

1 Given the formula ϕ :

$$(1 \vee \neg 2) \wedge (\neg 1 \vee 3) \wedge (4 \vee \neg 3) \wedge (\neg 4 \vee \neg 1) \wedge (\neg 4 \vee \neg 3 \vee 1) \wedge (2 \vee 3 \vee 1) \wedge (\neg 4 \vee 2 \vee 5)$$

the following DPLL inference sequence shows its unsatisfiability:

$\parallel \phi \implies 1^d \parallel \phi$	decide
$\implies 1^d 3 \parallel \phi$	unit propagate
$\implies 1^d 3 4 \parallel \phi$	unit propagate
$\implies \bar{1} \parallel \phi$	backtrack
$\implies \bar{1} \bar{2} \parallel \phi$	unit propagate
$\implies \bar{1} \bar{2} 3 \parallel \phi$	unit propagate
$\implies \bar{1} \bar{2} 3 \bar{4} \parallel \phi$	unit propagate
$\implies \text{FailState}$	fail

2 We consider the following additional variables:

$a_0: \neg(p \vee \neg(q \vee r)) \wedge (q \vee r)$	$a_1: q \vee r$
$a_2: \neg(p \vee \neg(q \vee r))$	$a_3: p \vee \neg(q \vee r)$
$a_4: \neg(q \vee r)$	

(a) Writing \bar{a}_i for $\neg a_i$, Tseitin's transformation leads to a formula with 14 clauses:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &\approx a_0 \wedge (a_0 \leftrightarrow a_2 \wedge a_1) \wedge (a_1 \leftrightarrow q \vee r) \wedge (a_2 \leftrightarrow \bar{a}_3) \wedge (a_3 \leftrightarrow p \vee a_4) \wedge (a_4 \leftrightarrow \bar{a}_1) \\ &\equiv a_0 \wedge (\bar{a}_0 \vee a_2) \wedge (\bar{a}_0 \vee a_1) \wedge (\bar{a}_2 \vee \bar{a}_1 \vee a_0) \wedge \\ &\quad (\bar{a}_1 \vee q \vee r) \wedge (\bar{q} \vee a_1) \wedge (\bar{r} \vee a_1) \wedge \\ &\quad (\bar{a}_2 \vee \bar{a}_3) \wedge (a_2 \vee a_3) \wedge \\ &\quad (\bar{a}_3 \vee p \vee a_4) \wedge (\bar{p} \vee a_3) \wedge (\bar{a}_4 \vee a_3) \wedge \\ &\quad (\bar{a}_4 \vee \bar{a}_1) \wedge (a_4 \vee a_1) \end{aligned}$$

(b) The transformation by Plaisted and Greenbaum produces a formula ψ with 10 clauses:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &\approx a_0 \wedge (a_0 \rightarrow a_2 \wedge a_1) \wedge (a_1 \rightarrow q \vee r) \wedge (a_2 \rightarrow \bar{a}_3) \wedge (a_3 \leftarrow p \vee a_4) \wedge (a_4 \leftarrow \bar{a}_1) \\ &\equiv a_0 \wedge (\bar{a}_0 \vee a_2) \wedge (\bar{a}_0 \vee a_1) \wedge \\ &\quad (\bar{a}_1 \vee q \vee r) \wedge \\ &\quad (\bar{a}_2 \vee \bar{a}_3) \wedge \\ &\quad (\bar{p} \vee a_3) \wedge (\bar{a}_4 \vee a_3) \wedge \\ &\quad (a_4 \vee a_1) \end{aligned}$$

The following DPLL inference sequence shows satisfiability of ψ :

$\parallel \psi \implies a_0 \parallel \psi$	unit propagate
$\implies a_0 a_1 \parallel \psi$	unit propagate
$\implies a_0 a_1 a_2 \parallel \psi$	unit propagate
$\implies a_0 a_1 a_2 \overline{a_3} \parallel \psi$	unit propagate
$\implies a_0 a_1 a_2 \overline{a_3} \overline{p} \parallel \psi$	unit propagate
$\implies a_0 a_1 a_2 \overline{a_3} \overline{p} \overline{a_4} \parallel \psi$	unit propagate or pure literal
$\implies a_0 a_1 a_2 \overline{a_3} \overline{p} \overline{a_4} q^d \parallel \psi$	decide
$\implies a_0 a_1 a_2 \overline{a_3} \overline{p} \overline{a_4} q^d r^d \parallel \psi$	decide

(The last step is only necessary if a total assignment is desired.)

