Client c}
9         State_Representation state = {
10             {tx → ⊥, for every Transaction tx}, // log
11             {c, i → ∅, for every Client c and every Integer i}, // allowed_acks
12         }

14         Set(Client) faulty_clients = ∅

16         Set(Transaction) quasi_committed_current_view = ∅
17         Map(Transaction, View → Set(Server))
18         commit_confirms_from = {tx, v → ∅, for every Transaction tx and every View v}
19         Map(Transaction, View → Set(Message))
20         commit_confirms = {tx, v → ∅, for every Transaction tx and every View v}

21         Map(Transaction, View → Set(Server))
22         committed_from = {tx, v → ∅, for every Transaction tx and every View v}

```

```

21     Map(Transaction, View → Set(Message))
    committed = {tx, v → ∅, for every Transaction tx and every View v}

23     function balance_after_height(Client c, Integer height):
24         Integer balance = initial_balance(c)
25         Integer current_height = 1
26         while current_height ≤ height:
27             let tx be Transaction such that tx ∈ log and tx.issuer = c and tx.sn = current_height
28             if tx is Withdrawal_Transaction:
29                 balance = balance - tx.amount
30             else if tx is Deposit_Transaction:
31                 balance = balance + tx.withdrawal.amount
32             else if tx is Minting_Transaction:
33                 balance = balance + tx.amount
34                 current_height = current_height + 1
35         return balance

37     upon exists Message m ∈ waiting_messages such that m = [PREPARE, Transaction tx, View v] and
    v = current_view.view and current_view.installed = ⊤ and tx.issuer ∉ faulty_clients and current_view.processing = ⊤
    and tx.sn = log_height[tx.issuer] + 1 and (if tx is Deposit_Transaction then tx.withdrawal ∈ log):
38         waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}

40         // check whether the server is allowed to send ACK
41         if state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn] = ∅ or state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn] = {tx}:
42             if tx is Withdrawal_Transaction:
43                 if tx.amount > balance_after_height(tx.issuer, tx.sn - 1): // not enough money
44                     return
45             else if tx is Deposit_Transaction: // deposit transaction
46                 if exists Transaction tx' ∈ log such that tx' is Deposit_Transaction and
    tx'.issuer = tx.issuer and tx'.withdrawal = tx.withdrawal: // withdrawal already used
47                     return
48             else if tx is Vote_Transaction: // vote transaction
49                 if exists Transaction tx' ∈ log such that tx' is Vote_Transaction and
    tx'.issuer = tx.issuer and tx'.motion = tx.motion: // the motion is already being voted for
50                     return
51                 state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn] = {tx}
52                 send [ACK, tx, v, view_path[v]] to tx.issuer
53         else:
54             // new proof of misbehavior discovered
55             state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn] = state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn] ∪ {tx}
56             faulty_clients = faulty_clients ∪ {tx.issuer}

```

```

58     function allowed_to_commit_confirm(Transaction tx):
59         if tx ∈ log:
60             return ⊤

62         if tx.sn ≠ log_height[tx.issuer] + 1:
63             return ⊥

65         if tx is Withdrawal_Transaction or tx is Vote_Transaction or tx is Minting_Transaction:
66             return ⊤
67         else:
68             return tx.withdrawal ∈ log

70     upon exists Message m ∈ waiting_messages such that m = [COMMIT, Transaction tx, Set(Message)
certificate, View v] and verify_transaction_certificate(tx, certificate) = ⊤ and v = current_view.view and
current_view.installed = ⊤ and current_view.processing = ⊤ and allowed_to_commit_confirm(tx) = ⊤:
71         waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
72         // first sight of the commit message
73         if tx ∉ log:
74             // update the state representation
75             state.log[tx] = m

77             log = log ∪ {tx}
78             log_height[tx.issuer] = tx.sn

80         broadcast [COMMIT, tx, certificate, v] to v.members()

82         send [COMMIT-CONFIRM, tx, v, view_path[v]] to m.sender // confirm to the sender, not to the tx.issuer

84     upon exists Message m ∈ waiting_messages such that m = [COMMIT-CONFIRM, Transaction tx, View v,
View_Path path] and path.destination() = v and m.sender ∈ v.members() and tx ∈ log:
85         waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
86         if m.sender ∉ commit_confirms_from[tx][v]:
87             commit_confirms_from[tx][v] = commit_confirms_from[tx][v] ∪ {m.sender}
88             commit_confirms[tx][v] = commit_confirms[tx][v] ∪ {m}

90     function allowed_to_quasi_commit(Transaction tx):
91         if tx ∉ log or quasi_committed[tx] = ⊤:
92             return ⊥

94         if log_quasi_committed_height[tx.issuer] + 1 ≠ tx.sn:

```

```

95     return  $\perp$ 

97     if  $tx$  is Deposit_Transaction and ( $tx.withdrawal \notin \log$  or  $quasi\_committed[tx.withdrawal] = \perp$ ):
98         return  $\perp$ 

100    if (exists View  $v^*$  such that  $|commit\_confirms\_from[tx][v^*]| \geq v^*.quorum()$ ) =  $\perp$ :
101        return  $\perp$ 

103    let  $v$  be the smallest View such that  $|commit\_confirms\_from[tx][v]| \geq v.quorum()$ 
104    if  $v \subset current\_view.view$ :
105        return  $\top$ 
106    else: //  $v = current\_view.view$ 
107        if  $quasi\_committed\_current\_view = \emptyset$ :
108            return  $\top$ 
109        Set(Server)  $intersection = \bigcap_{tx' \in quasi\_committed\_current\_view} commit\_confirms\_from[tx'][v]$ 
110        return  $|commit\_confirms\_from[tx][v] \cap intersection| \geq v.quorum()$ 

112    upon exists Transaction  $tx$  such that  $allowed\_to\_quasi\_commit(tx) = \top$ :
113         $quasi\_committed[tx] = \top$ 
114         $log\_quasi\_committed\_height[tx.issuer] = tx.sn$ 

116    let  $v$  be the smallest View such that  $commit\_confirms\_from[tx][v] \geq v.quorum()$ 
117    if  $v = current\_view.view$ :
118         $quasi\_committed\_current\_view = quasi\_committed\_current\_view \cup \{tx\}$ 

120    upon exists Message  $m \in waiting\_messages$  such that  $m = [COMMITTED, Transaction\ tx, View\ v,$ 
View_Path  $path]$  and  $path.destination() = v$  and  $m.sender \in v.members()$ :
121         $waiting\_messages = waiting\_messages \setminus \{m\}$ 
122        if  $m.sender \notin committed\_from[tx][v]$ :
123             $committed\_from[tx][v] = committed\_from[tx][v] \cup \{m.sender\}$ 
124             $committeds[tx][v] = committeds[tx][v] \cup \{m\}$ 

126    function  $allowed\_to\_broadcast\_committed(Transaction\ tx)$ :
127        if  $quasi\_committed[tx] = \perp$ :
128            return  $\perp$ 

130        if  $tx.sn = 1$  and  $tx$  is not Deposit_Transaction:
131            return  $\top$ 

133        if  $tx.sn = 1$ :
134            return  $confirmed[tx.withdrawal]$ 

```



```

136     if tx is not Deposit_Transaction:
137         return exists Transaction tx' such that tx'.issuer = tx.issuer and tx'.sn = tx.sn - 1 and
confirmed[tx'] =  $\top$ 

139         return (exists Transaction tx' such that tx'.issuer = tx.issuer and tx'.sn = tx.sn - 1 and
confirmed[tx'] =  $\top$ ) and confirmed[tx.withdrawal] =  $\top$ 

141     upon exists Transaction tx such that allowed_to_broadcast_committed(tx) =  $\top$  and
current_view.installed =  $\top$ :
142         broadcast [COMMITTED, tx, current_view.view, view_path[current_view.view]] to current_view.view.
members()

144     upon exist Transaction tx and View v such that committed_from[tx][v]  $\geq$  v.plurality():
145         confirmed[tx] =  $\top$ 
146         send committeds[tx][v] to tx.issuer
147         if tx is Withdrawal_Transaction:
148             send committeds[tx][v] to tx.receiver

150     upon exists Message m  $\in$  waiting_messages such that m = [QUERY, Integer qid, View v] and
v = current_view.view and current_view.installed =  $\top$  and current_view.processing =  $\top$ :
151         waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
152         Log quasi_committed_log = {tx | quasi_committed[tx] =  $\top$ }
153         send [QUERY-RESPONSE, quasi_committed_log.total_money(), qid, v, view_path[v]] to m.sender

155     function refine_state(Set(State_Representation) states): // states  $\neq$   $\emptyset$ 
156         for each State_Representation rec_state  $\in$  states:
157             for each Client c and Integer i such that rec_state.allowed_acks[c][i]  $\neq$   $\perp$ :
158                 state.allowed_acks[c][i] = state.allowed_acks[c][i]  $\cup$  rec_state.allowed_acks[c][i]

160         if state.verify() =  $\top$ :
161             for each State_Representation rec_state  $\in$  states:
162                 state.log = merge_logs(state, rec_state) // from Listing 38

164         log = state.extract_log() // committed[tx] =  $\perp$ , for every newly inserted transaction
165         for each Client c:
166             Log client_log = {tx | tx  $\in$  log and tx.issuer = c}
167             log_height[c] = |client_log|
168             // log_quasi_committed_height[c] does not change
169         faulty_clients = {c | exists Integer i such that |state.allowed_acks[c][i]|  $\geq$  2}

```

