# Some Properties of Federated Byzantine Agreement Systems

## Giuliano Losa

## September 11, 2019

## Contents

1 Definition of	of a Federated Byzantine A	Agreement System 1
2 Intact and	the Cascade Theorem	2
3 The Union	Theorem	3
1 Definition System	on of a Federated By	zantine Agreement
theory $FBA$ imports $Main$ begin		
— Projecting or	t where $n \equiv \{Sl \cap S \mid Sl : Sl \in slices n\}$ a $S$ is the same as deleting the contract the Stellar Whitepaper.	omplement of $S$ , where deleting
and $W :: 'nod$	$ode \Rightarrow 'node \ set \ set$ — the quorus $de \ set$ — the well-behaved nodes $ne: \bigwedge p \ . \ p \in W \Longrightarrow slices \ p \neq \{$ ot empty	
	$p \in Q \cap W$ . ( $\exists Sl \in slices \ p$ . So set whose well-behaved members	
end		

#### 2 Intact and 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 IW — We consider the projection of the system on I.
 for slices WI +
 assumes I \subseteq W— An intact set is a set I satisfying those three assumptions.
   and q-avail: orig.quorum\ I - I is a quorum in the original system.
   and q-inter: \land Q \ Q'. \llbracket proj.quorum \ Q; \ proj.quorum \ Q'; \ Q \cap I \neq \{\}; \ Q' \cap I
\neq \{\}\} \implies Q \cap Q' \cap I \neq \{\}
     - Any two sets that intersect I and that are quorums in the projected system
intersect in I. Note that requiring that Q \cap Q' \neq \{\} instead of Q \cap Q' \cap I \neq \{\}
would be equivalent.
begin
theorem cascade:
— If U is a quorum of an intact node and S is a super-set of U, then either S
includes all intact nodes or there is an intact node outside of S which is blocked by
the intact members of S. This shows that, in SCP, once the intact members of a
quorum accept a statement, a cascading effect occurs and all intact nodes eventually
accept it regardless of what befouled and faulty nodes do.
 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 1: \forall n \in I - S. \exists Sl \in slices n . Sl \cap S \cap I = \{\} and 2: \neg (I \subseteq S)
S
 proof -
First we show that I - S is a quorum in the projected system. This is
immediate from the definition of quorum and assumption 1.
   have proj.quorum (I-S) using 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<sub>1</sub> + i2:intact slices W I<sub>2</sub> — 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) - I_1 \cup I_2 is a quorum in the
original system.
 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 \{\}
    — Any two sets that intersect I_1 \cup I_2 and that are quorums in the system
projected on I_1 \cup I_2 intersect in I_1 \cup I_2.
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
   unfolding proj.quorum-def i2.proj.quorum-def project-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)
   qed
   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
blast
   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)
 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 I_2\neq \{\}
I_2 \neq \{\}
   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
 show ?thesis
   by (smt Int-Un-distrib Int-commute assms(3,4) sup-bot.right-neutral)
end
end
```