

Asynchronous Consensus Without Rounds*

Robbert van Renesse

Department of Computer Science, Cornell University

Abstract

Fault tolerant consensus protocols usually involve ordered rounds of voting between a collection of processes. In this paper, we derive a general specification of fault tolerant asynchronous consensus protocols and present a class of consensus protocols that refine this specification without using rounds. Crash-tolerant protocols in this class use $3f + 1$ processes, while Byzantine-tolerant protocols use $5f + 1$ processes.

1 Introduction

To the best of our knowledge, all published crash and Byzantine fault tolerant asynchronous consensus protocols use *rounds* (well-known examples include [2, 4, 8, 17, 5], new ones appearing frequently).¹ In each round (*aka* ballot, phase, or view), a collection of processes \mathcal{P} (sometimes called *acceptors*) vote on a set of proposals or abstain. The number of rounds is unbounded. If each process in a quorum votes for proposal c in the same round, then c is decided.² By requiring that processes vote at most once in a round and that quorums overlap, it is impossible that different proposals are decided in the same round. In order to prevent different rounds from deciding different values, rounds are totally ordered and protocols maintain the following invariant:

Round Vote Safety: A process may vote for c' in round r' only if no c , $c \neq c'$, is decided in a round r ordered before r' .

Based on this invariant, various generic consensus frameworks such as [20, 19, 13, 26, 25, 18, 12, 22] that claim to capture many or even all asynchronous consensus protocols have been published. One is tempted to conclude that fault tolerant consensus protocols require ordered rounds. In this paper, we show that such a conclusion would be wrong by describing **ProtoConsensus**, a class of asynchronous consensus protocols that does not use rounds. In our protocols processes also vote, and can change their votes, but in the absence of rounds (and the state used to implement round ordering) they cannot leverage Round Vote Safety. Also, in the absence of rounds, our protocols use a different rule for determining when they decide, based on consistent cuts.

In Section 2 we describe a simple specification and model for asynchronous consensus implementations. We refine this specification in Section 3 for protocols that have to tolerate failures. In Section 4 we further refine this specification to obtain **ProtoConsensus**, and we present “Texel,” a

*This paper was written in 2010. Citations may be outdated.

¹ So-called *permissionless blockchains* do not use round numbers as such either, but are probabilistic and assume synchrony.

²Consistent with Lamport’s terminology, we distinguish the protocol *deciding* from clients *learning* the decision.

```

specification Consensus( $C$ ):
  var  $decision$ 
  transition decide( $c$ ):
    precondition:
       $c \in C \wedge decision = \text{UNDECIDED}$ 
    action:
       $decision := \text{DECIDED}(c)$ 

```

(a)

Figure 1: (a) Specification of state transitions in **Consensus**. (Initially, $decision$ is either **UNDECIDED** or **DECIDED**(c) for some $c \in C$); (b) Generic implementation consisting of a set of processes \mathcal{P} , their local states, a message buffer (initially \emptyset), and transitions.

```

specification Implementation( $\mathcal{P}$ ):
  var  $\{ localState_\pi \mid \pi \in \mathcal{P} \}, msgbuffer$ 
  initially:  $msgbuffer = \emptyset$ 
  transition deliver( $\pi, m, args$ ):
    precondition:
       $\langle \pi, m \rangle \in msgbuffer \wedge$ 
       $someCondition(localState_\pi, m, args)$ 
    action:
       $msgbuffer := msgbuffer \setminus \{ \langle \pi, m \rangle \}$ 
       $(localState_\pi, msgs) := someFunc(localState_\pi, m, args)$ 
       $msgbuffer := msgbuffer \cup msgs$ 
  transition local( $\pi, args$ ):
    precondition:
       $someCondition'(localState_\pi, args)$ 
    action:
       $(localState_\pi, msgs) := someFunc'(localState_\pi, args)$ 
       $msgbuffer := msgbuffer \cup msgs$ 

```

(b)

binary consensus protocol in this class of protocols. Section 5 proves the protocol's correctness. We discuss differences with round-based protocols, learning, termination, and coping with Byzantine failures in Section 6.

2 Consensus Specification and Model

Figure 1(a) shows a simple state transition specification for a consensus protocol (excluding interface transitions for proposing and learning). A specification defines states and gives legal state transitions between those states. The specification as a whole, as well as individual transitions, can involve parameters (listed in parentheses) that are bound within the defined scope. A **transition** definition includes a **precondition** and an **action**. If the precondition holds then the transition is *enabled*. A transition is performed indivisibly, including validating its precondition and executing the action should the precondition hold. Transitions are deterministic, but multiple transitions may be enabled simultaneously. An *execution from state* s_0 complies with a specification if it involves a series of transitions, where the first transition is enabled in s_0 , and each subsequent transition is enabled in the state produced by performing the previous transition. If an execution from s_0 exists that results in a state s , we say that s is *reachable* from s_0 .