```

171   function installed(View  $v$ ):
172        $quasi\_committed\_current\_view = \emptyset$ 
173       // try to quasi-commit non-quasi-committed transactions
174       for each Transaction  $tx \in log$  such that  $quasi\_committed[tx] = \perp$ :
175           let  $state.log[tx] = [COMMIT, tx, Set(Message) certificate, View v']$ 
176           broadcast  $[COMMIT, tx, certificate, v]$  to  $v.members()$ 

```

Listing 39. Transaction module - implementation

Proof of correctness. We now prove the commitment validity, integrity, learning, admissibility and signing property of Carbon (see §3.3). The first property we prove is the commitment integrity.

Theorem 29 (Commitment Integrity). Commitment integrity is satisfied.

PROOF. Let a transaction tx be committed and let $tx.issuer$ be correct. Since tx is committed, a (correct or faulty) process has obtained a commitment proof σ_c such that $verify_commit(tx, \sigma_c) = \top$ (see §3.1, paragraph “Commitment proofs”). Since σ_c is a collection of COMMITTED messages that contain tx signed by $tx.issuer$ (see Listing 35), $tx.issuer$ has issued tx (since $tx.issuer$ signs tx upon issuing it; line 44 of Listing 36). Hence, the theorem holds. \square

The next property we prove is the commitment admissibility property. In order to prove the property, we first define *certified* transactions.

Definition 5 (Certified Transaction). A transaction tx is *certified* if and only if a (correct or faulty) process obtains a set of messages $certificate$ such that $verify_transaction_certificate(tx, certificate) = \top$. Moreover, if the view specified in the ACK messages of $certificate$ (see Listing 37) is v , then tx is certified in v .

Next lemma proves that a transaction can be certified only in a view that is installable at time ∞ .

Lemma 72. Let a transaction tx be certified in a view v . Then, $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$.

PROOF. Since tx is certified in v , at least a single correct server $r \in v.members()$ sends the ACK message associated with v for tx (see Listing 37); note that v is a valid view since every ACK message is accompanied by a view-path to v (by line 2 of Listing 37). Since a correct member of v sends the message at line 52 of Listing 39, v is installed at that correct server (by the check at line 37 of Listing 39). If $v = genesis$, $\alpha_\infty(genesis) = \top$ (by definition) and the lemma holds. Otherwise, $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$ (similarly to Lemma 19) and the lemma is concluded. \square

The important result before proving the commitment admissibility property is that conflicting transactions cannot be certified. In order to prove this statement, we first show that no transaction stored in the $state.allowed_acks$ variable of a correct server is ever removed.

Lemma 73. Consider any client c and any integer i . Let $allowed_acks_t$ be the value of the $state.allowed_acks[c][i]$ variable at a correct server r at time t . Let $allowed_acks_{t'}$ be the value of the $state.allowed_acks[c][i]$ variable at r at time $t' > t$. Then, $allowed_acks_t \subseteq allowed_acks_{t'}$.

PROOF. The lemma follows from the fact that no transaction is ever removed from the $state.allowed_acks$ variable at a correct server (see Listing 39). \square

The next lemma shows that two conflicting transactions cannot be certified in the same view.

Lemma 74. Let transactions tx and tx' be certified in a view v such that (1) $tx.issuer = tx'.issuer$, and (2) $tx.sn = tx'.sn$. Then, $tx = tx'$.

PROOF. By contradiction, let $tx \neq tx'$. By Lemma 72, v is installable at time ∞ (i.e., $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$). Moreover, v is a valid view. Hence, at least quorum of members of v are correct (see §2, paragraph “Failure model”).

Since tx (resp., tx') is certified in v , a quorum of members of v have sent the ACK message associated with v for tx (resp., tx'), by Listing 37. Because of the quorum intersection, there exists a correct server $r \in v.members()$ that has sent ACK messages for both transactions. Without loss of generality, suppose that r has sent the ACK message for tx before the ACK message for tx' .

At the moment of sending the ACK message for tx , $state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn] = \{tx\}$ at server r (by line 51 of Listing 39). Similarly, at the moment of sending the ACK message for tx' , $state.allowed_acks[tx'.issuer][tx'.sn] = \{tx'\}$ (by line 51 of Listing 39). This is impossible due to Lemma 73, hence r does not send both ACK messages. Therefore, $tx \neq tx'$ and the lemma holds. \square

Now, we prove that any correct member of a view $v' \supset v$ is aware of the fact that a transaction tx is certified in a view v , if that is indeed the case.

Lemma 75. Let a transaction tx be certified in a view v . Consider time t and a correct server $r \in v'.members()$ with $current_view.view = v'$ at server r at time t , where $v' \supset v$. Then, $tx \in state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn]$ at server r at time t .

PROOF. By Lemma 72, v is installable at time ∞ (i.e., $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$). Moreover, v is a valid view.

Let t^* be the first time at which a correct server sets its $current_view.view$ variable to a view greater than v ; let us denote that server by r^* and the view by v^* . We now prove that the statement of the lemma holds at time t^* at server r^* .

Since $v \subset v^*$, $v^* \neq genesis$ (by Lemma 49). Hence, r^* has executed line 29 of Listing 32. This implies that $reconfiguration.destination = v^*$ at that time at server r^* . Furthermore, $reconfiguration.source = v$. Let us prove this claim. If $reconfiguration.source \subset v$, this fact conflicts with Lemma 56. If $reconfiguration.source \supset v$, then t^* would not be the first time at which a correct server sets its $current_view.view$ variable to a view greater than v (since the INSTALL message m is obtained, where $m.source() \supset v$). Finally, $reconfiguration.prepared = \top$ at server r^* .

Since $r^* \in v^*.members()$, r^* has not executed line 10 of Listing 32. Let us investigate both places at which r^* could have set its $reconfiguration.prepared$ variable to \top :

- line 41 of Listing 33: Server r^* has received STATE – UPDATE messages from a quorum of members of v (recall that $reconfiguration.source = v$ at that time). By the quorum intersection, there exists a correct server R such that (1) R has sent the ACK message for tx in view v , and (2) r^* has received the STATE – UPDATE message from R .

First, we show that R has sent the ACK message before the STATE – UPDATE message. By contradiction, suppose that R has sent the STATE – UPDATE message to r^* before the ACK message. At the moment of sending the STATE – UPDATE message (line 14 of Listing 33), $current_view.view$ at server R is smaller than or equal to v or is equal to \perp (otherwise, t^* would not be the first time at which a correct server sets its $current_view.view$ variable to a view greater than v). Hence, the $stop_processing_until$ variable (set at line 12 of Listing 33) at server R is at least equal to v at that time. Therefore, the check at line 37 of Listing 39 does not pass while $current_view.view = v$ (since $current_view.processing = \perp$; see Listing 32), which means that R does not send the ACK message associated with view v . Hence, we reach contradiction.

At the moment of sending the ACK message for tx associated with view v , $state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn] = \{tx\}$ at server R (by line 51 of Listing 39). Therefore, by Lemma 73, at the moment of sending the STATE – UPDATE message to r^* , $tx \in state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn]$ at server R . After executing the `refine_state` function (see Listing 39), $tx \in state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn]$ at server r^* . By Lemma 73, the statement of the lemma holds for r^* at time t^* .

- line 47 of Listing 33: This scenario is impossible since it contradicts the fact that t^* is the first time at which a correct server sets its `current_view.view` variable to a view greater than v .

Note that, because of Lemma 73, the statement of the lemma is satisfied at server r^* at all times after time t^* .

Next, we introduce the following invariant. Consider time t^{**} and a server r^{**} such that `current_view.view` = v^{**} at server r^{**} at time t^{**} , where $v \subset v^{**}$. Then, the statement of the lemma holds at server r^{**} at time t^{**} . Note that this invariant is satisfied at time t^* , which is the first time at which these conditions are satisfied.

Consider a server r' that sets its `current_view.view` variable to $v' \supset v$. Hence, `reconfiguration.prepared` = \top at server r' . Moreover, `reconfiguration.source` $\supseteq v$ (otherwise, Lemma 56 is contradicted). Let us investigate both places at which r' could have set its `reconfiguration.prepared` variable to \top :

- line 41 of Listing 33: If `reconfiguration.source` $\supset v$, we know that a correct process from which r' has received the STATE – UPDATE message has its `current_view.view` greater than v at the moment of sending the STATE – UPDATE message (because of the obtained INSTALL message m , where $m.source() \supset v$ and the quorum intersection). Thus, the invariant is preserved since the invariant holds for a correct server from which r' receives the STATE – UPDATE message (see the `refine_state` function in Listing 38).

If `reconfiguration.source` = v , then r' has received the STATE – UPDATE messages from at least $v.plurality()$ of correct members of v . If at least a single such member had `current_view.view` variable equal to a view greater than v at the moment of sending the STATE – UPDATE message, the invariant is preserved because of the invariant hypothesis (and the `refine_state` function). Otherwise, the invariant is preserved because of the argument given in the base step. The statement of the lemma is preserved for server r' forever by Lemma 73.

- line 47 of Listing 33: Since `reconfiguration.source` $\supseteq v$, the invariant is preserved because of the invariant hypothesis (and the `state_refine` function).

Since the invariant is preserved, the lemma holds. \square

The next lemma proves that two conflicting transactions cannot be certified in different views.

Lemma 76. Let a transaction tx be certified in a view v . Let a transaction tx' be certified in a view $v' \neq v$. Moreover, let (1) $tx.issuer = tx'.issuer$, and (2) $tx.sn = tx'.sn$. Then, $tx = tx'$.

PROOF. By contradiction, let $tx \neq tx'$. By Lemma 72, v and v' are installable views at time ∞ . Therefore, both views are valid. By the view comparability property, v and v' are comparable. Without loss of generality, let $v \subset v'$.

