CS 60002: Distributed Systems

T7: Byzantine Agreement

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KHARAGPUR

Sandip Chakraborty

sandipc@cse.iitkgp.ac.in

Byzantine Generals Problem

Commander

Lieutenant - 1

Lieutenant - 2

Byzantine Generals Problem

Attack

Attack

Byzantine Generals Problem

Faulty Commander

Attack

Retreat

Byzantine Generals Problem

Attack

Faulty Commander

We need a consensus mechanism to decide who is faulty

Retreat

Byzantine Generals Problem

Byzantine Generals Problem

Faulty Commander

Attack

Retreat

Commander Said: Attack

Commander Said: Retreat

Byzantine Generals Problem

Faulty Commander

Attack

Retreat

Commander Said: Attack

Can we reach to consensus?

Commander Said: Retreat

Byzantine Generals Problem

Byzantine Generals Problem

Good Commander

Attack

Attack

Commander Said: Attack

Commander Said: Retreat

Faulty Lieutenant

Byzantine Generals Problem

Good Commander

Attack

Attack

Commander Said: Attack

Commander Said: Retreat

Faulty Lieutenant

Consensus is NOT POSSIBLE with one commander and two lieutenants, when one is faulty

Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants

Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants

Faulty Commander

Attack

Attack

Retreat

Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants

Faulty Commander

Attack

Attack

Attack

Retreat

Attack

Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants



Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants



Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants

Faulty Commander

Attack

Attack: 3
Retreat: 0

Attack

Attack



Retreat

Attack

Attack

Retreat

Attack

Retreat

Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants



Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants



Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants



Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants

Good Commander

Attack

Attack

Attack

Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants

Good Commander

Attack

Attack

Attack

Attack

Retreat

Faulty Lieutenant

Byzantine Generals Problem – Three Lieutenants

Good Commander

Attack

Attack: 3
Retreat: 0

Attack

Attack

Consensus is reached !

Attack

Attack

Attack: 3
Retreat: 0

Attack: 2
Retreat: 1

Attack

Retreat

Faulty Lieutenant

Attack

A Formal Definition

- A commander must send an order to his *n-1* lieutenants so that the following two conditions are met
  - **IC1:** All loyal lieutenants obey the same order
  - **IC2**: If the commander is loyal, then every loyal lieutenants obey the order that he sends

- IC1 and IC2 are called ***iterative consistency*** conditions

Impossibility Results

- Let F be the maximum number of faulty processes that the protocol can tolerate – **Byzantine agreement is not possible with fewer than 3F+1 processes**

Impossibility Results

- Let F be the maximum number of faulty processes that the protocol can tolerate – **Byzantine agreement is not possible with fewer than 3F+1 processes**



Case 0: S is a correct process that sends 0

Impossibility Results

- Let F be the maximum number of faulty processes that the protocol can tolerate – **Byzantine agreement is not possible with fewer than 3F+1 processes**



Case 0: S is a correct process that sends 0
T is correct, T must decide 0 (**validity)**

Impossibility Results

- Let F be the maximum number of faulty processes that the protocol can tolerate – **Byzantine agreement is not possible with fewer than 3F+1 processes**



Case 0: S is a correct process that sends 0
T is correct, T must decide 0 (**validity)**

Impossibility Results

- Let F be the maximum number of faulty processes that the protocol can tolerate – **Byzantine agreement is not possible with fewer than 3F+1 processes**



Case 0: S is a correct process that sends 0
T is correct, T must decide 0 (**validity)**



Case 1: S is a correct process that sends 1
U is correct, U must decide 1 (**validity)**

Impossibility Results

- Let F be the maximum number of faulty processes that the protocol can tolerate – **Byzantine agreement is not possible with fewer than 3F+1 processes**



Case 2: S is faulty

For T: Same as Case-0

For U: Same as Case-1

Impossibility Results

- Let F be the maximum number of faulty processes that the protocol can tolerate – **Byzantine agreement is not possible with fewer than 3F+1 processes**



A correct process cannot distinguish between the two cases!

