Agreement Protocols

CS60002: Distributed Systems

Pallab Dasgupta Professor, Dept. of Computer Sc. & Engg., Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur



Classification of Faults

- Based on components that failed
 - Program / process
 - Processor / machine
 - Link
 - Storage
 - Clock
- Based on behavior of faulty component
 - Crash just halts
 - Failstop crash with additional conditions
 - Omission fails to perform some steps
 - Byzantine behaves arbitrarily
 - Timing violates timing constraints

Classification of Tolerance

- Types of tolerance:
 - Masking system always behaves as per specifications even in presence of faults
 - Non-masking system may violate specifications in presence of faults. Should at least behave in a well-defined manner
- Fault tolerant system should specify:
 - Class of faults tolerated
 - What tolerance is given from each class

Core problems

- Agreement (multiple processes agree on some value)
- Clock synchronization
- Stable storage (data accessible after crash)
- Reliable communication (point-to-point, broadcast, multicast)
- Atomic actions

Overview of Consensus Results

- Let f be the maximum number of faulty processors.
- Tight bounds for message passing:

	Crash failures	Byzantine failures
Number of rounds	f + 1	f + 1
Total number of processors	f + 1	3f + 1
Message size	polynomial	polynomial

Overview of Consensus Results

- Impossible in asynchronous case.
 - Even if we only want to tolerate a single crash failure.
 - True both for message passing and shared read-write memory.

Consensus Algorithm for Crash Failures

Code for each processor:

v := my input

at each round 1 through *f*+1:

if I have not yet sent v then send v to all
wait to receive messages for this round
v := minimum among all received values and
current value of v

if this is round *f*+1 then decide on *v*

Correctness of Crash Consensus Algo

- Termination: By the code, finish in round *f* + 1.
- Validity: Holds since processors do not introduce spurious messages
 - if all inputs are the same, then that is the only value ever in circulation.

Correctness of Crash Consensus Algo

Agreement:

- Suppose in contradiction p_i decides on a smaller value, *x*, than does p_i.
- Then x was hidden from p_i by a chain of faulty processors:



• There are *f* + 1 faulty processors in this chain, a contradiction.

Performance of Crash Consensus Algo

- Number of processors n > f
- *f* + 1 rounds
- $n^2 \cdot |V|$ messages, each of size $\log |V|$ bits, where V is the input set.

Lower Bound on Rounds

Assumptions:

- *n* > *f* + 1
- every processor is supposed to send a message to every other processor in every round
- Input set is {0,1}

Byzantine Agreement Problems

Model :

- Total of *n* processes, at most *m* of which can be faulty
- Reliable communication medium
- Fully connected
- Receiver always knows the identity of the sender of a message
- Byzantine faults
- Synchronous system
 - In each round, a process receives messages, performs computation, and sends messages.

Byzantine Agreement

- Also known as Byzantine Generals problem
 - One process x broadcasts a value v
 - <u>Agreement Condition</u>: All non-faulty processes must agree on a common value.
 - Validity Condition: The agreed upon value must be v if x is non-faulty.

Variants

- Consensus
 - Each process broadcasts its initial value
 - Satisfy agreement condition
 - If initial value of all non-faulty processes is v, then the agreed upon value must be v
- Interactive Consistency
 - Each process k broadcasts its own value v_k
 - All non-faulty processes agree on a common vector $(v_1, v_2, ..., v_n)$
 - If the kth process is non-faulty, then the kth value in the vector agreed upon by non-faulty processes must be v_k
- Solution to Byzantine agreement problem implies solution to other two

Byzantine Agreement Problem

- No solution possible if:
 - asynchronous system, or
 - n < (3m + 1)
- Lower Bound:
 - Needs at least (*m*+1) rounds of message exchanges
- "Oral" messages messages can be forged / changed in any manner, but the receiver always knows the sender

Proof

Theorem: There is no t-Byzantine-robust broadcast protocol for $t \ge N/3$



Scenario-0: T must decide 0



Scenario-1: U must decide 1



Scenario-2:

- -- similar to Scenario-0 for T
- -- similar to Scenario-1 for U
- -- T decides 0 and U decides 1

Lamport-Shostak-Pease Algorithm

Algorithm Broadcast(N, t) where t is the resilience

For *t* = 0, *Broadcast*(*N*, 0):

Pulse

1

The general sends (value, x_g) to all processes, the lieutenants do not send.
Receive messages of pulse 1.
The general decides on x_g.
Lieutenants decide as follows: if a message (value, x) was received from g in pulse-1 then decide on x else decide on udef

Lamport-Shostak-Pease Algorithm contd..

For *t* **> 0**, *Broadcast*(*N*, *t*):

Pulse

The general sends (value, x_q) to 1 all processes, the lieutenants do not send. Receive messages of pulse 1. Lieutenant *p* acts as follows: if a message $\langle value, x \rangle$ was received from g in pulse-1 then $x_p = x$ else $x_p = udef$; Announce x_p to the other lieutenants by acting as a general in Broadcast_D(N-1, t-1) in the next pulse

Pulse

t+1Receive messages of pulse t + 1.The general decides on x_g .For lieutenant p:A decision occurs inBroadcast_q(N - 1, t - 1) foreach lieutenant q $W_p[q] = decision in$ Broadcast_q(N - 1, t - 1) $y_p = max(W_p)$

Features

- Termination: If Broadcast(N, t) is started in pulse 1, every process decides in pulse t + 1
- <u>Dependence</u>: If the general is correct, if there are *f* faulty processes, and if
 N > 2f + t, then all correct processes decide on the input of the general
- Agreement: All correct processes decide on the same value

The Broadcast(N, t) protocol is a t-Byzantine-robust broadcast protocol for t < N/3

Time complexity: O(t+1) Message complexity: $O(N^t)$

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KHARAGPUR