Since tx' is certified in v' , there exists a correct server r' that sends the ACK message for tx' associated with view v' (at line 52 of Listing 39). By line 51 of Listing 39, `state.allowed_acks[tx'.issuer][tx'.sn] = {tx'}` at server r' at that time.

Let r' set its `current_view.view` variable to v' at some time $t_{v'}$; note that this indeed happens since r' sends the ACK message associated with v' (by the check at line 37 of Listing 39). Because of Lemma 75, $tx \in state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer = tx'.issuer][tx.sn = tx'.sn]$ at server r' at time $t_{v'}$. Finally, r' sends the ACK message for tx' after time $t_{v'}$ (by the check at line 37 of Listing 39, r' has already updated its `current_view.view` variable to v'). Recall that `state.allowed_acks[tx'.issuer][tx'.sn] = {tx'}` at server r' at that time. This is impossible due to Lemma 73, which implies that $tx = tx'$. \square

Finally, we prove that conflicting transactions cannot be certified.

Lemma 77 (Conflicting Transactions Cannot Be Certified). Let transactions tx and tx' be certified such that (1) $tx.issuer = tx'.issuer$, and (2) $tx.sn = tx'.sn$. Then, $tx = tx'$.

PROOF. Let v denote the smallest view in which tx is certified and let v' denote the smallest view in which tx' is certified. Since v and v' are valid views (follows from Lemma 72), v and v' are comparable (by the view comparability property defined in Listing 24; see Theorem 22). If $v = v'$, the lemma follows from Lemma 74. Otherwise, the lemma follows from Lemma 76. \square

The next lemma proves that the $state.log$ variable at a correct server only “grows”.

Lemma 78. Consider a correct server r . Let $log_t^r = \{tx \mid state.log[tx] \neq \perp \text{ at server } r \text{ at some time } t\}$. Let $log_{t'}^r = \{tx \mid state.log[tx] \neq \perp \text{ at server } r \text{ at some time } t' > t\}$. Then, $log_t^r \subseteq log_{t'}^r$.

PROOF. In order to prove the lemma, we prove that $state.log[tx]$, for any transaction tx , is never reverted to \perp . Therefore, we consider all the place at which $state.log$ variable at server r changes:

- line 75 of Listing 39: The invariant is trivially preserved in this case.
- line 162 of Listing 39: In this case, the invariant is preserved because of the `merge_logs` function (see Listing 38).

Therefore, the lemma holds. \square

The next important intermediate result we show is that $state.verify() = \top$ at a correct server at all times. In order to do so, we prove that the `merge_logs` function (see Listing 38) invoked with two “valid” states (according to the `verify()` function) returns an admissible log.

Lemma 79. Let $state_1$ (resp., $state_2$) be a state representation such that $state_1.verify() = \top$ (resp., $state_2.verify() = \top$). Let $log_map = merge_logs(state_1, state_2)$ and let $log = \{tx \mid log_map[tx] \neq \perp\}$. Then, log is admissible.

PROOF. Let $log_1 = state_1.extract_log()$ and $log_2 = state_2.extract_log()$. Every transaction $tx \in log_1 \cup log_2$ is certified (follows from the `verify_transaction_proof` function and the fact that $state_1.verify() = state_2.verify() = \top$). Furthermore, $log = log_1 \cup log_2$.

We now consider the `admissible(log)` function (see Listing 6):

- (1) The check at line 4 of Listing 6 passes since $log = log_1 \cup log_2$ and $admissible(log_1) = admissible(log_2) = \top$ (since $state_1.verify() = state_2.verify() = \top$).
- (2) Let $log_c = \{tx \mid tx \in log \text{ and } tx.issuer = c\}$, for some client c . Let $log_c^1 = \{tx \mid tx \in log_1 \text{ and } tx.issuer = c\}$ and $log_c^2 = \{tx \mid tx \in log_2 \text{ and } tx.issuer = c\}$. Since $state_1.verify() = state_2.verify() = \top$, $log = log_1 \cup log_2$ and Lemma 77, $log_c = log_c^1$ or $log_c = log_c^2$. Therefore, $admissible_client_log(c, log_c) = \top$ (because $state_1.verify() = state_2.verify() = \top$).

Therefore, log is indeed admissible. \square

The next lemma proves that, if $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at a correct server, then tx is certified.

Lemma 80. At all times, if $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at a correct server, then tx is certified.

PROOF. Initially, the statement of the lemma holds (since $state$ does not “contain” any information). We introduce the invariant that the statement of the lemma holds and we consider all the places at which $state.log$ is modified:

- line 77 of Listing 39: The invariant is preserved since the newly inserted transaction is certified (by line 70 of Listing 39).
- line 162 of Listing 39: The invariant is preserved since $state.verify() = \top$ (by line 160 of Listing 39) and $rec_state.verify() = \top$ (ensured by line 16 of Listing 33) and the `merge_logs` function (Listing 38).

The lemma holds. \square

The next lemma proves that $state.verify() = \top$ at a correct server.

Lemma 81. At all times, $state.verify() = \top$ at a correct server.

PROOF. Initially, $state.verify() = \top$ (since $state$ does not “contain” any information). We introduce the invariant that $state.verify() = \top$ and check the next modification of the variable. Let us consider all the places at which such modification can occur:

- line 51 of Listing 39: The only change introduced is that $state.allowed_acks[tx.issuer][tx.sn] = \{tx\}$, for some transaction tx . The `verify_allowed_acks` function still returns \top , which means that the invariant is preserved.
- line 55 of Listing 39: Similarly to the previous case, the `verify_allowed_acks` function returns \top , which implies that the invariant is preserved.
- line 75 of Listing 39: Let $state_{new}$ be the the value of the $state$ variable *after* the execution of this line. First, note that $state_{new}.extract_log() = log \neq \perp$. Moreover, $state_{new}.verify_allowed_acks() = \top$. Therefore, it is left to show that log is admissible.

Let $log_{before} = \{tx \mid state_{before}.log[tx] \neq \perp\}$, where $state_{before}$ is the value of the $state$ variable *before* the execution of this line. Hence, $log = log_{before} \cup \{tx\}$, where tx is the transaction inserted at this line. Let $c = tx.issuer$. Let us consider the `admissible_client_log` function (see Listing 6):

- (1) The check at line 4 of Listing 6 passes since log_{before} is admissible and, if tx is a deposit transaction, then $tx.withdrawal \in log_{before}$ (by the check at line 68 of Listing 39).
- (2) Consider any client $c' \neq c$. Let $log_{c'} = \{tx \mid tx \in log \text{ and } tx.issuer = c'\}$ and let $log_{c'}^{before} = \{tx \mid tx \in log_{before} \text{ and } tx.issuer = c'\}$. Since the only inserted transaction is tx and $tx.issuer \neq c'$, $log_{c'} = log_{c'}^{before}$. Hence, $admissible_client_log(c', log_{c'}) = \top$ (because of the invariant). Therefore, we need to prove the same for c .

Let $log_c = \{tx \mid tx \in log \text{ and } tx.issuer = c\}$ and $log_c^{before} = \{tx \mid tx \in log_{before} \text{ and } tx.issuer = c\}$. Because of the check at line 62 of Listing 39, $tx.sn = |log_c^{before}| + 1$. Consider the `admissible_client_log` function:

- (a) The check at line 19 of Listing 6 passes since all transactions from log_c are certified (since $state_{new}.extract_log() \neq \perp$) and no two conflicting transactions are certified (by Lemma 77).
- (b) The check at line 23 of Listing 6 passes since the invariant holds for $state_{before}$ and $tx.sn = |log_c^{before}| + 1$.
- (c) Since tx (the only inserted transaction) is certified (by the check at line 70 of Listing 39), there exists a correct server R that has sent the ACK message for tx (at line 52 of Listing 39). Therefore, the check from line 36 to 41 of Listing 6 passes because of the fact that the invariant holds for $state_{before}$, because R has executed the checks from line 42 to line 49 of Listing 39 and by lemmas 77 and 80.

Therefore, $admissible_client_log(c, log_c) = \top$, which concludes the invariant preservation in this case.

- line 158 of Listing 39: In this case, the invariant is preserved since $rec_state.verify() = \top$ (ensured by line 16 of Listing 33).

- line 162 of Listing 39: Let $state_{new}$ be the value of the $state$ variable *after* executing this line. First, $state_{new}.extract_log() = log \neq \perp$. By Lemma 79, log is admissible. Therefore, the invariant is preserved.

The invariant is always preserved, thus the lemma holds. \square

Note that Lemma 81 is crucial for the liveness of the reconfiguration module since the proof (see §6.2.3) assumes that correct servers always send the “valid” (according to the `verify` function) state. Lemma 81 proves that this is indeed the case. Finally, we are ready to prove the commitment admissibility property.

Theorem 30 (Commitment Admissibility). Commitment admissibility is satisfied.

PROOF. Consider log_t , the set of committed transactions at time t . Consider a transaction $tx \in log_t$. Since $tx \in log_t$ (i.e., tx is committed), there exists a correct server that sends the COMMITTED message for tx (see Listing 35); the COMMITTED message is broadcast at line 142 of Listing 39. We start by proving the following two claims:

- (1) If $tx.sn > 1$, then $tx' \in log_t$, where $tx'.issuer = tx.issuer$ and $tx'.sn = tx.sn - 1$. Before the COMMITTED message for tx is sent, the server checks whether $confirmed[tx'] = \top$ (at lines 137 or 139 of Listing 39). Therefore, tx' is committed (by line 145 of Listing 39 and Listing 35).
- (2) If tx is a deposit transaction, then $tx.withdrawal \in log_t$ (similarly to the previous case).

Because of the `allowed_to_broadcast_committed` function, $quasi_committed[tx] = \top$ at the server (by line 127 of Listing 39). Therefore, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at the server at that time (because of the `allowed_to_quasi_commit` function; by the check at line 91 of Listing 39). Since $state.verify() = \top$ (by Lemma 81), tx is certified.

Let us now consider the `admissible(logt)` function (see Listing 6):

- (1) The check at line 4 of Listing 6 passes because of the second statement.
- (2) Consider a client c . Let $log_c = \{tx \mid tx \in log_t \text{ and } tx.issuer = c\}$. Since all transactions that belong to log_t are certified, no conflicting transactions are in log_c (by Lemma 77). Moreover, if a transaction $tx \in log_c$, where $tx.sn > 1$, then $tx' \in log_c$ with $tx'.sn = tx.sn - 1$ (by the first statement from the proof). Finally, $admissible_client_log(c, log_c) = \top$ since, for every transaction $tx \in log_c$, there exists a correct server such that $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at some time, and lemmas 77 and 81 hold.

Therefore, the theorem holds. \square

Next, we define when a transaction is *quasi-committed*. In order to do so, we define the `verify_quasi_committed` function below.