Case 2: S is faulty

For T: Same as Case-0

For U: Same as Case-1

Impossibility Results

- Let F be the maximum number of faulty processes that the protocol can tolerate – **Byzantine agreement is not possible with fewer than 3F+1 processes**

- **NOTE:** Byzantine faults can be detected with fewer than 3F+1 processes
  - Needs F+1 processes to detect Byzantine faults – a correct node can reliably detect faults irrespective of the fraction of faulty nodes.
  - Check the following for a formal proof and the design of a Byzantine fault detector -- https://www.usenix.org/legacy/event/hotdep06/tech/prelim_papers/haeberlen/haeberlen_html/index.html

Impossibility Results

- Let F be the maximum number of faulty processes that the protocol can tolerate – **Byzantine agreement is not possible with fewer than 3F+1 processes**

- **NOTE:** Byzantine faults can be detected with fewer than 3F+1 processes
  - Needs F+1 processes to detect Byzantine faults – a correct node can reliably detect faults irrespective of the fraction of faulty nodes.
  - Check the following for a formal proof and the design of a Byzantine fault detector -- https://www.usenix.org/legacy/event/hotdep06/tech/prelim_papers/haeberlen/haeberlen_html/index.html
  - **This is indeed interesting, many works have taken an alternate approach of BFT consensus – detect the faulty nodes and then throw them out – less number of rounds but implementation is sometime complex.**

Asynchronous Byzantine Agreement

- F faulty nodes – need 3F + 1 nodes to reach consensus

Asynchronous Byzantine Agreement

- F faulty nodes – need 3F + 1 nodes to reach consensus
  - Faulty nodes create partition in the network

Asynchronous Byzantine Agreement

- F faulty nodes – need 3F + 1 nodes to reach consensus
  - Faulty nodes create partition in the network



Asynchronous Byzantine Agreement

- F faulty nodes – need 3F + 1 nodes to reach consensus
  - Faulty nodes create partition in the network



Asynchronous Byzantine Agreement

- F faulty nodes – need 3F + 1 nodes to reach consensus
  - Faulty nodes create partition in the network



Asynchronous Byzantine Agreement

- F faulty nodes – need 3F + 1 nodes to reach consensus
  - Faulty nodes create partition in the network



Either PL or PR must break the tie

Asynchronous Byzantine Agreement

- F faulty nodes – need 3F + 1 nodes to reach consensus
  - Faulty nodes create partition in the network



Put one additional node to PL / PR

Asynchronous Byzantine Agreement

- F faulty nodes – need 3F + 1 nodes to reach consensus
  - Faulty nodes create partition in the network

Breaks the tie to reach consensus



Put one additional node to PL / PR

Broad Idea of Agreement Protocols

- **Assumptions**: Synchronous, Completely connected, reliable communication, crash faults (crash-stop), maximum f faults

- (f+1) rounds for each process

- **Round 1:**
  - Broadcast own value to other processes
- **Round 2 to Round f+1:**
  - Broadcast any new received values
- **At the end of Round f+1:**
  - Decide on the minimum value received

Broad Idea of Agreement Protocols

- With f+1 rounds, there is at least one round with no faults
  - At the end of this round, all non-faulty processes have the values of all other non-faulty processes

Broad Idea of Agreement Protocols

- With f+1 rounds, there is at least one round with no faults
  - At the end of this round, all non-faulty processes have the values of all other non-faulty processes

- For a faulty process
  - If it failed before sending its value to any other node, no one has its value
  - If it sent to some nodes before failing, at the end of the round with no failures, all non-faulty nodes will have its value

Broad Idea of Agreement Protocols

- With f+1 rounds, there is at least one round with no faults
  - At the end of this round, all non-faulty processes have the values of all other non-faulty processes
- For a faulty process
  - If it failed before sending its value to any other node, no one has its value
  - If it sent to some nodes before failing, at the end of the round with no failures, all non-faulty nodes will have its value
- However, we do not know a priori when that round will come, so we have to go for f+1 rounds

Broad Idea of Agreement Protocols

- With f+1 rounds, there is at least one round with no faults
  - At the end of this round, all non-faulty processes have the values of all other non-faulty processes
- For a faulty process
  - If it failed before sending its value to any other node, no one has its value
  - If it sent to some nodes before failing, at the end of the round with no failures, all non-faulty nodes will have its value
- However, we do not know a priori when that round will come, so we have to go for f+1 rounds – **this minimum bound is also applicable for Byzantine faults, try the proof!**

BFT Consensus

- **Lamport-Shostak-Peas Algorithm***
  - Synchronous environment
  - Reliable communication channel
  - Fully Connected Network
  - Receivers always know the identity of the Senders

* LAMPORT, LESLIE, ROBERT SHOSTAK, and MARSHALL PEASE. "The Byzantine Generals Problem." *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 4.3 (1982): 382-401.