In the specification **Consensus**(C) of Figure 1(a), C is a set of *candidate values*. For simplicity of exposition, C is fixed and $|C| > 1$. Variable $decision$ completely characterizes the state of **Consensus**, and is either **UNDECIDED** or **DECIDED**(c) for some $c \in C$. There is a transition **decide**(c) for each candidate value c . The transition is enabled only if c is an element of C and if $decision = \text{UNDECIDED}$ holds. The **decide**(c) transition causes **Consensus** to move from state **UNDECIDED** into state **DECIDED**(c). It is easy to derive the following property:

Consistency: **Consensus** cannot transition into both **DECIDED**(c) and **DECIDED**(c') if $c \neq c'$.

But we also require the following to disqualify implementations that never decide, as well as implementations that can only decide the same predetermined element in C :

Non-triviality: For each $c \in C$, state `DECIDED`(c) is reachable from state `UNDECIDED`.

This paper focuses on implementations of `Consensus`(C) that employ a collection of processes \mathcal{P} communicating over a network. These implementations can be specified in much the same way, as illustrated in Figure 1(b). The *implementation state* is a collection of local states, one for each process, and a message buffer, which is a set of (*destination process identifier, payload*) pairs. The first argument of each transition is a process identifier. Transitions at a process π can read and write the process’s local state $localState_\pi$, but not that of others. Transitions are also allowed to add $\langle process\ identifier, payload \rangle$ pairs to the message buffer. Certain transitions, such as `deliver`, can remove such a pair and operate on the local state of the corresponding process. Others, such as `local`, do not take a message as input. It is easy to see that simultaneously enabled transitions at different processes are independent of one another:

Lemma 1 *If, in an implementation state s , a transition t_1 is enabled at process π_1 and transition t_2 at process π_2 , then first performing t_1 and then t_2 , or first performing t_2 and then t_1 , result in the same implementation state s' . Also, performing one of t_1 or t_2 in state s does not disable the other.*

We make, initially, the following assumptions about when such process transitions are taken:

- **Crash Failures:** A process follows its specification until the host on which it runs crashes and ceases to execute transitions. Hosts are assumed to fail independently of one another. A host that never fails is called *correct*, as is a process that runs on a correct host.
- **Fairness:** It cannot happen that, at some point, a transition becomes permanently enabled but is not thereafter executed. There is no bound on the time before an enabled transition is executed (known as *asynchrony*).

In consensus protocols, the `Consensus` state (*i.e.*, *decision*) is some function of the implementation state [1]. If this function maps the implementation state to `DECIDED`(c), we say that the protocol decided c . If the implementation state maps to `UNDECIDED`, we say that the protocol is undecided.

To tolerate host failures, an implementation has to distribute the `Consensus` state across multiple processes running on different hosts in a way so that the failure of some hosts does not make the `Consensus` state inaccessible to the others. A protocol that is always guaranteed to reach a `DECIDED`(c) state would be desirable but unachievable in our environment [10]. We focus on protocols that decide under favorable conditions, even in the face of some limited number of crash failures.

3 Non-blocking Consensus

In this section, we derive a state transition specification of *Non-blocking* consensus protocols, a specification that all fault-tolerant consensus protocols must refine. We assume that the number of failures is bounded by a constant f , $f > 0$, and define a *Fail-Prone System* \mathcal{F} to be a set consisting of all sets of f processes: $\mathcal{F} = \{F \mid F \subset \mathcal{P} \wedge |F| = f\}$.

Define a Π -execution to be an execution of a consensus protocol that involves only transitions at processes in Π ($\Pi \subseteq \mathcal{P}$). An undecided implementation state s is defined to be *c-decidable* by Π if there exists a Π -execution from s leading to an implementation state that is **DECIDED**(c). If s is *c-decidable* by Π , then s is also *c-decidable* by any superset of Π . We say that a consensus protocol is *Non-blocking* under \mathcal{F} iff:

Non-blocking: For any undecided implementation state s and any $F \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists a candidate value $c \in C$ such that s is *c-decidable* by $\mathcal{P} \setminus F$.