```

1 function verify_quasi_committed(Transaction tx, Set(Message) quasi_committed_certificate):
2   if does not exist View v such that m = [COMMIT-CONFIRM, tx, v, View_Path path] and
   v = path.destination(), for every Message m ∈ quasi_committed_certificate:
3     return ⊥
4   return |m.sender | m ∈ quasi_committed_certificate and m.sender ∈ v.members() | ≥ v.quorum()

```

Listing 40. Quasi-commitment - verification

Definition 6 (Quasi-Committed Transaction). We say that a transaction tx is *quasi-committed* if and only if a (correct or faulty) process obtains a set of messages $quasi_committed_certificate$ such that $verify_quasi_committed(tx, quasi_committed_certificate) = \top$. Moreover, if the view specified in the COMMIT – CONFIRM messages of $quasi_committed_certificate$ (see Listing 40) is v , then tx is quasi-committed in v .

Next, we prove that a transaction can be quasi-committed only in a view that is installable at time ∞ (similarly to Lemma 72).

Lemma 82. Let a transaction tx be quasi-committed in a view v . Then, $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$.

PROOF. Since tx is quasi-committed in v , at least a single correct server $r \in v.members()$ sends the COMMIT – CONFIRM message associated with v for tx (see Listing 40); note that v is a valid view since every COMMIT – CONFIRM message is accompanied by a view-path to v (by line 2 of Listing 40). Since a correct member of v sends the message at line 82 of Listing 39, v is installed at that correct server (by the check at line 70 of Listing 39). If $v = genesis$, $\alpha_\infty(genesis) = \top$ (by definition) and the lemma holds. Otherwise, $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$ (similarly to Lemma 19) and the lemma is concluded. \square

The next lemma proves that a quasi-committed transaction is “carried” by servers forever.

Lemma 83. Let a transaction tx be quasi-committed in a view v . Consider time t and a correct server $r \in v'.members()$ with $current_view.view = v'$ at time t , where $v' \supset v$. Then, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at server r at time t .

PROOF. By Lemma 82, v is installable at time ∞ (i.e., $\alpha_\infty(v) = \top$). Moreover, v is a valid view.

Let time t^* be the first time at which a correct server sets its $current_view.view$ variable to a view greater than v ; let us denote that server by r^* and the view by v^* . We now prove that the statement of the lemma holds at server r^* at time t^* .

Since $v \subset v^*$, $v^* \neq genesis$ (by Lemma 49). Hence, r^* has executed line 29 of Listing 32. This implies that $reconfiguration.destination = v^*$ at that time at server r^* . Furthermore, $reconfiguration.source = v$. Let us prove this claim. If $reconfiguration.source \subset v$, then this fact conflicts with Lemma 56. If $reconfiguration.source \supset v$, then t^* would not be the first time at which a correct server sets its $current_view.view$ variable to a view greater than v (since the INSTALL message m is obtained, where $m.source() \supset v$). Finally, $reconfiguration.prepared = \top$.

Since $r^* \in v^*.members()$, r^* has not executed line 10 of Listing 32. Let us investigate both places at which r^* could have set its $reconfiguration.prepared$ variable to \top :

- line 41 of Listing 33: Hence, r^* has received STATE – UPDATE messages from a quorum of members of v (recall that $reconfiguration.source = v$ at that time). By the quorum intersection, we know that there is a correct server R such that (1) R has sent the COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx in view v , and (2) r^* has received the STATE – UPDATE message from R .

First, we show that R has sent the COMMIT – CONFIRM message before the STATE – UPDATE message. By contradiction, suppose that R has sent the STATE – UPDATE message to r^* before the COMMIT – CONFIRM message. At the moment of sending the STATE – UPDATE message (line 14 of Listing 33), we know that $current_view.view$ at server R is smaller than or equal to v or is equal to \perp (otherwise, t^* would not be the first time at which a correct server sets its $current_view.view$ variable to a view greater than v). Hence, the $stop_processing_until$ variable (set at line 12 of Listing 33) is at least equal to v at that time. Therefore, the check at line 70 of Listing 39 does not pass while $current_view.view = v$ (since $current_view.processing = \perp$; see Listing 32), which means that R does not send the COMMIT – CONFIRM message associated with view v . Thus, we reach contradiction.

At the moment of sending the COMMIT – CONFIRM message, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at server R (by lines 73 and 75 of Listing 39). By Lemma 78, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at server R at the moment of sending the STATE – UPDATE message. Since $state.verify() = \top$ at server r^* (by Lemma 81), the check at line 160 of Listing 39 passes at server r^* . Therefore, because of the $merge_logs$ function, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at server r^* at time t^* .

- line 47 of Listing 33: This scenario is impossible since it contradicts the fact that t^* is the first time at which a correct server sets its `current_view.view` variable to a view greater than v .

By Lemma 78, the statement of the lemma is satisfied at all times after time t^* at server r^* .

Next, we introduce the following invariant. Consider time t^{**} and a server r^{**} such that `current_view.view` = v^{**} at server r^{**} at time t^{**} , where $v \subset v^{**}$. Then, the statement of the lemma holds at server r^{**} at time t^{**} . Note that this invariant is satisfied at time t^* , which is the first time at which these conditions are satisfied.

Consider a server r' that sets its `current_view.view` variable to $v' \supset v$. Hence, `reconfiguration.prepared` = \top at server r' . Moreover, `reconfiguration.source` $\supseteq v$ (otherwise, Lemma 56 is contradicted). Let us investigate both places at which r' could have set its `reconfiguration.prepared` variable to \top :

- line 41 of Listing 33: If `reconfiguration.source` $\supseteq v$, we know that a correct process from which r' has received STATE – UPDATE message has its `current_view.view` greater than v at the moment of sending the STATE – UPDATE message (because of the obtained INSTALL message m , where $m.source() \supseteq v$ and the quorum intersection). Hence, the invariant is preserved since `state.verify()` = \top (by Lemma 81), which means that the check at line 160 of Listing 39 passes, and the invariant holds for a server from which r' has received the STATE – UPDATE message (see the `merge_logs` function).

If `reconfiguration.source` = v , then r' has received the STATE – UPDATE messages from at least $v.plurality()$ of correct members of v . If at least a single such member had `current_view.view` variable equal to a view greater than v at the moment of sending the STATE – UPDATE message, the invariant is preserved because the check at line 160 of Listing 39 passes at r' (by Lemma 81) and the invariant hypothesis. Otherwise, the invariant is preserved because of the argument given in the base step.

- line 47 of Listing 33: Since `reconfiguration.source` $\supseteq v$, the invariant is preserved because of the check at line 160 of Listing 39 passes at r' (by Lemma 81) and the invariant hypothesis.

Since the invariant is always preserved, the lemma holds. \square

We say that a transaction tx *depends on* a transaction tx' if and only if:

- $tx.issuer = tx'.issuer$ and $tx.sn = tx'.sn + 1$; or
- tx is a deposit transaction, tx' is a withdrawal transaction and $tx.withdrawal = tx'$.

Now, given an admissible log, we specify the rank of every transaction that belongs to the log; we denote by $rank_L(tx)$ the rank of a transaction tx in an admissible log L . We define the rank in the following manner:

- If tx does not depend on any transaction that belongs to L , then $rank_L(tx) = 0$.
- Otherwise, $rank_L(tx) = \max(rank_L(tx_1), rank_L(tx_2)) + 1$, where tx depends on $tx_1 \in L$ and tx depends on $tx_2 \in L$.

Recall that v_{final} is the greatest forever-alive view (see Definition 2). Moreover, we say that a transaction tx is quasi-committed at a correct server r if and only if `quasi_committed[tx]` = \top at server r . The next lemma shows that any transaction that belongs to the `log` variable (recall that `log` = `state.extract_log()`) of a correct member of v_{final} eventually belongs to the `log` variable of all other correct members of v_{final} .

Lemma 84. Consider a correct server $r \in v_{final}.members()$. Let `state.log[tx]` $\neq \perp$ at server r . Eventually, `state.log[tx]` $\neq \perp$ at every correct server $r' \in v_{final}.members()$.

PROOF. Recall that, by the finality property (see Listing 24), the following holds:

- (1) all correct members of v_{final} update their current view to v_{final} (i.e., set their `current_view.view` variable to v_{final}),

- (2) no correct member of v_{final} updates its current view to any other view afterwards,
- (3) all correct members of v_{final} install v_{final} ,
- (4) no correct member of v_{final} leaves, and
- (5) no correct member of v_{final} stops processing in v_{final} .

Let $log_r = \{tx \mid state.log[tx] \neq \perp \text{ at server } r\}$. By Lemma 81, log_r is admissible (see Listing 38). In the rest of the proof, we consider a particular server $r^* \neq r$, where $r^* \in v_{final}.members()$. We prove the lemma by induction.

Base step: We consider all the transactions that belong to log_r with rank 0. Let us denote that set of transactions by TX_0 .

If r broadcasts the COMMIT message for $tx \in TX_0$ to all members of v_{final} at line 80 or line 176 of Listing 39, r^* eventually receives the message and sets $state.log[tx]$ to the received COMMIT message (by the finality property and the fact that tx is certified, by Lemma 81).

Otherwise, tx is quasi-committed at server r (since $quasi_committed[tx] = \top$; line 174 of Listing 39) at the moment of installing v_{final} (line 171 of Listing 39). Let v_{tx} be the smallest view in which tx is quasi-committed; note that such view is defined since all views in which tx is quasi-committed are valid (by Lemma 82) and all valid views are comparable (by the view comparability property; see Listing 24). By Listing 39, $v_{tx} \subset v_{final}$. Hence, the base case is satisfied by Lemma 83 and the finality property.

Inductive step: We consider all transactions that belong to log_r with rank $rank$. Let TX_{rank} denote that set of transactions. We assume, for all transactions tx' that belong to log_r with the smaller rank, that $state.log[tx'] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} . We prove that the invariant is preserved for all transactions that belong to TX_{rank} .

If r broadcasts the COMMIT message for $tx \in TX_{rank}$ to all members of v_{final} at line 80 or line 176 of Listing 39, r^* eventually receives the message and sets $state.log[tx]$ to the received COMMIT message (by the finality property, induction hypothesis and the fact that tx is certified, by Lemma 81).

Otherwise, tx is quasi-committed at server r (since $quasi_committed[tx] = \top$; line 174 of Listing 39) at the moment of installing v_{final} (line 171 of Listing 39). Let v_{tx} be the smallest view in which tx is quasi-committed; note that such view is defined since all views in which tx is quasi-committed are valid (by Lemma 82) and all valid views are comparable (by the view comparability property; see Listing 24). By Listing 39, $v_{tx} \subset v_{final}$. Hence, the inductive case is satisfied by Lemma 83 and the finality property. □