BFT Consensus

- **Lamport-Shostak-Peas Algorithm***
  - Synchronous environment
  - Reliable communication channel
  - Fully Connected Network
  - Receivers always know the identity of the Senders

Unrealistic assumptions for real networks

* LAMPORT, LESLIE, ROBERT SHOSTAK, and MARSHALL PEASE. "The Byzantine Generals Problem." *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 4.3 (1982): 382-401.

BFT Consensus

- **Lamport-Shostak-Peas Algorithm***
  - Synchronous environment
  - Reliable communication channel
  - Fully Connected Network
  - Receivers always know the identity of the Senders

- Many different variants of BFT Consensus have emerged

BFT Consensus

- **Lamport-Shostak-Peas Algorithm***
  - Synchronous environment
  - Reliable communication channel
  - Fully Connected Network
  - Receivers always know the identity of the Senders

- Many different variants of BFT Consensus have emerged

- **Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance (PBFT)****
  - Use cryptographic techniques to release the **unrealistic** assumptions

** Castro, Miguel, and Barbara Liskov. "Practical byzantine fault tolerance." *USENIX OSDI*. Vol. 99. No. 1999. 1999.

Lamport-Shostak-Peas Algorithm

- **Oral messages –** messages can be forged or changed in any manner, but the receiver always knows the sender

- The algorithm has been defined in a recursive way

Lamport-Shostak-Peas Algorithm

OM(f) for f>0

- Source x broadcast values to all processes
- Let v_i = the value received by process i from source (0 if no value received). Process i acts as a new source and initiates OM(f-1), sending v_i to remaining f-2 processes
- For each I, j, i≠j, let v_j = value received by process i from process j in the previous step using OM(f-1). Process i uses the value majority (v_1, v_2, …, v_n)

Lamport-Shostak-Peas Algorithm

OM(0)

- Source x broadcast values to all processes
- Each process uses the value; if no value received, 0 is used.

Lamport-Shostak-Peas Algorithm

OM(0)

- Source x broadcast values to all processes
- Each process uses the value; if no value received, 0 is used.

- Time complexity: (f+1) rounds
- Message complexity: $O(n^f)$ where n is the total number of processes

Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance

- **Why Practical?**
  - Considers an asynchronous environment (Gives priority to Safety over Liveness)
  - Utilizes digital signature to validate the identity of the senders
  - Low overhead
- Incorporated in many distributed applications including Blockchain
- Uses cryptographic techniques to make the messages tamper-proof

PBFT Overview

- Based on State Machine Replication
  - Considers 3F + 1 replicas where F can be the maximum number of faulty replicas

- The replicas move through a succession of configurations, known as ***views***
  - One replica in a view is considered as the **primary** (works like a leader), and others are considered **backups**
  - The primary proposes a value (similar to the Proposers in Paxos), and the backups accept the value (similar to the Paxos Acceptors)
  - When the primary is detected as faulty, the view is changed – PBFT elects a new primary and a new view is initiated
  - Every view is identified by a unique integer *v*
  - Only the messages from the current view is accepted

PBFT – Broad Idea

PBFT – Broad Idea



PBFT – Broad Idea



Client waits for F+1 replies, where F is the maximum number of faulty replicas

Backups

PBFT – The Algorithm

- The protocol starts by the client sending a Request message to the primary
- The primary collects all the Request messages from different clients and order them based on certain pre-defined logic

PBFT – The Algorithm



- Primary assigns a sequence number *n* to the Request (or a set of Requests) and multicast a message **<<PRE-PREPARE, *v*, *n*, *d*>$_{\beta\_p}$, *m*>** to all the backups
  - *v* is the current view number, *d* is the message digest, m is the message
  - β_p is the private key of the primary

PBFT – The Algorithm



- Pre-prepare works as a proof that the Request was assigned a sequence number *n* for the view *v*

