

Correctness of Failures:-

Assumption 1: There is atleast one correct replica

Assumption 2: In all the failure cases we assume that at most $t-1$ servers are faulty

Hist(objId) : update request sequence

Pending(objId) : request set

Case 1: Failure of Head

1) Master removes the head H and makes H^+ , the successor of H , the new head. This new head exists as per the above assumption 2.

2) Consistency with T_1 , T_2 and/or T_3 (Specifications in [vRS2004chain])

As H gets removed from the chain, the requests received by H and not yet forwarded to H^+ are removed from the Pending(objId). Removing a request from Pending(objId) is consistent with T_2 , so deleting H from the chain is consistent with specification mentioned.

Case 2: Failure of Tail

1) Master removes the tail T from the chain and makes T^- , the predecessor of T as the new Tail. This new tail exists as per the above assumption 2.

2) Consistency with T_1 , T_2 and/or T_3 (Specifications in [vRS2004chain])

This change alters the value of both Pending(objId) and Hist(objId).

a) Pending(objId) decreases in size because

b) $\text{Hist}(T, \text{objId}) \leq \text{Hist}(T^+, \text{objId})$ (Update Propagation invariant as $T^- < T$ holds) so changing the tail from T to T^- increases the no of requests completed by tail and thus reduce the number of requests pending in Pending(objId)

c) As per T_3 , the update requests completed by T^- and not by T do not appear in Hist(objId) because with T^- as now the tail, $\text{Hist}(\text{objId}) = \text{Hist}(T^-, \text{objId})$

Thus the above transitions alter the chain in a manner consistent with repeated T_3 transitions.

Case 3: Failure of Internal Servers

1) Faulty server S , gets removed from the chain and the master informs S^+ , successor of S and then S^- , predecessor of S about the new chain configuration.

2) Update Propagation invariant is preserved as S^- which now connects to S^+ , first sends to S^+ , all those requests which are there in Hist(S^- , objId) and have not reached S^+ .

3) Each server i also maintains a list Sent(i) of update requests that i has forwarded to some successor but have not been processed by the tail.

a) When server S forwards an update r for o : $\text{sent}(S, o).add(r)$

b) When tail receives update r : send ack(r) to T^- (if any) after processing the update r

c) When S receives ack(r) for o : $\text{Sent}(s, o).remove(r)$

Send ack(r) to S^- (if any)

Thus a request received by the tail must have been received by all of its predecessors so the Inprocess Requests Invariant is also satisfied.

Extending a chain:-

- 1) A new server T^+ is added to the end of the chain.
- 2) Original Tail T initially forwards its history so that
 $\text{Hist}(T^+, \text{objId}) = \text{Hist}(T, \text{objId})$ and simultaneously processes requests from its predecessors and updates $\text{Send}(T)$ accordingly.
 Therefore as $\text{Hist}(T^+, \text{objId}) \leq \text{Hist}(T, \text{objId})$ holds throughout this forwarding, the Update Propagation Invariant is preserved.

As the inprocess invariant $\text{Hist}(T, \text{objId}) = \text{Hist}(T^+, \text{objId}) \wedge \text{Sent}(T)$ is established T^+ starts serving as the new tail.