Some Properties of Federated Byzantine Agreement Systems

Giuliano Losa

September 10, 2019

Contents

1	Definition of a Federated Byzantine Agreement System	1
2	The Cascade Theorem	1
3	The Union Theorem	2
1	Definition of a Federated Byzantine Agreemen System	\mathbf{nt}
theory FBA imports $Main$ begin		
	finition project where roject slices $S \ n \equiv \{Sl \cap S \mid Sl \ . \ Sl \in slices \ n\}$	
fi	cale $FBAS =$ \mathbf{xes} slices :: 'node \Rightarrow 'node set set — the quorum slices $\mathbf{and}\ W$:: 'node set — the well-behaved nodes $\mathbf{ssumes}\ slices\text{-}ne: \land p\ .\ p\in W \Longrightarrow slices\ p\neq \{\}$ \mathbf{gin}	
	finition quorum where uorum $Q \equiv \forall p \in Q \cap W$. $(\exists Sl \in slices p . Sl \subseteq Q)$	
en	d	

2 The Cascade Theorem

locale intact = - Here we fix an intact set I and prove the cascade theorem. $orig: FBAS \ slices \ W + proj: FBAS \ project \ slices \ I \ W$ — We consider the projection of the system on I

```
for slices WI +
 assumes I \subseteq W
   and q-avail:orig.quorum I
   and q-inter: \land Q \ Q'. [proj.quorum Q; proj.quorum Q'; Q \cap I \neq \{\}; Q' \cap I
\neq \{\}\} \implies Q \cap Q' \cap I \neq \{\}
begin
theorem cascade:
  fixes US
 assumes orig.quorum U and U \cap I \neq \{\} and U \subseteq S
 obtains I \subseteq S \mid \exists n \in I - S : \forall Sl \in slices n : Sl \cap S \cap I \neq \{\}
 have False if \forall n \in I - S. \exists Sl \in slices n . Sl \cap S \cap I = \{\} and \neg I \subseteq S
 proof -
First we show that I - S is a quorum in the projected system:
   have proj.quorum (I-S) using that(1)
     unfolding proj.quorum-def project-def
    by (auto; smt DiffI Diff-Compl Diff-Int-distrib Diff-eq Diff-eq-empty-iff Int-commute)
Then we show that U is also a quorum in the projected system:
   moreover have proj.quorum \ U \ using \langle orig.quorum \ U \rangle
     unfolding proj.quorum-def orig.quorum-def project-def
     by (simp; meson Int-commute inf.coboundedI2)
Since quorums of I must intersect, we get a contradiction:
   ultimately show False using \langle U \subseteq S \rangle \langle U \cap I \neq \{\} \rangle \langle \neg I \subseteq S \rangle q-inter by auto
 thus ?thesis using that by blast
qed
end
```

3 The Union Theorem

Here we prove that the union of two intact sets that intersect is intact. This implies that maximal intact sets are disjoint.

```
locale intersecting-intact = i1:intact slices W \ I_1 + i2:intact slices W \ I_2 — We fix two intersecting intact sets I_1 and I_2. + proj:FBAS project slices (I_1 \cup I_2) W — We consider the projection of the system on I_1 \cup I_2. for slices W \ I_1 \ I_2 + assumes inter:I_1 \cap I_2 \neq \{\} begin theorem union-quorum: i1.orig.quorum \ (I_1 \cup I_2)
```

```
using i1.intact-axioms i2.intact-axioms
  unfolding intact-def FBAS-def intact-axioms-def i1.orig.quorum-def
  by (metis Int-iff Un-iff le-supI1 le-supI2)
theorem union-quorum-intersection:
  assumes proj.quorum Q_1 and proj.quorum Q_2 and Q_1 \cap (I_1 \cup I_2) \neq \{\} and
Q_2 \cap (I_1 \cup I_2) \neq \{\}
 shows Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap (I_1 \cup I_2) \neq \{\}
proof -
First we show that Q_1 and Q_2 are quorums in the projections on I_1 and I_2.
 have i1.proj.quorum Q_1 using \langle proj.quorum Q_1 \rangle
   unfolding i1.proj.quorum-def proj.quorum-def project-def
   by auto (metis Int-Un-distrib Int-iff Un-subset-iff)
  moreover have i2.proj.quorum Q_2 using \langle proj.quorum Q_2 \rangle
   unfolding i2.proj.quorum-def proj.quorum-def project-def
   by auto (metis Int-Un-distrib Int-iff Un-subset-iff)
  moreover have i2.proj.quorum Q_1 using \langle proj.quorum Q_1 \rangle
   \mathbf{unfolding}\ proj.quorum\text{-}def\ i2.proj.quorum\text{-}def\ project\text{-}def
   by auto (metis Int-Un-distrib Int-iff Un-subset-iff)
  moreover have i1.proj.quorum Q_2 using \langle proj.quorum | Q_2 \rangle
   unfolding proj.quorum-def i1.proj.quorum-def project-def
   by auto (metis Int-Un-distrib Int-iff Un-subset-iff)
Next we show that Q_1 and Q_2 intersect if they are quorums of, respectively,
I_1 and I_2. This is the only interesting part of the proof.
 moreover have Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap (I_1 \cup I_2) \neq \{\}
   if i1.proj.quorum \ Q_1 and i2.proj.quorum \ Q_2 and i2.proj.quorum \ Q_1
     and Q_1 \cap I_1 \neq \{\} and Q_2 \cap I_2 \neq \{\}
   for Q_1 Q_2
 proof -
   obtain n where n \in I_1 \cap I_2 using inter by blast
   have i1.proj.quorum I_2
   proof -
     have i1.orig.quorum\ I_2 by (simp\ add:\ i2.q-avail)
     thus ?thesis unfolding i1.orig.quorum-def i1.proj.quorum-def project-def
       by auto (meson Int-commute Int-iff inf-le2 subset-trans)
   ged
   moreover note \langle i1.proj.quorum | Q_1 \rangle
    ultimately have Q_1 \cap I_2 \cap I_1 \neq \{\} using i1.q-inter inter \langle Q_1 \cap I_1 \neq \{\}\rangle
   moreover note \langle i2.proj.quorum \ Q_2 \rangle
   moreover note \langle i2.proj.quorum | Q_1 \rangle
    ultimately have Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap I_2 \neq \{\} using i2.q-inter \langle Q_2 \cap I_2 \neq \{\} \rangle by
   thus ?thesis by (simp add: inf-sup-distrib1)
 qed
```

Next we show that Q_1 and Q_2 intersect if they are quorums of the same

```
intact set. This is obvious.
 moreover
 have Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap (I_1 \cup I_2) \neq \{\}
   if i1.proj.quorum\ Q_1 and i1.proj.quorum\ Q_2 and Q_1\cap I_1\neq \{\} and Q_2\cap
I_1 \neq \{\}
   for Q_1 Q_2
   by (simp add: Int-Un-distrib i1.q-inter that(1) that(2) that(3) that(4))
  moreover
  have Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap (I_1 \cup I_2) \neq \{\}
   if i2.proj.quorum Q_1 and i2.proj.quorum Q_2 and Q_1 \cap I_2 \neq \{\} and Q_2 \cap
   for Q_1 Q_2
   by (simp add: Int-Un-distrib i2.q-inter that)
Finally we have covered all the cases and get the final result:
 ultimately
 \mathbf{show}~? the sis
   by (smt Int-Un-distrib Int-commute assms(3,4) sup-bot.right-neutral)
qed
end
end
```