For Consistency, all *c-decidable* implementation states have the following property:

Theorem 2 *If implementation state s is c-decidable by Π , then for every set Π' of processes disjoint from Π , and every $c', c' \neq c$, s is not c' -decidable by Π' .*

Proof By contradiction, suppose there exists a Π -execution E from s that decides c , and a Π' -execution E' from s that decides c' , where $c' \neq c$ and $\Pi \cap \Pi' = \emptyset$. Because $\Pi \cap \Pi' = \emptyset$, the implementation state resulting from first executing E from s and then E' must be identical to the implementation state resulting from first executing E' and then E (a corollary of Lemma 1). However, first executing E causes the protocol to decide c while first executing E' causes the protocol to decide c' . Because an execution of a consensus protocol cannot decide multiple candidate values (Consistency), we have derived a contradiction. ■

Corollary 3 *If a state s is both c-decidable by Π and c' -decidable by Π , $c \neq c'$, then any execution from s that decides any candidate value $c'' \in C$ involves transitions at processes in Π .*

Proof Because $c \neq c'$, it must be the case that $c'' \neq c$, or $c'' \neq c'$, or both. Because s is *c-decidable*, any execution that decides c'' , $c'' \neq c$, must involve processes in Π (implied by Theorem 2). By the same reasoning, any execution that decides c'' , $c'' \neq c'$ must involve processes in Π . Therefore, any execution that decides any c'' must involve processes in Π . ■

We call an undecided implementation state *dominated* by Π if every deciding execution involves processes in Π . If an implementation state is dominated by Π , then the crash of all processes in Π makes it impossible for the protocol to decide. A Non-blocking consensus protocol cannot have states that are dominated by sets of processes that might all fail (*i.e.*, elements of \mathcal{F}), and this is the basis for a refinement of **Consensus**. We use \mathcal{F} to partition undecided implementation states:

- **DANGEROUS:** there exists a set of processes F in \mathcal{F} such that the implementation state is dominated by F .
- **PREDECIDED**(c): (i) the implementation state is not **DANGEROUS**, (ii) there exists an $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that the implementation state is *c-decidable* by F , and (iii) there does not exist an $F' \in \mathcal{F}$ and a $c' \in C, c' \neq c$, such that the implementation state is *c'-decidable* by F' . (In other words, there exist f processes that can decide c by themselves, while it would take more than f processes to decide any other value.)
- **OPEN:** the implementation state is neither **DANGEROUS** nor **PREDECIDED**(c) for any $c \in C$.

Theorem 4 *If an undecided implementation state s is c-decidable by $\{\pi\}$ (a singleton set consisting of π), then s is either **PREDECIDED**(c) or is dominated by $\{\pi\}$ and thus **DANGEROUS**.*

```

specification NonblockingConsensus( $C, \mathcal{F}$ ):
  var  $nbdecision$ 
  transition predecide( $c$ ):
    precondition:  $c \in C \wedge \forall c' : nbdecision \neq \text{DECIDED}(c')$ 
    action:  $nbdecision := \text{PREDECIDED}(c)$ 
  transition revert( $c$ ):
    precondition:  $nbdecision = \text{PREDECIDED}(c)$ 
    action:  $nbdecision := \text{OPEN}$ 
  transition decide( $c$ ):
    precondition:  $nbdecision = \text{PREDECIDED}(c)$ 
    action:  $nbdecision := \text{DECIDED}(c)$ 

```

Figure 2: State transitions in Non-blocking consensus. (Initially, $nbdecision$ is OPEN or, for some $c \in C$, either PREDECIDED(c) or DECIDED(c).)

Proof Let s be an undecided implementation state that is c -decidable by $\{\pi\}$. It is impossible that s is a PREDECIDED(c') state if $c' \neq c$ (by requirement (iii) on PREDECIDED states). By definition of fail-prone systems, π must be in at least one element F of \mathcal{F} , and thus s is c -decidable by F . There are two cases. (1) If s is c' -decidable by F for some $c' \neq c$, then s is dominated by F (Corollary 3) and thus a DANGEROUS state. (2) If no such c' exists, then s is a PREDECIDED(c) state. ■

Because Non-blocking consensus protocols cannot have states that are DANGEROUS, it must be in state PREDECIDED(c) just before such a protocol can decide a candidate value c (by Theorem 4). The NonblockingConsensus specification in Figure 2 is designed to meet exactly these requirements. It is straightforward to exhibit a refinement mapping that shows that NonblockingConsensus is a refinement of Consensus.

4 ProtoConsensus

Most consensus protocols avoid DANGEROUS states using rounds, enforcing that within a round, if two process vote for a candidate value (rather than abstain), then they vote for the same candidate value. Such consensus protocols enforce this by having two phases in each round, one in which a value is proposed, and a second in which processes vote on a proposed value. For example, in the first phase, a designated leader may propose a value that satisfies Round Vote Safety, and in the second phase the processes vote for that value. This approach avoids close ties while voting, which could lead to blocking in the face of failures. Such protocols can tolerate fewer than half of processes in \mathcal{P} failing.

