

Byzantine Agreement

CS255

Chris Pollett

Mar. 20, 2006.

Outline

- Byzantine Agreement Problem

Byzantine Agreement Problem

- Similar to Choice Coordination Problem.
- We want to agree on one of two possible values (say, heads or tails $[0,1]$).
- We have n processors t of which may be faulty.
- We require that the decision reached by a protocol should have:
 1. All good processors finish with the same decision.
 2. If all the good processors begin with the same value v , then they should all finish with same value v .

More on the set up of the Byzantine Problem

- The set of faulty processors is fixed before the computation begins.
- The good processors do not know which processors are faulty.
- During a round, each processor may send one message to each other processor.
- Each processor receives a vote from each of the remaining processors, before the following round begins.
- A processor is allowed to send different messages to different processors.
- Good processors will be assumed to follow our algorithm exactly.
- It is known any deterministic algorithm for this problem needs at least $t+1$ rounds.
- We will present a randomized algorithm with $O(1)$ expected runtime.

Some More Remarks before we Begin

- Last day, our solution to the choice coordination problem was only for two processors choosing between two values.
- Neither of these processors was faulty.
- The algorithm we present today works for n processors choosing between two values, so is already more general, ignoring the allowance for faulty processors.
- The original choice coordination problem was for n processors to choose among m choices.
- Notice by repeating the Byzantine procedure $\log_2 m$ times we can have our processors agree on a first bit of the number between 1 to m , then a second bit of the number between 1 to m , etc.
- If each such single bit agreement can be done in constant time as a function of n . Then, agreeing on a number between 1 and m can be done in $O(\log m)$ time. Notice this does not depend on the number of processors.

Randomized Algorithm for Byzantine Agreement

- We will assume that at the start of each round a trusted third party flips a fair coin.
- Any of the processors have access to this coin.
- We will assume that the number of faulty processors is a number $t < n/8$.
- Each round a good processor sends the same vote to all the other processors.
- A faulty processor may send arbitrary or even inconsistent votes to each other processor.
- Let $L = (5n/8) + 1$, $H = (3n/4) + 1$, and $G = 7n/8$.

What the i th Processor does during a round (if it is good).

Input: A value for b_i .

Output: A decision d_i .

1. $\text{vote} = b_i$.
2. For each round, do
 3. Broadcast vote;
 4. Receive votes from all the other processors.
 5. Set $\text{maj} = \text{majority (0 or 1) value among the votes cast}$
 6. Set $\text{tally} = \text{the number of votes that maj received.}$
 7. if $\text{coin} = \text{heads}$ then set $\text{threshold} = L$; else set $\text{threshold} = H$
 8. if $\text{tally} \geq \text{threshold}$ then set $\text{vote} = \text{maj}$; else $\text{vote} = 0$
 9. if $\text{tally} \geq G$ then set $d_i = \text{maj}$ permanently.

Analysis

- First, if all processors begin the round with the same vote, then 9 will apply and so this value will be the value eventually settled upon.
- Suppose the processors begin the round with different values for the vote.
- If two processors compute different values for maj in step 5, then tally does not exceed threshold regardless of whether L or H was chosen as threshold. So all good processors would set their votes to 0 and an agreement would be reached.
- We say a faulty processor **foils** a threshold x in $\{L,H\}$ in a round if, by sending different messages to the good processors, they cause tally to exceed x for at least one good processor, and to be no more than x for at least one good processor.
- Since the difference between the two possible thresholds is at least t , the faulty processor can foil at most one threshold in a round.
- Since the threshold is chosen with equal probability from $\{L,H\}$, it is foiled with probability at most $1/2$.
- Thus, the expected number of rounds before we have an unfoiled threshold is at most 2. If the threshold is not foiled then all good processors compute the same value v in step 8.