The next lemma proves that a correct member of v_{final} eventually receives the COMMIT – CONFIRM messages from all correct members of v_{final} .

Lemma 85. Let a correct server $r \in v_{final}.members()$ broadcast the COMMIT message for a transaction tx to all members of v_{final} . Eventually, r receives COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx associated with v_{final} from all correct members of v_{final} .

PROOF. We consider all possible places at which r could broadcast the COMMIT message:

- line 80 of Listing 39: Therefore, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at server r (by line 75 of Listing 39).
- line 176 of Listing 39: Again, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at server r (by the check at line 174 of Listing 39).

Since in both possible cases, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at server r , $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct server $r' \in v_{final}.members()$ (by Lemma 84).

Once this happens at a correct server r' and r' receives the COMMIT message sent by r (which happens because of the finality property), r' sends the COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx associated with v_{final} at line 82 of Listing 39 (because of the `allowed_to_commit_confirm` function; line 59 of Listing 39). Furthermore, the finality property ensures that r eventually receives this COMMIT – CONFIRM message sent by r' , which concludes the proof. \square

Next, we prove that a transaction tx is quasi-committed at a correct server $r \in v_{final}$, where $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at r .

Lemma 86. Consider a correct server $r \in v_{final}.members()$. Let $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at server r . Then, r eventually quasi-commits tx .

PROOF. We prove the lemma by contradiction. Hence, suppose that r does not quasi-commit tx . By Lemma 84, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} .

Let $log_r = \{tx \mid state.log[tx] \neq \perp \text{ at server } r\}$. Because of Lemma 81, log_r is admissible. Recall that $tx \in log_r$.

Let $\mathcal{D}(tx)$ be the reflexive transitive closure of the “depends-on” relation for tx given log_r . Let $quasi_committed_r$ denote the set of transactions quasi-committed by r ; note that $tx \notin quasi_committed_r$ (by the assumption). Moreover, let $quasi_committed_r^*$ denote the set of transactions quasi-committed at r for which r has sent the COMMIT message associated with v_{final} ; observe that $quasi_committed_r^* \subseteq quasi_committed_r$. By Lemma 85, r eventually receives COMMIT – CONFIRM messages for tx' associated with v_{final} from all correct members of v_{final} , for all transactions $tx' \in quasi_committed_r^*$.

Let $tx^* \in \mathcal{D}(tx)$ such that (1) $tx^* \notin quasi_committed_r$, and (2) all dependencies of tx^* are quasi-committed at r ; note that tx^* indeed exists since $tx \in \mathcal{D}(tx)$, $tx \notin quasi_committed_r$, and log_r is a DAG (since it is admissible).

Since $tx^* \notin quasi_committed_r$, r broadcasts the COMMIT message for tx^* to all members of v_{final} (by the finality property; lines 80 or 176 of Listing 39). Eventually, r receives COMMIT – CONFIRM messages for tx^* associated with v_{final} from all correct members of v_{final} (by Lemma 85).

Recall that all dependencies of tx^* are quasi-committed by r . Therefore, once (1) all dependencies of tx^* are quasi-committed by r , (2) COMMIT – CONFIRM messages for tx^* are received from all correct members of v_{final} , and (3) COMMIT – CONFIRM messages for tx' are received from all correct members of v_{final} , for every $tx' \in quasi_committed_r^*$ (note that $quasi_committed_current_view \subseteq quasi_committed_r^*$), r quasi-commits tx^* (since the `allowed_to_quasi_commit` function returns \top). Thus, we reach contradiction and tx is quasi-committed at r . \square

The next lemma proves that a correct server $r \in v_{final}.members()$ eventually obtains a commitment proof for tx if tx is quasi-committed at r .

Lemma 87. Consider a correct server $r \in v_{final}.members()$. Let tx be quasi-committed at r . Then, r eventually obtains a commitment proof σ_c such that `verify_commit(tx, σ_c) = \top` .

PROOF. Since tx is quasi-committed at r , $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at r (because of the `allowed_to_quasi_commit` function and Lemma 78; line 91 of Listing 39). Let $log_r = \{tx \mid state.log[tx] \neq \perp \text{ at server } r\}$. Because of Lemma 81, log_r is admissible. Recall that $tx \in log_r$.

By Lemma 84, $state.log[tx'] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} , for every $tx' \in log_r$. Finally, by Lemma 86, tx' is quasi-committed at every correct member of v_{final} , for every $tx' \in log_r$.

Let $\mathcal{D}(tx)$ be the reflexive transitive closure of the “depends-on” relation for tx given log_r ; note that $\mathcal{D}(tx) \subseteq log_r$. We prove the lemma by induction.

Base step: We consider all the transactions that belong to $\mathcal{D}(tx)$ with rank 0. Let us denote that set of transactions by TX_0 .

Eventually, every correct member of v_{final} broadcasts the COMMITTED message for $tx \in TX_0$ to members of v_{final} (because of the `allowed_to_broadcast_committed` function and the finality property). The finality property ensures that every correct member of v_{final} receives the set of $v_{final}.plurality()$ messages (at line 144 of Listing 39), which constitutes a commitment proof σ_c for tx (see Listing 35). Moreover, $confirmed[tx] = \top$ at every correct member of v_{final} . Therefore, the base step holds.

Inductive step: We consider all transactions that belong to $\mathcal{D}(tx)$ with rank $rank$. Let TX_{rank} denote that set of transactions. We assume, for all transactions tx' that belong to $\mathcal{D}(tx)$ with the smaller rank, that $confirmed[tx] = \top$ at every correct member of v_{final} . We prove that the invariant is preserved for all transactions that belong to TX_{rank} .

Eventually, every correct member of v_{final} broadcasts the COMMITTED message for $tx \in TX_{rank}$ to members of v_{final} (because of the `allowed_to_broadcast_committed` function, the inductive hypothesis and the finality property). The finality property ensures that every correct member of v_{final} receives the set of $v_{final}.plurality()$ messages (at line 144 of Listing 39), which constitutes a commitment proof σ_c for tx (see Listing 35). Moreover, $confirmed[tx] = \top$ at every correct member of v_{final} . Therefore, the inductive step holds, as well. Thus, the proof is concluded. \square

Finally, we are ready to prove the commitment validity property.

Theorem 31 (Commitment Validity). Commitment validity is satisfied.

PROOF. Consider a transaction tx issued by a forever-correct client which is not committed. All transactions on which tx depends are committed (see §3.1, paragraph “Rules”). Let tx be dependent on tx' ; as already mentioned, tx' is committed. Therefore, tx' is quasi-committed (by the `allowed_to_broadcast_committed` function; line 127 of Listing 39). Let $v_{tx'}$ be the smallest view in which tx' is quasi-committed. We distinguish two cases:

- Let $v_{tx'} \subset v_{final}$. Therefore, $state.log[tx'] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} (by Lemma 83).
- Let $v_{tx'} = v_{final}$. Hence, there exists a correct member of v_{final} that sends the COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx' associated with v_{final} . Thus, $state.log[tx'] \neq \perp$ at that server (by line 75 of Listing 39). By Lemma 84, $state.log[tx'] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} .

In both cases, $state.log[tx'] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} . By Lemma 86, tx' is quasi-committed at every correct member of v_{final} . Finally, by Lemma 87, every correct member of v_{final} obtains a commitment proof for tx' (and sets $confirmed[tx'] = \top$).

Since $tx.issuer$ is forever-correct, the client eventually learns about v_{final} (i.e., $v_{final} \in history$ at the client). Once that happens, the client sends the PREPARE message for tx to all members of v_{final} (at lines 40 or 53 of Listing 36). Since $state.log[tx'] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} , for every dependency tx' of tx , all correct members of v_{final} send the ACK message to the client (at line 52 of Listing 39). Hence, the client eventually obtains a transaction certificate for tx .

Similarly, the client sends the COMMIT message to all members of v_{final} (at lines 42 or 76 of Listing 36). Therefore, every correct member of v_{final} eventually receives the COMMIT message (since $state.log[tx'] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} , for every dependency tx' of tx). Finally, this means that $log.state[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} (by line 75 of Listing 39). By Lemma 86, tx is quasi-committed at every correct member of v_{final} . Furthermore, every correct member of v_{final} eventually obtains a commitment proof for tx (by Lemma 87), which implies that tx is committed. Since we reach contradiction, our starting assumption was not correct, which means that tx is committed. The theorem holds. \square

Next, we prove the commitment learning property.

Theorem 32 (Commitment Learning). Commitment learning is satisfied.

PROOF. Let a transaction tx be committed. Therefore, tx is quasi-committed (by the `allowed_to_broadcast_committed` function; line 127 of Listing 39). Let v_{tx} be the smallest view in which tx is quasi-committed. We distinguish two cases:

- Let $v_{tx} \subset v_{final}$. Therefore, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} (by Lemma 83).
- Let $v_{tx} = v_{final}$. Hence, there exists a correct member of v_{final} that sends the COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx associated with v_{final} . Thus, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at that server (by line 75 of Listing 39). By Lemma 84, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} .

In both cases, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} . By Lemma 86, tx is quasi-committed at every correct member of v_{final} . Finally, by Lemma 87, every correct member of v_{final} obtains a commitment proof for tx (and sets $confirmed[tx'] = \top$). Once that happens, a correct member of v_{final} sends the commitment proof to $tx.issuer$ (at line 146 of Listing 39) and, if tx is a withdrawal transaction, to $tx.receiver$ (at line 148 of Listing 39). Since no correct member of v_{final} leaves (by the finality property), the appropriate clients eventually obtain commitment proofs (at line 78 of Listing 36) and the theorem holds. \square

The last property of Carbon we need to prove is the commitment signing property (see §3.3, paragraph “Properties of Carbon”). In order to show that this property holds, we first prove that an issued transaction cannot be quasi-committed in “stale” views.

Lemma 88. Let a transaction tx be issued at time t . Let $\mathcal{V}(t) = \{v \mid current_view.view = v \neq \perp \text{ at a correct server at time } t\}$. If $\mathcal{V}(t) \neq \emptyset$ and v_{max} is the greatest view of $\mathcal{V}(t)$, then tx is not quasi-committed in a view v , for any view $v \subset v_{max}$.

PROOF. Note that $\mathcal{V}(t)$ might contain values of the `current_view.view` variable of correct servers that halted by time t (note that `current_view.view` is not modified upon leaving; see Listing 32). We prove the lemma by contradiction. Therefore, let tx be quasi-committed in a view $v \subset v_{max}$.