In this section we present ProtoConsensus, a class of crash-tolerant consensus protocols that use voting without rounds and avoid DANGEROUS states by using two-thirds majorities. When close to deciding one value, at least one-third of processes have to change their vote in order to decide another value. As we shall see, the protocols can tolerate fewer than one-third of processes in \mathcal{P} failing, that is, $f = \lfloor (n - 1)/3 \rfloor$, where $n = |\mathcal{P}|$.

In these protocols, each process π proposes a candidate value by making an initial vote, but may change its vote based on the outcome of *experiments* it runs. We say that π *supports* c if c is the candidate value that π most recently voted for. An experiment consists of π sending a **query** message to its peers and awaiting corresponding **response** messages. A process may run only one experiment at a time. In between experiments, we say that π is *idle*; during an experiment we say that π is *experimenting*. A peer process π' may only respond if it is idle; a **response** message contains the candidate value that π' is supporting. If π supports c , but responses from one-third





Figure 3: (a) Specification of Texel . (b) Event-time diagram of three experiments x_1 , x_2 , and x_3 . Here $x_1 \prec x_2$, but x_1 and x_3 , as well as x_2 and x_3 , are concurrent. x_1 and x_3 are reversing; x_2 is not. Delayed messages are not shown.

or more of peer processes contain a value other than c , then π may terminate its experiment and vote for any candidate value in C . Alternatively, process π may abort an experiment at any time without changing the value that it is supporting.

As in [16], we define a strict partial order on experiments x_1 and x_2 . $x_1 \prec x_2$ if $x_1 \neq x_2$ and

- x_1 and x_2 are experiments of the same process, and x_1 happened before x_2 ; or
- x_1 is an experiment of process π_1 , and x_2 an experiment of π_2 , and the **query** message of x_1 (sent by π_1) was received and processed by π_2 before it initiated x_2 ; or
- $\exists x : x_1 \prec x \wedge x \prec x_2$ (transitive closure).

See Figure 3(b) for examples. The \prec relation between experiments is asymmetric in that it is impossible for two experiments x_1 and x_2 that both $x_1 \prec x_2$ and $x_2 \prec x_1$ hold. However, neither may hold, and we say that the experiments are *concurrent*. We call an experiment of some process π a *reversing experiment* iff (1) the experiment terminated; (2) just before the experiment π supported c for some $c \in C$; and (3) right after the experiment π supported c' , with $c' \neq c$.

A *consistent cut* CC of the execution of a protocol is a collection of its reversing experiments, such that if an experiment is a member of CC , then so are all reversing experiments that precede it according to the partial order \prec defined above. **The protocol has decided c iff the execution contains a consistent cut CC in which more than two-thirds of processes support c after their last experiment in CC .** We say that CC supports c in that case.

For illustration we describe a specific instance of **ProtoConsensus**, a protocol that we call *Texel*.³ We use $C = \{\mathbf{red}, \mathbf{blue}\}$ (that is, the protocol is binary) and $n = 3f + 1$ processes ($f > 0$). If c is an element of C , then by \bar{c} we denote the opposing candidate value of c . In Figure 3(a), we show the specification of *Texel*. Process π maintains two variables:

- \mathcal{N}_π , an unbounded collection of *nonces*. These collections are disjoint, *i.e.*, $\pi \neq \pi' \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}_\pi \cap \mathcal{N}_{\pi'} = \emptyset$. Nonces are not ordered in any way.
- vs_π : the vote state of process π , either **SUPPORTING**(c) or **EXPERIMENTING**($c, nonce, tallies[]$). Here c is an element of C , $nonce$ an element in \mathcal{N}_π before the experiment started, and $tallies[]$ a two-element array of non-negative integers such that $tallies[\mathbf{red}] \leq f \wedge tallies[\mathbf{blue}] \leq f$. Initially, $vs_\pi = \mathbf{SUPPORTING}(c_\pi)$, where c_π is the proposal of process π .

At any time, a process π with $vs_\pi = \mathbf{SUPPORTING}(c)$ can set vs_π to **EXPERIMENTING**($c, nonce, tallies[]$), starting a new experiment (**transition experiment**($\pi, c, nonce, tallies[]$) in Figure 3(a)). Here

- $nonce$ is an arbitrary element of \mathcal{N}_π , and removed from \mathcal{N}_π so it cannot be reused. (The cardinality of \mathcal{N}_π remains the same, so no notion of ordering can be derived from its cardinality);
- $tallies[c] = 1$ and $tallies[\bar{c}] = 0$.

As part of this **experiment** transition, process π broadcasts a $\langle \mathbf{query}, \pi, nonce \rangle$ message to its $3f$ peers (no self-delivery). The nonce serves to recognize response messages to this specific **query**.

