## STELLAR CONSENSUS PROTOCOL

## HIDENORI SHINOHARA

Abstract. This is my personal notes on the Stellar consensus protocol. This roughly follows the structure of the white paper on https://www.stellar.org/.

## 1. Preliminary

**Definition 1.1.** Let V be a set and  $Q: V \to 2^{2^V} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$  be a function such that  $\forall v \in V, \forall q \in V$  $Q(v), v \in q$ . Then we call the pair  $\langle V, Q \rangle$  a federated Byzantine agreement system, or FBAS for short.

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $\langle V, Q \rangle$  be an FBAS.  $U \subset V$  is called a quorum if and only if  $\forall v \in V$  $U, \exists q \in Q(v), q \subset U.$ 

**Definition 1.3.** Let  $\langle V, Q \rangle$  be an FBAS. We say  $\langle V, Q \rangle$  enjoys quorum intersection if and only if for any pair of quorums  $U_1, U_2, U_1 \cap U_2 \neq \emptyset$ .

**Definition 1.4.** Let  $\langle V, Q \rangle$  be an FBAS and  $B \subset V$ . Then the FBAS  $\langle V, Q \rangle^B$  is defined to be  $\langle V \setminus B, Q^B \rangle$  where  $\forall v \in V, Q^B(v) = \{q \setminus B \mid q \in Q(v)\}.$ 

**Theorem 1.5.** Definition 1.4 is well-defined. In other words, if  $\langle V, Q \rangle$  is an FBAS and  $B \subset V$ , then  $\langle V, Q \rangle^B$  is an FBAS.

*Proof.* Let  $v \in V \setminus B, q' \in Q^B(v)$  be given. Then  $q' = q \setminus B$  for some  $q \in Q(v)$ . By the definition of an FBAS,  $v \in q$ . Since  $v \notin B$ ,  $v \in q \setminus B = q'$ . Therefore,  $\langle V, Q \rangle^B$  is an FBAS.

**Theorem 1.6.** Let U be a quorum in FBAS  $\langle V, Q \rangle$ , let  $B \subset V$  be a set of nodes, and let  $U' = U \setminus B$ . If  $U' \neq \emptyset$ , then U' is a quorum in  $\langle V, Q \rangle^B$ .

*Proof.* Since  $U' \neq \emptyset$ , it suffices to show that  $\forall v \in U', \exists q \in Q^B(v), q \subset U'$ . Let  $v \in U'$ . Then  $v \in U$ . Since U is a quorum in  $\langle V, Q \rangle$ , we can find  $q \in Q(v)$  such that  $q \subset U$ . Then  $q'=q\setminus B\in Q^B(v)$ , and  $q'=q\setminus B\subset U\setminus B=U'$ . Therefore, U' is a quorum in  $\langle V,Q\rangle^B$ .  $\square$ 

**Definition 1.7.** Let  $\langle V, Q \rangle$  be an FBAS and  $B \subset V$  be a set of nodes. B is called a dispensable set, or DSet, if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- $\langle V, Q \rangle^B$  enjoys quorum intersection. B = V or  $V \setminus B$  is a quorum in  $\langle V, Q \rangle$ .

**Theorem 1.8.** If an FBAS enjoys quorum intersection and contains no ill-behaved node, then two contradictory statements cannot be both ratified.

*Proof.* Suppose the statement is false and let  $a, \bar{a}$  denote two contradictory statements ratified in such an FBAS. Let  $U_a, U_{\bar{a}}$  denote quorums ratifying such statements, respectively. By the definition of quorum intersection,  $U_a \cap U_{\bar{a}} \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $v \in U_a \cap U_{\bar{a}}$ . This implies that v voted for both a and  $\bar{a}$ . However, this goes against the definition of voting. In other words, v must be ill-behaved, which is a contradiction to our assumption.

**Theorem 1.9.** Let  $\langle V, Q \rangle$  be an FBAS. Let  $B \subsetneq V$  be a subset containing all the ill-behaved nodes and suppose that  $\langle V, Q \rangle^B$  enjoys quorum intersection. Let  $v_1 \neq v_2 \in V \setminus B$ . If  $v_1$  ratifies a statement a, then  $v_2$  cannot ratify any statement that contradicts a.

Proof. Suppose that the theorem is false and let  $U_1, U_2$  be quorums of  $v_1, v_2$  that ratify  $a, \bar{a}$ , respectively where a and  $\bar{a}$  are contradictory. Since  $v_1 \in U_1 \setminus B$ ,  $U_1 \setminus B \neq \emptyset$ . By Theorem 1.6,  $U_1' = U_1 \setminus B$  is a quorum in  $\langle V, Q \rangle^B$ . Similarly,  $U_2' = U_2 \setminus B$  is a quorum in  $\langle V, Q \rangle^B$ . Since  $\langle V, Q \rangle^B$  enjoys quorum intersection,  $U_1' \cap U_2' \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $v \in U_1' \cap U_2'$ . Then  $v \in U_1 \cap U_2$ . In order for  $U_1, U_2$  to ratify  $a, \bar{a}$ , respectively, v must vote for both a and  $\bar{a}$ . However, this is against the definition of voting. v must be an ill-behaved node, so  $v \in B$ , which is a contradiction because  $v \in U_1 \setminus B$ .