3 See `minesweeper.py`.

4 To model the problem, we have the set of routers $R = \{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_7\}$ and the set of destinations $D = \{d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4\}$ for $d_1 = 10.91.110.*$, $d_2 = 10.91.120.*$, $d_3 = 10.91.130.*$, $d_4 = 10.91.140.*$. We can use $7 * 4 * 7 = 196$ variables $x_{i,d,j}$ for all combinations of $\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j \in R$ and $d \in D$, with the intended meaning that $x_{i,d,j}$ is assigned true iff \mathbf{r}_i sends packages with destination d to \mathbf{r}_j , or $i = j$ and d is in the VLAN of \mathbf{r}_i .

First, we must ensure that every router must forward packages:

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^7 \bigwedge_{d \in D} \bigvee_{j=1}^7 x_{i,d,j}$$

Next, the rules can be encoded as follows:

(C1) No router should send a package to itself, so forbid $x_{i,d,i}$ unless d is in the VLAN of \mathbf{r}_i .

$$\bigwedge_{i \in \{3,4,7\}} \bigwedge_{d \in D} \neg x_{i,d,i} \\ \left(\bigwedge_{d \in D \setminus \{d_1\}} \neg x_{1,d,1} \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{d \in D \setminus \{d_2\}} \neg x_{2,d,2} \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{d \in D \setminus \{d_3\}} \neg x_{5,d,5} \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{d \in D \setminus \{d_4\}} \neg x_{6,d,6} \right)$$

(C2) Traffic directed to an address in a different cluster is forwarded to a router above (if such a router exists). From the picture, one can see that e.g. the routers above \mathbf{r}_1 are \mathbf{r}_7 and \mathbf{r}_4 , and the destinations in a different cluster are d_3 and d_4 . Thus we get:

$$\bigwedge_{d \in \{d_3, d_4\}} (x_{1,d,4} \vee x_{1,d,7}) \wedge \bigwedge_{d \in \{d_3, d_4\}} (x_{2,d,4} \vee x_{2,d,7}) \wedge \bigwedge_{d \in \{d_1, d_2\}} (x_{3,d,4} \vee x_{3,d,3}) \wedge \bigwedge_{d \in \{d_1, d_2\}} (x_{4,d,4} \vee x_{4,d,3})$$

(C3) Two routers in the same cluster and on the same level (i.e. not one above the other) route to the same destination. This concerns the router pairs $(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)$ and $(\mathbf{r}_5, \mathbf{r}_6)$.

$$\bigwedge_{d \in D} \bigwedge_{j=1}^7 (x_{1,d,j} \leftrightarrow x_{2,d,j}) \wedge \bigwedge_{d \in D} \bigwedge_{j=1}^7 (x_{5,d,j} \leftrightarrow x_{6,d,j})$$

The current routing tables set the following variables to true:

$$(x_{1,d_2,2} \wedge x_{1,d_2,7} \wedge x_{1,d_3,4} \wedge x_{1,d_4,7}) \wedge \\ (x_{2,d_1,1} \wedge x_{2,d_3,5} \wedge x_{2,d_4,5} \wedge x_{2,d_4,6}) \wedge \\ (x_{5,d_1,7} \wedge x_{5,d_2,4} \wedge x_{5,d_3,4} \wedge x_{5,d_4,3} \wedge x_{5,d_4,6})$$

and all other variables $x_{1,d,j}$, $x_{2,d,j}$, and $x_{5,d,j}$ to false. One problem is thus that $x_{1,d_3,4} \leftrightarrow x_{2,d_3,4}$ is not satisfied.