In **ProtoConsensus** protocols, processes are not allowed to respond to queries if they are experimenting themselves. In *Texel* this is enforced by terminating an experiment upon receipt of a **query** message before responding. Thus when processing a $\langle \mathbf{query}, source, nonce \rangle$ message (**transition processQuery** in Figure 3(a)), a process π' with $vs_{\pi'} = \mathbf{EXPERIMENTING}(c', \cdot, \cdot)$ aborts its experiment by setting $vs_{\pi'} := \mathbf{SUPPORTING}(c')$. If π' already has $vs_{\pi'} = \mathbf{SUPPORTING}(c')$, then it leaves its state unchanged. In either case, π' sends $\langle \mathbf{response}, nonce, c' \rangle$ to *source*.

On receipt of $\langle \mathbf{response}, nonce, c' \rangle$ (**transition processResponse**), π transitions as follows:

- if $vs_\pi = \mathbf{EXPERIMENTING}(c, nonce, tallies[])$ and $tallies[c'] = f$, then π sets $vs_\pi := \mathbf{SUPPORTING}(c')$;
- if $vs_\pi = \mathbf{EXPERIMENTING}(c, nonce, tallies[])$ and $tallies[c'] < f$, then process π transitions to **EXPERIMENTING**($c, nonce, tallies'[]$) such that $tallies'[c'] = tallies[c'] + 1$, and $tallies'[\bar{c}] = tallies[\bar{c}]$;
- in all other cases, the process ignores the message and remains in the same state.

An experiment by a correct process is guaranteed to terminate—termination requires at most $2f$ responses, and there are $3f$ peers to provide them of which at most f are faulty.

5 Correctness

Because *Texel* does not have rounds, it does not support Round Vote Safety. Instead, *Texel* and other protocols in **ProtoConsensus** satisfy the following important invariant:

Consistent Cut Vote Safety: If a consistent cut supports c , then no process π that supports c on that cut can subsequently run a reversing experiment.

³Texel (Lat. 53.017, Long. 4.798), pronounced *Tessel*, is a charming Dutch island, well north of the charming Greek island of Paxos (Lat. 39.199, Long. 20.184).

Proof Suppose not, and let CC be a consistent cut that supports c and x be the first subsequent reversing experiment by a process π supporting c , setting vs_π to $\text{SUPPORTING}(c')$, $c' \neq c$. At the start of x , π broadcasts a $\langle \text{query}, \pi, \text{nonce} \rangle$, using a previously unused *nonce*. If received by some process π' , then processing must be after all experiments of π' in CC (if not, and processing happens before some experiment x' by π' in CC , then $x \prec x'$ and x must be part of CC , contradicting that x follows CC). Before setting vs_π to $\text{SUPPORTING}(c')$, π must have received more than f responses containing a value other than c . Since there are only $3f$ peers of π and at least $2f$ of its peers must have been supporting c in CC , at least one of the supporting processes in CC must have finished a reversing experiment before x . This contradicts that x is the first reversing experiment. ■

Next we show that Texel supports Consistency and Non-triviality, and is Non-blocking under \mathcal{F} .

Theorem 5 *Texel satisfies Consistency.*

Proof We have to prove that, in any execution, if two consistent cuts support c_1 and c_2 resp., then $c_1 = c_2$. Suppose not, and consider an execution in which there exists two consistent cuts CC_1 and CC_2 , with $2f + 1$ processes that support c_1 in CC_1 and $2f + 1$ processes that support c_2 in CC_2 , $c_1 \neq c_2$. Because there are only $3f + 1$ processes, there must be f processes that are supporting c_1 in CC_1 and c_2 in CC_2 . Since the experiments at a single process are totally ordered, each of these processes has had a reversing experiment, contradicting Consistent Cut Vote Safety. ■

Theorem 6 *Texel satisfies Non-triviality.*

Proof We have to show that from any undecided implementation state s either candidate value can be decided. We will construct an execution from s that decides (wlog) **red**:

1. from s , start experiments on all idle processes so that all processes are experimenting.
2. deliver all **query** messages to all processes. In Texel, an experimenting process that receives a **query** aborts its experiment without changing its vote. Because none of these experiments are reversing, the state is still undecided. Thus at least $f + 1$ processes must have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\text{red})$ and $f + 1$ must have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\text{blue})$ (because if only f processes had $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(c)$, then $2f + 1$ processes would have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\bar{c})$ and \bar{c} would be decided, contradicting that the state is undecided).
3. start experiments on all processes that have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\text{blue})$, deliver the corresponding **query** messages to the processes that have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\text{red})$, and deliver the corresponding responses. This causes all experiments to be reversing, and all corresponding processes to have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\text{red})$.