PBFT – The Algorithm

A backup accepts the Pre-prepare message, if

- The signature is correct and *d* is the digest of the message *m*
- The backup is in view *v*
- It has not received a different Pre-Prepare message with sequence *n* and view *v* with a different message digest
- The sequence number is within a threshold (the message is not too old – prevents a reply attack)

PBFT – The Algorithm



- The correct backups send a Prepare message to all other backups including the primary – works as proof that the backups agree on the message with the sequence number *n* under view *v*

PBFT – The Algorithm



- Message format for backup *k* : <PREPARE, *v*, *n*, *d*, *k*>$_{\beta\_k}$

PBFT – The Algorithm

Primary and backups accepts the Prepare message, if

- The signatures are correct
- View number is equal to the current view
- Sequence number is within a threshold (note that messages may be received **out of order** – so a backup may receive the Prepare message before the corresponding Pre-prepare message – so it needs to keep track of all the messages received)

PBFT – Three Phase Commit

- Pre-prepare and Prepare ensure that non-faulty replicas guarantee on a **total order** for the requests within a view

PBFT – Three Phase Commit

- Pre-prepare and Prepare ensure that non-faulty replicas guarantee on a **total order** for the requests within a view

- Assumptions for Commit:
  - Primary is non-faulty
  - You may have a maximum of ***f*** faults including Crash + Network + Byzantine

PBFT – Three Phase Commit

- A message is committed if
  - ***2f*** Prepare from different backups matches with the corresponding Pre-prepare
  - You have total ***2f + 1*** votes (one from the primary that you already have!) from the non-faulty replicas

PBFT – Three Phase Commit

- A message is committed if
  - ***2f*** Prepare from different backups matches with the corresponding Pre-prepare
  - You have total ***2f + 1*** votes (one from the primary that you already have!) from the non-faulty replicas

- Note that all ***2f + 1*** votes may not be same
  - You have votes from Byzantine faulty replicas as well

Why *2f + 1* Votes? The idea of Quorum

- **Quorum:** Minimum number of votes a distributed transaction needs to obtained to get committed
  - Proposed by David Gifford in 1979 (Gifford, David K. (1979). *Weighted voting for replicated data*. SOSP '79)
  - Widely used in Commit protocols and Replica management

Why *2f + 1* Votes? The idea of Quorum

- **Quorum:** Minimum number of votes a distributed transaction needs to obtained to get committed
  - Proposed by David Gifford in 1979 (Gifford, David K. (1979). *Weighted voting for replicated data*. SOSP '79)
  - Widely used in Commit protocols and Replica management

- **Byzantine Dissemination Quorum:**
  - **Intersection:** Any two quorums have at least one correct replica in common
  - **Availability:** There is always a quorum available with no faulty replicas

Why *2f + 1* Votes? The idea of Quorum

- **Quorum:** Minimum number of votes a distributed transaction needs to obtained to get committed
  - Proposed by David Gifford in 1979 (Gifford, David K. (1979). *Weighted voting for replicated data*. SOSP '79)
  - Widely used in Commit protocols and Replica management

- **Byzantine Dissemination Quorum:**
  - **Intersection:** Any two quorums have at least one correct replica in common
  - **Availability:** There is always a quorum available with no faulty replicas

- PBFT uses Byzantine Dissemination Quorum with *2f + 1* replicas

Quorum in PBFT

- You have *f* number of faulty nodes – you need at least ***3f + 1*** replicas to reach consensus
  - But you do not know whether those are Crash faults, Network faults, or Byzantine Faults

Quorum in PBFT

- You have *f* number of faulty nodes – you need at least ***3f + 1*** replicas to reach consensus
  - But you do not know whether those are Crash faults, Network faults, or Byzantine Faults

- **Case 1: All *f* are Crash or Network faulty – You'll not receive messages from them!**
  - You'll receive ***2f + 1*** Prepare messages from non-faulty nodes
  - All these ***2f + 1*** are non-faulty votes – you can reach to an agreement

Quorum in PBFT

- You have *f* number of faulty nodes – you need at least ***3f + 1*** replicas to reach consensus
  - But you do not know whether those are Crash faults, Network faults, or Byzantine Faults