First, note that no correct server obtains tx before time t (due to the definition of “issued at time t ”; see §3.3, paragraph “Properties of Carbon”). Therefore, no correct server sends the COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx before t . Moreover, since tx is quasi-committed in v and Lemma 82 holds, v is a view installable at time ∞ .

Let r_{first} be the first correct server to set its `current_view.view` variable to a view greater than v ; let that view be $v_{first} \supset v$. Observe that r_{first} sets its `current_view.view` variable to v_{first} by time t . Since $v \subset v_{first}$, $v_{first} \neq genesis$ (by Lemma 49). Therefore, before updating its `current_view.view` variable to v_{first} , r_{first} has received STATE – UPDATE messages from the quorum of members of v (the rule at line 40 of Listing 33 becomes active and `reconfiguration.source = v` at that time at r_{first} , by Lemma 56). Each such STATE – UPDATE message is sent before time t at line 14 of Listing 33. Therefore, before sending the STATE – UPDATE message (i.e., before time t), the `stop_processing_until` variable is equal to (at least) v at each correct server that sends the STATE – UPDATE message received by r_{first} .

Furthermore, since tx is quasi-committed in v , at least $v.plurality()$ of correct members of v have sent the COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx associated with v (at line 82 of Listing 39); each such message is sent at some time greater than or equal to t . Therefore, there exists a correct member of v that (1) sets its `stop_processing_until` variable to (at least) v before time t , and (2) sends the COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx associated with v at time t (or later). Such behavior is not a correct one (see Listing 32). Hence, we reach contradiction and tx is not quasi-committed in v . The lemma holds. \square

The direct consequence of Lemma 88 is that no correct server sends the COMMITTED message associated with a view smaller than v_{max} . Let us prove this claim.

Lemma 89. Let a transaction tx be issued at time t . Let $\mathcal{V}(t) = \{v \mid \text{current_view.view} = v \neq \perp \text{ at a correct server at time } t\}$. If $\mathcal{V}(t) \neq \emptyset$ and v_{max} is the greatest view of $\mathcal{V}(t)$, then no correct server sends the COMMITTED message for tx associated with a view v , for any view $v \subset v_{max}$.

PROOF. By contradiction, let a correct server r send the COMMITTED message for tx associated with a view $v \subset v_{max}$. That means that tx is quasi-committed at server r (by the `allowed_to_broadcast_committed` function; line 127 of Listing 39). Since $\text{current_view.view} = v$ at the moment of sending the COMMITTED message (by line 142 of Listing 39), tx is quasi-committed in a view smaller than or equal to v . Since $v \subset v_{max}$, this is not possible due to Lemma 88. Therefore, r does not send the COMMITTED message for tx associated with $v \subset v_{max}$ and the lemma holds. \square

The next theorem shows that the commitment signing property is satisfied.

Theorem 33 (Commitment Signing). Commitment signing is satisfied.

PROOF. Let a transaction tx be issued at time t and let a commitment proof σ_c be obtained at time $t' \geq t$, where $\text{verify_commit}(tx, \sigma_c) = \top$. Since tx is issued at time t , no correct server sends the COMMITTED message for tx before time t (follows from the definition of “issued at time t ”; see §3.3, paragraph “Properties of Carbon”).

Consider a correct server r . We distinguish two cases:

- (1) Let r leave before time t . Since r does not send any COMMITTED message for tx before time t and r halts immediately after leaving (which happens before time t), $r \notin \sigma_c.\text{signers}$.
- (2) Let r join after time t' . All the COMMITTED messages that belong to σ_c are sent by time t' . Since r does not send any COMMITTED messages before joining (see Listing 39; r joins after time t'), $r \notin \sigma_c.\text{signers}$.

Finally, consider a faulty server r . Again, we distinguish two cases:

- (1) Let r leave before time t . Therefore, there exists a correct server r^* that triggers the special r left event (at line 64 of Listing 32) before time t .

Let $\mathcal{V}(t) = \{v \mid \text{current_view.view} = v \neq \perp \text{ at a correct server at time } t\}$. First, $\mathcal{V}(t) \neq \emptyset$ because of r^* and $r \notin v_{max}.\text{members}()$, where v_{max} is the greatest view of $\mathcal{V}(t)$. Moreover, for any view v such that $r \in v.\text{members}()$, $v \subset v_{max}$. By Lemma 89, no correct server sends the COMMITTED message for tx associated with any view smaller than v_{max} . Hence, $r \notin \sigma_c.\text{signers}$.

- (2) Let r join after time t' . All the COMMITTED messages that belong to σ_c are sent by time t' . Let r^* be a correct server that sends the COMMITTED message $m \in \sigma_c$; such correct server indeed exists due to Listing 35. Let that message be associated with view v .

Assume that $r \in v.\text{members}()$. If $v = \text{genesis}$, then r would have joined by time t' because r^* would have triggered the special r joined event at line 53 of Listing 27. Hence, $v \neq \text{genesis}$. Therefore, r^* have entered the pseudocode at line 3 of Listing 32 with the “source” view being v_s . If $r \notin v_s.\text{members}()$, r would have joined by time t' (by line 60 of Listing 32 executed by r^*). Hence, $r \in v_s.\text{members}()$ and we reach the same point as we reached with view v . Eventually, the recursion stops since genesis is the smallest valid view (by Lemma 49). Therefore, $r \in \text{genesis}.\text{members}()$, which means that r joins before time t' . Thus, we reach contradiction and $r \notin v.\text{members}()$, which implies that $r \notin \sigma_c.\text{signers}$.

The theorem holds and commitment signing is satisfied. \square

Next, we prove the query validity property.

Theorem 34 (Query Validity). Query validity is satisfied.

PROOF. By contradiction, suppose that the query validity property is not satisfied. Since the client is forever-correct, the client eventually learns about v_{final} (i.e., $v_{final} \in history$ at the client) and it broadcasts the QUERY message to members of v_{final} (line 38 or 63 of Listing 36). By the finality property (see Listing 24), every correct member of v_{final} eventually installs v_{final} , does not update its current view afterwards and does not leave. Therefore, every correct member of v_{final} eventually receives the QUERY message (at line 150 of Listing 39) and responds with the QUERY – RESPONSE message (at line 153 of Listing 39). Eventually, the client receives the QUERY – RESPONSE messages from all correct members of v_{final} (i.e., the rule at line 91 of Listing 36 becomes active) and the client learns the total amount of money in Carbon. Thus, the theorem holds. \square

The next theorem proves the query safety property.

Theorem 35 (Query Safety). Query safety is satisfied.

PROOF. Since a correct client learns the total amount of money, the client has received the QUERY – RESPONSE messages from $v.quorum()$ of members of a valid view v (by the rule at line 91 of Listing 36). Let the client learn that the total amount of money is X . Therefore, there exists a correct server that has sent the QUERY – RESPONSE message for a value $X' \geq X$. Let that server be $r \in v.members()$.

Since r “calculates” the total amount of money by “looking into” all the transactions it has quasi-committed (by lines 152 and 153 of Listing 39), there exists a set $mints$ of quasi-committed minting transactions such that $X' = \sum_{tx \in mints} tx.amount$. For each transaction $tx \in mints$, let v_{tx} be the smallest view in which tx is quasi-committed. We distinguish two cases:

- Let $v_{tx} \subset v_{final}$. Therefore, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} (by Lemma 83).
- Let $v_{tx} = v_{final}$. Hence, there exists a correct member of v_{final} that sends the COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx associated with v_{final} . Thus, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at that server (by line 75 of Listing 39). By Lemma 84, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} .

In both cases, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} , for every transaction $tx \in mints$. By Lemma 86, tx is quasi-committed at every correct member of v_{final} , for every $tx \in mints$. Finally, by Lemma 87, every correct member of v_{final} obtains a commitment proof for tx , which means that tx is committed, for every $tx \in mints$. Hence, the theorem holds. \square

Finally, we prove the query liveness property.

Theorem 36 (Query Liveness). Query liveness is satisfied.

PROOF. Let $X = \sum_{tx \in mints} tx.amount$. Since tx is committed, for every $tx \in mints$, tx is quasi-committed (by the `allowed_to_broadcast_committed` function; line 127 of Listing 39). For each transaction $tx \in mints$, let v_{tx} be the smallest view in which tx is quasi-committed. We distinguish two cases:

- Let $v_{tx} \subset v_{final}$. Therefore, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} (by Lemma 83).
- Let $v_{tx} = v_{final}$. Hence, there exists a correct member of v_{final} that sends the COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx associated with v_{final} . Thus, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at that server (by line 75 of Listing 39). By Lemma 84, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} .

In both cases, $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} , for every transaction $tx \in mints$. By Lemma 86, tx is quasi-committed at every correct member of v_{final} , for every $tx \in mints$. Therefore, eventually all correct members of v_{final} would send the QUERY – RESPONSE message (at line 153 of Listing 39) for a value $X' \geq X$.

Let the client request to learn the total amount of money after this happens and after all correct members of v_{final} have set their `current_view.view` variable to v_{final} (which does happen due to the finality property). Therefore, the client eventually receives (at most) $v_{final}.plurality() - 1$ values (through the QUERY – RESPONSE messages) smaller than X . Hence, the median function (at line 93 of Listing 36) returns a value greater than or equal to X . Thus, the query liveness property is satisfied. \square

Hence, all properties of Carbon specified in §3.3 are satisfied.

Corollary 1. All properties of Carbon specified in §3.3 are satisfied.

PROOF. We list all the properties of Carbon and their corresponding proofs:

- Commitment validity follows from Theorem 31.
- Commitment integrity follows from Theorem 29.
- Commitment learning follows from Theorem 32.
- Commitment admissibility follows from Theorem 30.
- Commitment signing follows from Theorem 33.
- Query validity follows from Theorem 34.
- Query safety follows from Theorem 35.
- Query liveness follows from Theorem 36.
- Join safety follows from Theorem 23.
- Leave safety follows from Theorem 24.
- Join liveness follows from Theorem 26.
- Leave liveness follows from Theorem 27.
- Removal liveness follows from Theorem 28.

\square

9 SERVER’S MODULES: VOTING MODULE

Finally, we present the last module of a server: the *voting module*. This module has a responsibility of ensuring the properties of the asynchronous stake-based voting (see §3.2).

First, we define when `verify_voting(mot, σ_v)` returns \top (see Listing 41), where σ_v is a voting proof. Then, we present the implementation of the module. Lastly, we prove that the voting liveness and voting safety properties are satisfied.