Now that all processes have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\text{red})$, and the state consisting of all experiments forms a consistent cut, **red** is decided. ■

Theorem 7 *Texel is Non-blocking under \mathcal{F} .*

Proof Consider any undecided implementation state s of the protocol and suppose f processes have failed. We show that there exists a deciding execution that does not involve the failed processes. Because there are $2f + 1$ correct processes and only two candidate values, there must be at least $f + 1$ correct processes that have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(c)$ or $vs_\pi = \text{EXPERIMENTING}(c, \cdot, \cdot)$ for some $c \in C$. Wlog., assume $c = \text{red}$. The deciding execution is then as follows:

1. from s , start experiments on all idle correct processes so that all correct processes are experimenting.
2. deliver all **query** messages to all correct processes. This causes experiments on correct processes to finish, but none will be reversing. At this time all correct processes will be idle. Because no experiment is reversing, the state is still undecided and at least $f + 1$ correct processes have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\mathbf{red})$.
3. start experiments on all correct processes that have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\mathbf{blue})$, deliver the corresponding **query** messages to the correct processes that have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\mathbf{red})$, and deliver the corresponding responses. This causes all running experiments on correct processes to be reversing, and all those processes to have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\mathbf{red})$.

Now that $2f + 1$ processes have $vs_\pi = \text{SUPPORTING}(\mathbf{red})$, **red** is decided. ■

Texel is a refinement of **NonblockingConsensus**. A refinement mapping could be as follows:

The Texel protocol is in a **DECIDED**(c) state if the execution contains a consistent cut CC that supports c . If no such consistent cut exists, the implementation state is undecided. If the implementation state is undecided and there exists a continuation of the execution that decides c with only f or fewer processes making transitions, but it takes more than f processes to decide any c' , $c' \neq c$, then the protocol is in a **PREDECIDED**(c) state. If no such continuation exists, the implementation state is **OPEN**.

From Theorems 5, 6, and 7 it is easy to see that this mapping is well-defined. Consequently, all transitions taken by the protocol either correspond to transitions in **NonblockingConsensus** or are *stutter transitions* (*i.e.*, transitions that leave the state of **NonblockingConsensus** unchanged). In particular, any process transition that leaves the implementation state undecided must correspond to a **predecide**, a **revert**, or a stutter transition, depending on how the implementation state changes. A process transition that causes the first existence of a consistent cut that supports c must be a **decide**(c) transition, while all future process transitions are stutter transitions.

6 Discussion

6.1 Rounds versus Consistent Cuts

Rounds generalize synchronous *communication-closed layers* [9] for asynchronous environments. The *basic round model* was formalized in [8], and later extended by papers such as [11, 6]. An elegant way of structuring fault tolerant asynchronous distributed algorithms, rounds are totally ordered and uniquely identified by round numbers. In a round, a process exchanges messages with other processes and takes an execution step before proceeding to another round. At the same point in time, different processes may be executing in different rounds. Each process maintains the round number of the round that it is in, and tags messages with this number. Messages received early (*i.e.*, with a round number higher than the round number of the receiving process) are buffered and delivered when the process reaches that round, while messages received late are discarded. In [8], the authors propose a *Global Stabilization Time* after which no messages arrive late, making it possible to guarantee termination properties.

Instead of rounds, Texel and other protocols in the **ProtoConsensus** class use consistent cuts defined on partially ordered experiments run by individual processes. Processes do not agree on

rounds and corresponding round numbers. Without a round number, Texel processes have no way of detecting and delaying delivery of early messages. We show that indeed it is not possible to derive a round number from the state that a Texel process keeps. To wit, a process π maintains only its vote and a set of nonces in between experiments. The cardinality of this set remains unchanged throughout protocol runs and cannot be used to derive a round number. During an experiment, a process also uses a counter to count responses and a nonce to match responses to the experiment’s query. Both are forgotten after the experiment and thus cannot be used to derive a round number either.

A previous approach to reduce synchronization among processes in consensus protocols was to let processes be involved in multiple rounds simultaneously [15]. Our approach eliminates rounds altogether, further reducing constraints on processes.