- **Case 2: All *f* are Byzantine faulty – they send messages!**
  - You may receive at most ***3f + 1*** Prepare messages (votes) -- ***f*** are from Byzantine nodes
  - Sufficient to wait till ***2f + 1*** Prepare messages – even if ***f*** are faulty, you still have ***f+1*** non-faulty votes
  - You cannot wait for ***f+1***, the first ***f*** might be all faulty

Quorum in PBFT

- You have *f* number of faulty nodes – you need atleast ***3f + 1*** replicas to reach consensus
  - But yo ts, or Byz
- **Case 2: A**
  - You m om Byzan
  - Suffici you still have ***f***
  - You cannot wait for ***f+1***, the first ***f*** might be all faulty

Remember, you are on an asynchronous channel – messages get delayed and can be received out of order

Wait untill you receive *2f + 1* Prepare messages – once you received *2f + 1* votes, you can safely take a decision based on majority voting

PBFT – The Algorithm



- Message format for replica *k* : <COMMIT, *v*, *n*, *d*, *k*>$_{\beta\_k}$

PBFT – The Algorithm



- Message format for replica *k* : <COMMIT, *v*, *n*, *d*, *k*>$_{\beta\_k}$
- The protocol is committed for a replica when
  - It has sent the Commit message
  - It has received *2f* Commit messages from other replicas

PBFT – The Algorithm



- Message format for replica *k* : <COMMIT, *v*, *n*, *d*, *k*>$_{\beta\_k}$
- The protocol is committed for a replica when
  - It has sent the Commit message
  - It has received *2f* Commit messages from other replicas

Liveness and Weak Synchrony

- Unlike multiple Paxos proposers, PBFT works with a single Primary
  - Ping-pong does not arise from the proposals from multiple replicas
  - However, a replica needs to wait for ***2f + 1*** votes (Prepare and Commit messages)

- However, a primary may fail – the liveness gets hampered as the protocol cannot progress any further
  - Primary failure cannot be handled in a pure asynchronous system – you do not know whether it is a message delay from the primary, or a primary failure

Liveness and Weak Synchrony

- Unlike multiple Paxos proposers, PBFT works with a single Primary
  - Ping-pong does not arise from the proposals from multiple replicas
  - However, a replica needs to wait for ***2f + 1*** votes (Prepare and Commit messages)

- However, a primary may fail – the liveness gets hampered as the protocol cannot progress any further
  - Primary failure cannot be handled in a pure asynchronous system – you do not know whether it is a message delay from the primary, or a primary failure

- **Weak Synchrony:** (1) Both sender and the receiver is correct, (2) Sender keeps retransmitting the messages until it is received, (3) There is an **asymptotic upper bound** on the message transmission delay

View Change

- What if the **primary** is **faulty** ?
  - Non-faulty replicas detect the fault
  - Replicas together start view change operation

View Change

- What if the **primary** is **faulty** ?
  - Non-faulty replicas detect the fault
  - Replicas together start view change operation
- View-change protocol provides **eventual liveness** -- Allows the system to make progress when primary fails
- If the primary fails, backups will not receive any message or will receive faulty messages from the primary
- View changes are triggered by timeouts (weak synchrony assumption)
  - Prevent backups from waiting indefinitely for requests to execute

View Change

- Backup starts a timer when it receives a request, and the timer is not already running
  - The timer is stopped when the request is executed
  - Restarts when some new request comes

- If the timer expires at view *v*, backup starts a **View Change** to move to the view *v + 1*

The View Change Protocol



- Multicast the view change message $\langle \text{VIEW-CHANGE}, v+1, n, C, P, k \rangle_{\beta\_k}$
  - n is the sequence number of last stable checkpoint s known to k
  - C is a set of $2f + 1$ valid checkpoint messages corresponding to s
  - P is a set containing a set P_m for each request m that prepared at k with a sequence number higher than n

The View Change Protocol



- The new view is initiated after receiving *2f + 1* View Change messages
- Next primary selection
  - Round Robin (Hyperledger Sawtooth)
  - Leader election (Hyperledger Fabric)

The View Change Protocol



- Replicas send a View Change ACK – quorum is formed on these messages

The View Change Protocol



- Replicas send a View Change ACK – quorum is formed on these messages
- New View message to initiate a new view

Happy Learning