```

1 function verify_voting(Motion  $mot$ , Voting_Proof  $\sigma_v$ ):
2   if  $\sigma_v$  is not Set(Message):
3     return  $\perp$ 
4
5   if does not exist View  $v$  such that  $m = [\text{SUPPORT}, mot, v, \text{View\_Path } path]$  and  $v = path.destination()$ ,
     for every Message  $m \in \sigma_v$ :
6     return  $\perp$ 
7
8   return  $|m.sender \mid m \in \sigma_v \text{ and } m.sender \in v.members()| \geq v.quorum()$ 

```

Listing 41. The `verify_voting` function

Intuitively, a voting proof is “valid” for a motion if and only if a quorum of members of a view claim that they “support” the motion to pass.

Voting module - implementation. Next, we present the implementation of the voting module of a server.

```

1 Voting Module:
2   Implementation:
3     upon start: // initialization of the module; executed as soon as the start event is triggered
4       Map(Motion, View → Set(Server))
5       support_from = {mot, v → ∅, for every Motion mot and every View v}
6       Map(Motion, View → Set(Message))
7       supports = {mot, v → ∅, for every Motion mot and every View v}
8
9     upon exists Motion mot such that current_view.installed = ⊤ and current_view.processing = ⊤ and support
10    (log, mot) = ⊤: // see §3.2
11      broadcast [SUPPORT, mot, current_view.view, view_path[current_view.view]]
12    to current_view.view.members()
13
14    upon exists Message m ∈ waiting_messages such that m = [SUPPORT, Motion mot, View v, View_Path
15    path] such that v = path.destination() and m.sender ∈ v.members():
16      waiting_messages = waiting_messages \ {m}
17      if m.sender ∉ support_from[mot][v]:
18        support_from[mot][v] = support_from[mot][v] ∪ {m.sender}
19        supports[mot][v] = supports[mot][v] ∪ {m}
20
21    upon exist Motion mot and View v such that |support_from[mot][v]| ≥ v.quorum():
22      // the motion passes since the server obtains the voting proof

```

Listing 42. Voting module - implementation

Proof of correctness. We start by proving the voting safety property (see §3.2, paragraph “Properties”). First, we show that any transaction quasi-committed at a correct server is seen by a quorum of a correct members of the latest installable view at the time. We say that a transaction tx is quasi-committed at server r at time t if and only if $quasi_committed[tx] = \top$ at server r at time t (note that the $quasi_committed$ variable is never reset to \perp ; see Listing 39). Moreover, the time at which a correct server r updates its current view to v (i.e., executes line 41 of Listing 27 or line 31 of Listing 32) is denoted by $update_time(r, v)$.

Lemma 90. Consider a time t and a correct server r . Let $current_view.view = v \neq \perp$ at server r at time t . Moreover, let $quasi_committed_r(t)$ denote the set of transactions that are quasi-committed at server r at time t and let there exist a transaction $tx \in quasi_committed_r(t)$ that is quasi-committed in v by time t .

There exists a set C_v of servers, where $C_v \subseteq v.members()$ and $|C_v| \geq v.plurality()$, such that, for every server $r_v \in C_v$, the following holds:

- (1) r_v is correct, and
- (2) $quasi_committed_r(t) \subseteq log_{r_v}(t)$, where $log_{r_v}(t) = \{tx \mid state.log[tx] \neq \perp \text{ at server } r_v \text{ at time } t\}$.

PROOF. Every transaction $tx \in \text{quasi_committed}_r(t)$ is quasi-committed in a view smaller than or equal to v (see Listing 39). Recall that there is a transaction $tx \in \text{quasi_committed}_r(t)$ that is quasi-committed in v .

Let $\text{quasi_committed}_r^*(t)$ denote the set of transactions that are quasi-committed at server r at time t and which are quasi-committed in view v (and not in a smaller view); note that $\text{quasi_committed}_r^*(t) \subseteq \text{quasi_committed}_r(t)$. According to the `allowed_to_quasi_commit` function (line 90 of Listing 39), a set $R_v \subseteq v.\text{members}()$ of servers exists, where $|R_v| \geq v.\text{plurality}()$, every server from R_v is correct and every server from the R_v set has sent the COMMIT – CONFIRM associated with view v for every transaction from $\text{quasi_committed}_r^*(t)$. Moreover, all these servers have updated their current view to v before time t (because of the check at line 70 of Listing 39).

Consider any server $r_v \in R_v$ at time t . For every transaction $tx \in \text{quasi_committed}_r(t) \setminus \text{quasi_committed}_r^*(t)$, $\text{state.log}[tx] \neq \perp$ at time t at server r_v (follows from lemmas 78 and 83). Moreover, for every transaction $tx^* \in \text{quasi_committed}_r^*(t)$, $\text{state.log}[tx] \neq \perp$ at time t at server r_v (follows from line 75 of Listing 39 and Lemma 78). Hence, the R_v set satisfies the statement of the lemma and the lemma holds. \square

Next, we prove that (at most) $v.\text{plurality}()$ of correct members of a “stale” view v send a SUPPORT message associated with v . This lemma is similar to Lemma 88.

Lemma 91. Let a motion mot be proposed at time t . Let $\mathcal{V}(t) = \{v \mid \text{current_view.view} = v \neq \perp \text{ at a correct server at time } t\}$. If $\mathcal{V}(t) \neq \emptyset$ and v_{max} is the greatest view of $\mathcal{V}(t)$, then at most $v.\text{plurality}() - 1$ of correct members of a view $v \subset v_{max}$ send the SUPPORT message for mot associated with view v .

PROOF. The proof of the lemma is similar to the proof of Lemma 88. Note that $\mathcal{V}(t)$ might contain values of the `current_view.view` variable of correct servers that halted by time t (note that `current_view.view` is not modified upon leaving; see Listing 32). We prove the lemma by contradiction. Without loss of generality, suppose that $v.\text{plurality}()$ of correct members of a view $v \subset v_{max}$ send the SUPPORT message for mot associated with v .

First, note that no correct server obtains a vote transaction for mot before time t (follows from the definition “motion proposed at time t ”; see §3.2, paragraph “Motions”). Therefore, no correct server sends the SUPPORT message for mot before t (due to the `support` function from Listing 8 and the check at line 7 of Listing 42). Moreover, since a correct server sends the SUPPORT message associated with v , v is installable at time ∞ (due to the check at line 7 of Listing 42).

Let r_{first} be the first correct server to set its `current_view.view` variable to a view greater than v ; let that view be $v_{first} \supset v$. Observe that r_{first} sets its `current_view.view` variable to v_{first} by time t . Since $v \subset v_{first}$, $v_{first} \neq \text{genesis}$ (by Lemma 49). Therefore, before updating its `current_view.view` variable to v_{first} , r_{first} has received STATE – UPDATE messages from the quorum of members of v (the rule at line 40 of Listing 33 becomes active and `reconfiguration.source = v` at that time at r_{first} , by Lemma 56). Each such STATE – UPDATE message is sent before time t at line 14 of Listing 33. Therefore, before sending the STATE – UPDATE message (i.e., before time t), the `stop_processing_until` variable is equal to (at least) v at each correct server that sends the STATE – UPDATE message received by r_{first} .

Furthermore, by the assumption, $v.\text{plurality}()$ of correct members of $v \subset v_{max}$ send the SUPPORT message for mot associated with v ; each such message is sent at some time greater than or equal to t . Therefore, there exists a correct member of v that (1) sets its `stop_processing_until` variable to (at least) v before time t , and (2) sends the SUPPORT message for mot associated with v at time t (or later). Such behavior is not a correct one (see listings 32 and 42). Hence, we reach contradiction and the lemma holds. \square

Before we prove the voting safety property, we add the assumption that member of v_{final} store in their `log` variable every transaction ever stored in the `log` variable of a correct server.

Assumption 1. Consider a correct server r such that $\log.state[tx] \neq \perp$ at server r , for some transaction tx . Eventually, $\log.state[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} .

Assumption 1 can easily be implemented in the following manner. If a correct server r leaves, then $r \notin v_{final}.members()$ (follows from Lemma 60 and the fact that v_{final} is the greatest forever-alive view). Hence, once a correct server leaves, it “pushes” all transactions that are in its \log variable until it receives a quorum of confirmations (i.e., the COMMIT – CONFIRM messages) with respect to a view. This eventually happens because of the fact that v_{final} exists. Only once the server has ensured that all of its transactions are “preserved”, the server halts.

Finally, we are ready to prove the voting safety property.

Theorem 37 (Voting Safety). Voting safety is satisfied.

PROOF. Let a motion mot be proposed at time t and let mot pass. Since the client learns that the amount of money in Carbon is $money$, the client has received a quorum of QUERY – RESPONSE messages associated with some view v_{query} (at line 91 of Listing 36). Hence, there exists a correct server $r \in v_{query}.members()$ such that the total amount of money in its “log of quasi-committed” transactions is at least $money$ (since quasi-committed transactions are never “reset”; see Listing 39). Let $\log_r = \{tx \mid quasi_committed[r] = \top \text{ at server } r \text{ at the moment of sending the QUERY – RESPONSE message}\}$; $\log_r.total_money() \geq money$. Finally, note that every transaction $tx \in \log_r$ is quasi-committed in a view smaller than or equal to v_{query} (by Listing 39).