6.2 Learning and Termination

A practical implementation of Texel must provide a fault-tolerant way for processes to learn the outcome of a decision by determining if there exists a consistent cut along which $2f + 1$ processes are supporting the same candidate value c . One approach is to associate a *Vector Clock* [23] with each vote. A vector clock is a vector with an integer entry for each process and is a compact representation of causal relationships. Each process π has its own copy VC_π , initialized to all zeroes, associated with its initial vote. When π starts an experiment, it increments $VC_\pi[\pi]$, and piggybacks the new vector clock on the experiment’s **query** message. On receipt of $\langle \mathbf{query}, \pi, \text{nonce}, VC_\pi \rangle$ by a process π' , π' sets $VC_{\pi'}$ to $\max(VC_{\pi'}, VC_\pi)$ (the pairwise maximum of $VC_{\pi'}$ and VC_π). When the experiment ends, π associates its vote with its current vector clock. A *learner* periodically queries all processes for votes along with the associated vector clocks. If the learner receives votes from a set of processes Π such that $\forall \pi, \pi' \in \Pi : VC_{\pi'}[\pi] \leq VC_\pi[\pi]$, then it knows that it has collected votes from some consistent cut. Moreover, if $|\Pi| > 2f$ and the votes are unanimously for some candidate value c , then the learner learns that c has been decided.

Texel does not coordinate progress toward termination (*i.e.*, that learners eventually learn a decision). For a pragmatic **ProtoConsensus** protocol, chances of termination need to be significantly improved, for example, by having **ProtoConsensus** transitions be guided by messages sent by a weakly elected leader that attempts to have only processes in the minority run experiments, have them query the majority, and then vote for their candidate to forge a decision. Such a strategy would make a decision likely, but may still fail.

To go further and guarantee termination, the asynchronous execution model needs to be extended with an *oracle* that eventually constrains when to perform enabled transitions in order to forge a decision, such as the weak ordering oracles described in [21]. (Texel is reminiscent of the R-Consensus or OneThirdRule protocol [21, 6, 22], which also uses $3f + 1$ processes but is round-based.) Non-blockingness under \mathcal{F} guarantees that terminating executions exist, and hence such oracles can be defined, but doing so is outside the scope of this paper.

6.3 Byzantine Failures

The protocols we have described tolerate up to f crash or omission failures. We briefly describe how they can be generalized for Byzantine failures. To tolerate f Byzantine failures, a Byzantine Texel protocol would need $5f + 1$ processes communicating using authenticated links. The protocol decides when more than $3f$ *correct* processes support a particular value (which can only be learned if more than $4f$ processes *claim* to be supporting that value—up to f processes may be lying).

A process can change its vote c if in an experiment it learns that more than $2f$ processes are supporting a candidate value other than c . This rule ensures Consistent Cut Vote Safety because if $3f + 1$ correct processes support c , then at most $2f$ can claim to support a value other than c . The protocol resembles Bosco [24] but does not use rounds.

It is easy to see that Byzantine Texel satisfies Non-triviality. To see why the protocol is Non-blocking under \mathcal{F} , consider an undecided state. Because there are at least $4f+1$ correct processes and the protocol is binary, there are $2f + 1$ correct processes supporting the same value c . The remaining correct processes could each do an experiment and end up voting for c themselves, causing c to be decided (and, importantly so, causing c to be learnable). (While the protocol is Non-blocking under \mathcal{F} , an adversary that controls the order in which Texel transitions happen can easily prevent the protocol from deciding. Again, an oracle is required to ensure termination.)

A Byzantine-tolerant protocol that uses only $3f + 1$ processes can be constructed by applying the translation method of [14] to the crash-tolerant Texel protocol. Prior translation methods for asynchronous systems such as described in [3] and [7] work only for round-based protocols. While the resulting protocol still has no rounds of voting on a candidate value, the mechanisms of [14] does require processes to maintain monotonically increasing counters.

7 Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated the existence of a class of asynchronous consensus protocols, **ProtoConsensus**, that is fundamentally different from prior published consensus protocols in that it does not use rounds. We have derived **ProtoConsensus** through stepwise refinement from a simple specification of consensus. For purposes of illustration, we have described Texel, a simple protocol in this class. While Texel is not a pragmatic protocol for $f > 1$ (for $f = 1$ Texel decides after at most one reversing experiment), it represents a different breed of fault tolerant asynchronous consensus protocols that provides new insight into the consensus problem and merits further study. For example, because **ProtoConsensus** protocols do not have to agree on round numbers, they appear candidates for self-stabilizing protocols (protocols that would, however, not satisfy **NonblockingConsensus**).

References

- [1] M. Abadi and L. Lamport. The existence of refinement mappings. In *Proc. of the Third Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 165–175, Edinburgh, UK, July 1988. IEEE.
- [2] M. Ben-Or. Another advantage of free choice: Completely asynchronous agreement protocols. In *Proc. of the 2nd ACM Symp. on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 27–30, Montreal, Quebec, August 1983. ACM SIGOPS-SIGACT, ACM Press.
- [3] G. Bracha. Asynchronous Byzantine agreement protocols. *Information and Computation*, 75(2):130–143, November 1987.
- [4] G. Bracha and S. Toueg. Resilient consensus protocols. In *Proc. of the 2nd ACM Symp. on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 12–26, Montreal, Quebec, August 1983. ACM SIGOPS-SIGACT.
- [5] M. Castro and B. Liskov. Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance. In *Proc. of the 3rd Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI'99)*, New Orleans, LA, February 1999. USENIX.

