Distributed Algorithms Reliable Broadcast

Prof R. Guerraoui Lpdwww.epfl.ch



De

1

© R. Guerraoui



Broadcast abstractions



Modules of a process



Intuition

- Provide the second of the s
- The subscribers might require some
 reliability guarantees from the broadcast
 service (we say sometimes quality of service
 QoS) that the underlying network does not
 provide

Overview

- We shall consider three forms of reliability for a broadcast primitive
- (1) Best-effort broadcast
- (2) (Regular) reliable broadcast
- (3) Uniform (reliable) broadcast
- We shall give first specifications and then algorithms

Best-effort broadcast (beb)

Events

- Request: <bebBroadcast, m>
- Indication: <bebDeliver, src, m>

• Properties: BEB1, BEB2, BEB3

Best-effort broadcast (beb)

Properties

- **BEB1. Validity**: If pi and pj are correct, then every message broadcast by pi is eventually delivered by pj
- *BEB2. No duplication:* No message is delivered more than once
- *BEB3. No creation:* No message is delivered unless it was broadcast

Best-effort broadcast



Best-effort broadcast



Reliable broadcast (rb)

Events

- Request: <rbBroadcast, m>
- Indication: <rbDeliver, src, m>

• Properties: RB1, RB2, RB3, RB4

Reliable broadcast (rb)

Properties

- *« RB1 = BEB1.*
- *« RB2 = BEB2.*
- *RB3 = BEB3.*
- *RB4. Agreement:* For any message m, if any correct process delivers m, then every correct process delivers m





Reliable broadcast



Uniform broadcast (urb)

Events

- Request: <urbBroadcast, m>
- Indication: <urbDeliver, src, m>

• Properties: URB1, URB2, URB3, URB4

Uniform broadcast (urb)

Properties

- *URB1 = BEB1.*
- *URB2 = BEB2.*
- *C* URB3 = BEB3.
- *URB4. Uniform Agreement:* For any message m, if any process delivers m, then every correct process delivers m

Uniform reliable broadcast



Uniform reliable broadcast



Overview

- We consider three forms of reliability for a broadcast primitive
- (1) Best-effort broadcast
- (2) (Regular) reliable broadcast
- (3) Uniform (reliable) broadcast
- We give first specifications and then algorithms

Algorithm (beb)

Implements: BestEffortBroadcast (beb). **Uses:** PerfectLinks (pp2p). upon event < bebBroadcast, m> do **forall** pi ∈ S do
 trigger < pp2pSend, pi, m>; upon event < pp2pDeliver, pi, m> do r trigger < bebDeliver, pi, m>;

Algorithm (beb)



Algorithm (beb)

Proof (sketch)

- **BEB1. Validity**: By the validity property of perfect links and the very facts that (1) the sender sends the message to all and (2) every correct process that pp2pDelivers a message bebDelivers it
- *BEB2. No duplication:* By the no duplication property of perfect links
- *BEB3. No creation:* By the no creation property of perfect links



Implements: ReliableBroadcast (rb).

Vses:

BestEffortBroadcast (beb).

PerfectFailureDetector (P).

r upon event < Init > do

- \checkmark delivered := \varnothing ;
- correct := S;

r **forall** pi ∈ S **do** from[pi] := \emptyset ;

Algorithm (rb – cont'd)

upon event < rbBroadcast, m> do
 delivered := delivered U {m};
 frigger < rbDeliver, self, m>;

rtrigger < bebBroadcast, [Data,self,m]>;

Algorithm (rb – cont'd)

r upon event < crash, pi > do

- correct := correct \ {pi};
- **✓ forall** $[pj,m] \in from[pi]$ **do**
 - r trigger < bebBroadcast,[Data,pj,m]>;

Algorithm (rb – cont'd)

- upon event < bebDeliver, pi, [Data,pj,m]> do
 - if m ∉ delivered then
 - delivered := delivered U {m};
 - f trigger < rbDeliver, pj, m>;
 - if pi ∉ correct then
 - f trigger < bebBroadcast,[Data,pj,m]>;
 - else
 - from[pi] := from[pi] U {[pj,m]};





Proof (sketch)

- **RB1. RB2. RB3:** as for the 1st algorithm
- **RB4. Agreement:** Assume some correct process pi rbDelivers a message m rbBroadcast by some process pk. If pk is correct, then by property BEB1, all correct processes bebDeliver and then rebDeliver m. If pk crashes, then by the completeness property of P, pi detects the crash and bebBroadcasts m to all. Since pi is correct, then by property BEB1, all correct processes bebDeliver and then rebDeliver m.

Implements: uniformBroadcast (urb).

Vses:

BestEffortBroadcast (beb).

PerfectFailureDetector (P).

r upon event < Init > do

r correct := S;

 \checkmark delivered := forward := \varnothing ;

 \checkmark ack[Message] := \varnothing ;

Algorithm (urb – cont'd)

upon event < crash, pi > do

correct := correct \ {pi};

upon event < urbBroadcast, m> do
 forward := forward U {[self,m]};
 fortigger < bebBroadcast, [Data,self,m]>;

Algorithm (urb – cont'd)

upon event <bebDeliver, pi, [Data,pj,m]> do

- r ack[m] := ack[m] U {pi};
- if [pj,m] ∉ forward then

forward := forward U {[pj,m]};

rtrigger < bebBroadcast,[Data,pj,m]>;

Algorithm (urb – cont'd)

- - delivered := delivered U {m};
 - f trigger < urbDeliver, pj, m>;





37

Proof (sketch)

- *URB2. URB3:* follow from BEB2 and BEB3
- *Constant Contract process pi bebDelivers a message m, then pi eventually urbDelivers m.*
- Any process that bebDelivers m bebBroadcasts m. By the completeness property of the failure detector and property BEB1, there is a time at which pi bebDelivers m from every correct process and hence urbDelivers m.

Proof (sketch)

- **URB1. Validity:** If a correct process pi urbBroadcasts a message m, then pi eventually bebBroadcasts and bebDelivers m: by our lemma, pi urbDelivers m.
- **URB4. Agreement:** Assume some process pi urbDelivers a message m. By the algorithm and the completeness and accuracy properties of the failure detector, every correct process bebDelivers m. By our lemma, every correct process will urbDeliver m.