Let $\mathcal{V}(t) = \{v \mid current_view.view = v \neq \perp \text{ at a correct server at time } t\}$. Since the client learns the amount of money in Carbon at time t , $\mathcal{V}(t) \neq \emptyset$. Let v_{max} be the greatest view of $\mathcal{V}(t)$; observe that $v_{query} \subseteq v_{max}$.

Since mot passes, there exists a valid (and installable at time ∞) view v_{pass} such that (at least) $v_{pass}.plurality()$ of correct members of v_{pass} send the SUPPORT message for mot associated with v_{pass} (by Listing 41); let us denote this set of servers by R_{pass} . No server from the R_{pass} sends the SUPPORT message for mot before time t (follows from the definition of motion being proposed at time t and Listing 8). By Lemma 91, $v_{max} \subseteq v_{pass}$. We separate two cases:

- Let $v_{max} \subset v_{pass}$. For each server $r_{pass} \in R_{pass}$, at the moment of updating its current view to v_{pass} , $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$, for every transaction $tx \in \log_r$ (by Lemma 83).

Let $\log_{r_{pass}} = \{tx \mid state.log[tx] \neq \perp \text{ at server } r_{pass} \text{ at the moment of sending the SUPPORT message}\}$. By Lemma 78, $\log_r \subseteq \log_{r_{pass}}$, for every server $r_{pass} \in R_{pass}$. By Lemma 81, $\log_{r_{pass}}$ is admissible, for every server $r_{pass} \in R_{pass}$. Since $\log_r \subseteq \log_{r_{pass}}$, $money \leq \log_r.total_money() \leq \log_{r_{pass}}.total_money()$, for every server $r_{pass} \in R_{pass}$. Finally, by Assumption 1, eventually $state.log[tx] \neq \perp$ at a correct member of v_{final} , which implies that the correct member of v_{final} quasi-commits tx (by Lemma 86) and obtains a commitment proof for tx (by Lemma 87), for every $tx \in \log_{r_{pass}}$ and every server $r_{pass} \in R_{pass}$. Hence, $\log_{r_{pass}} \subseteq \log_{\infty}$, for every server $r_{pass} \in R_{pass}$, which concludes the proof in this case.

- Let $v_{max} = v_{pass}$. If all transactions that belong to \log_r are quasi-committed in a view smaller than $v_{max} = v_{pass}$, the theorem holds because of the argument given in the previous case. Therefore, we assume the opposite in the rest of the proof.

By Lemma 90, there exists a set R_{pass} of correct members of v_{pass} , where $R_{pass} \subseteq v_{pass}.members()$ and $|R_{pass}| \geq v_{pass}.plurality()$, such that, for every server $r_{pass} \in R_{pass}$, the following holds:

- (1) r_{pass} is correct, and
- (2) $\log_r \subseteq \log_{r_{pass}}(t)$, where $\log_{r_{pass}}(t) = \{tx \mid state.log[tx] \neq \perp \text{ at server } r_{pass} \text{ at time } t\}$.

Therefore, there exists a server $r^* \in R_{pass}$ that has sent the SUPPORT message for mot associated with v_{pass} (after time t). Let $\log_{r^*} = \{tx \mid state.log[tx] \neq \perp \text{ at server } r^* \text{ at the moment of sending the SUPPORT message}\}$.

By Lemma 78, $\log_r \subseteq \log_{r^*}$. By Lemma 81, \log_{r^*} is admissible. Since $\log_r \subseteq \log_{r^*}$, $\text{money} \leq \log_r.\text{total_money}() \leq \log_{r^*}.\text{total_money}()$. Finally, by Assumption 1, eventually $\text{state.log}[tx] \neq \perp$ at a correct member of v_{final} , which implies that the correct member of v_{final} quasi-commits tx (by Lemma 86) and obtains a commitment proof for tx (by Lemma 87), for every $tx \in \log_{r^*}$. Hence, $\log_{r^*} \subseteq \log_{\infty}$, which concludes the proof in this case.

Since the proof is verified in both possible cases, the theorem holds. \square

Lastly, we prove the voting liveness property.

Theorem 38 (Voting Liveness). Voting liveness is satisfied.

PROOF. Let $\log_{\text{pass}} \subseteq \log_{\infty}$ exist. Every transaction $tx \in \log_{\text{greater}}$ is quasi-committed (by the check at line 127 of Listing 39), for any admissible log \log_{greater} with $\log_{\text{pass}} \subseteq \log_{\text{greater}} \subseteq \log_{\infty}$. Let v_{tx} be the smallest view in which $tx \in \log_{\text{greater}}$ is quasi-committed, for every $tx \in \log_{\text{greater}}$. We distinguish two cases:

- Let $v_{tx} \subset v_{\text{final}}$. Therefore, $\text{state.log}[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} (by Lemma 83).
- Let $v_{tx} = v_{\text{final}}$. Hence, there exists a correct member of v_{final} that sends the COMMIT – CONFIRM message for tx associated with v_{final} . Thus, $\text{state.log}[tx] \neq \perp$ at that server (by line 75 of Listing 39). By Lemma 84, $\text{state.log}[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} .

In both cases, $\text{state.log}[tx] \neq \perp$ at every correct member of v_{final} , for every $tx \in \log_{\text{greater}}$.

Eventually, every correct member of v_{final} broadcasts the SUPPORT message for the motion to all members of v_{final} (at line 8 of Listing 42) since it obtains all transactions from \log_{greater} (and any “greater” log supports the motion) and all correct members of v_{final} receive this message (by the finality property). Therefore, the rule at line 16 of Listing 42 is eventually active at every correct member of v_{final} , which means that the motion passes (at line 17 of Listing 42). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] AGUILERA, M. K., KEIDAR, I., MALKHI, D., AND SHRAER, A. Dynamic Atomic Storage without Consensus. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 58, 2 (2011), 1–32.
- [2] ALCHIERI, E., BESSANI, A., GREVE, F., AND DA SILVA FRAGA, J. Efficient and Modular Consensus-Free Reconfiguration for Fault-Tolerant Storage. In *21st International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems* (2018).
- [3] AUVOLAT, A., FREY, D., RAYNAL, M., AND TAĀANI, F. Byzantine-tolerant causal broadcast. *Theoretical Computer Science* 885 (2021), 55–68.
- [4] BUCHMAN, E., KWON, J., AND MILOSEVIC, Z. The latest gossip on BFT consensus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.04938* (2018).
- [5] CACHIN, C., GUERRAOU, R., AND RODRIGUES, L. *Introduction to Reliable and Secure Distributed Programming*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [6] COLLINS, D., GUERRAOU, R., KOMATOVIC, J., KUZNETSOV, P., MONTI, M., PAVLOVIC, M., PIGNOLET, Y.-A., SEREDINSCHI, D.-A., TONKIKH, A., AND XYKIS, A. Online Payments by Merely Broadcasting Messages. In *2020 50th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)* (2020), IEEE, pp. 26–38.
- [7] DI LUNA, G. A., ANCEAUME, E., BONOMI, S., AND QUERZONI, L. Synchronous Byzantine Lattice Agreement in $O(\log f)$ Rounds. In *2020 IEEE 40th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)* (2020), IEEE, pp. 146–156.
- [8] DI LUNA, G. A., ANCEAUME, E., AND QUERZONI, L. Byzantine Generalized Lattice Agreement. In *2020 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)* (2020), IEEE, pp. 674–683.
- [9] EYAL, I., GENCER, A. E., SIRER, E. G., AND RENESSE, R. V. Bitcoin-NG: A Scalable Blockchain Protocol. In *13th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)* (2016), pp. 45–59.
- [10] GAFNI, E., AND MALKHI, D. Elastic Configuration Maintenance via a Parsimonious Speculating Snapshot Solution. In *International Symposium on Distributed Computing* (2015), Springer, pp. 140–153.
- [11] GILAD, Y., HEMO, R., MICALI, S., VLACHOS, G., AND ZELDOVICH, N. Algorand: Scaling Byzantine Agreements for Cryptocurrencies. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)* (2017), pp. 51–68.
- [12] GUERRAOU, R., KOMATOVIC, J., KUZNETSOV, P., PIGNOLET, Y.-A., SEREDINSCHI, D.-A., AND TONKIKH, A. Dynamic Byzantine Reliable Broadcast. In *24th International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems (OPODIS)* (2020), pp. 23:1–23:18.
- [13] GUERRAOU, R., KUZNETSOV, P., MONTI, M., PAVLOVIĆ, M., AND SEREDINSCHI, D.-A. The Consensus Number of a Cryptocurrency. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)* (2019), pp. 307–316.

Carbon: An Asynchronous Voting-Based Payment System for a Client-Server Architecture

- [14] JEHL, L., VITENBERG, R., AND MELING, H. Smartmerge: A new approach to reconfiguration for atomic storage. In *International Symposium on Distributed Computing* (2015), Springer, pp. 154–169.
- [15] KERMARREC, A.-M., AND VAN STEEN, M. Gossiping in Distributed Systems. *ACM SIGOPS operating systems review* 41, 5 (2007), 2–7.
- [16] KOKORIS-KOGIAS, E., JOVANOVIC, P., GASSER, L., GAILLY, N., SYTA, E., AND FORD, B. OmniLedger: A Secure, Scale-Out, Decentralized Ledger via Sharding. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)* (2018), pp. 19–34.
- [17] KUZNETSOV, P., PIGNOLET, Y.-A., PONOMAREV, P., AND TONKIKH, A. Permissionless and Asynchronous Asset Transfer [Technical Report]. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.04966* (2021).
- [18] KUZNETSOV, P., AND TONKIKH, A. Asynchronous Reconfiguration with Byzantine Failures. In *34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)* (2020), pp. 27:1–27:17.
- [19] LOKHAVA, M., LOSA, G., MAZIÈRES, D., HOARE, G., BARRY, N., GAFNI, E., JOVE, J., MALINOWSKY, R., AND MCCALEB, J. Fast and Secure Global Payments with Stellar. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)* (2019), pp. 80–96.
- [20] NAKAMOTO, S. Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System. *Decentralized Business Review* (2008), 21260.
- [21] WOOD, G., ET AL. Ethereum: A Secure Decentralised Generalised Transaction Ledger. *Ethereum project yellow paper 151*, 2014 (2014), 1–32.
- [22] ZHENG, X., AND GARG, V. Byzantine Lattice Agreement in Synchronous Message Passing Systems. In *34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)* (2020), vol. 179, pp. 32:1–32:16.