- [6] B. Charron-Bost and A. Schiper. The Heard-Of model: computing in distributed systems with benign failures. *Distributed Computing*, 22(1):49–71, 2009.
- [7] B.A. Coan. A compiler that increases the fault-tolerance of asynchronous protocols. *Transactions on Computers*, 37(12):1541–1553, 1988.
- [8] C. Dwork, N. Lynch, and L. Stockmeyer. Consensus in the presence of partial synchrony. *J. ACM*, 35(2):288–323, April 1988.
- [9] T. Elrad and N. Francez. Decomposition of distributed programs into communication-closed layers. *Science of Computer Programming*, 2(3), April 1982.
- [10] M.J. Fischer, N.A. Lynch, and M.S. Patterson. Impossibility of distributed consensus with one faulty process. *J. ACM*, 32(2):374–382, April 1985.
- [11] E. Gafni. Round-by-round fault detectors (extended abstract): unifying synchrony and asynchrony. In *Proceedings of the 17th annual ACM symposium on Principles Of Distributed Computing*, pages 143–152, Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, 1998.
- [12] R. Guerraoui, N. Knezevic, V. Quema, and M. Vukolic. The next 700 BFT protocols. In *Proc. of the 5th ACM European conf. on Computer systems (EUROSYS'10)*, Paris, France, April 2010.
- [13] R. Guerraoui and M. Raynal. The Information Structure of Indulgent Consensus. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 53(4):453–466, 2004.
- [14] C. Ho, D. Dolev, and R. Van Renesse. Making distributed systems robust. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference On Principles Of Distributed Systems (OPODIS'07)*, number 4878 in Lecture Notes on Computer Science, Guadeloupe, West Indies, December 2007. Springer-Verlag.
- [15] M. Hurfin, A. Mostéfaoui, M. Raynal, and R. Macêdo. A consensus protocol based on a weak failure detector and a sliding round window. In *Proc. of the 20th Symp. on Reliable Distributed Systems*. IEEE, 2001.
- [16] L. Lamport. Time, clocks, and the ordering of events in a distributed system. *Comm. of the ACM*, 21(7):558–565, July 1978.
- [17] L. Lamport. The part-time parliament. *Trans. on Computer Systems*, 16(2):133–169, 1998.
- [18] Z. Milosevic, M. Hutle, and A. Schiper. Unifying Byzantine consensus algorithms with weak interactive consistency. In *13th Int. Conf. On Principles Of Distributed Systems*, Nimes, France, December 2009.
- [19] A. Mostefaoui, S. Rajsbaum, and M. Raynal. A versatile and modular consensus protocol. In *Proc. of the Int. Conf. on Dependable Systems and Networks*, Washington, DC, June 2002.
- [20] A. Mostefaoui and M. Raynal. Solving consensus using Chandra-Toueg’s unreliable failure detectors: A general quorum-based approach. In *Distributed Computing*, volume 1693 of *Lecture Notes on Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, January 1999.

- [21] F. Pedone, A. Schiper, P. Urbán, and D. Cavin. Solving agreement problems with weak ordering oracles. In *Proc. of the 4th European Dependable Computing Conference (EDCC-4)*, number 2485 in Lecture Notes on Computer Science, pages 609–613, Toulouse, France, October 2002. Springer-Verlag.
- [22] O. Rütli, Z. Milosevic, and A. Schiper. Generic construction of consensus algorithms for benign and Byzantine faults. In *Proc. of the 40th International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks*, Chicago, IL, May 2010.
- [23] R. Schwarz and F. Mattern. Detecting causal relationships in distributed computations: In search of the holy grail. *Distributed Computing*, 7(3):149–174, March 1994.
- [24] Y.J. Song and R. Van Renesse. Bosco: One-step Byzantine asynchronous consensus. In *Proc. of the 22nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC'08)*, number 5218 in Lecture Notes on Computer Science, Arcachon, France, September 2008. Springer-Verlag.
- [25] Y.J. Song, R. Van Renesse, F.B. Schneider, and D. Dolev. The building blocks of consensus. In *Proc. of the 9th International Conf. on Distributed Computing and Networking*, Kolkata, India, January 2008.
- [26] P. Zieliński. Optimistically Terminating Consensus: All asynchronous consensus protocols in one framework. In *5th International Symposium on Parallel and Distributed Computing (ISPDC'06)*, Timisoara, Romania, July 2006. IEEE.