4.1: Introduction

- Coordination in the absence of master-slave relationship
- Failures and how to deal with it
- Distributed mutual exclusion
- Agreement is a complex problem
- Multicast communication
- Byzantine agreement

Assumptions

- Channels are reliable
- The network remains connected
- Process failures are not a threat to the communication
- Processes only fail by crashing
Failure Detectors

- Failure detector is a service that answers queries about the failures of other processes.
- Most failure detectors are **unreliable failure detectors**
  - Returning either *suspected* or *unsuspected*
    - *suspected*: some indication of process failure
    - *unsuspected*: no evidence for process failure
- **Reliable failure detector**
  - Returning either *failed* or *unsuspected*
    - *failed*: detector has determined that the process has failed
    - *unsuspected*: no evidence for failure

Example of an unreliable failure detector

- Each process $p$ sends a 'p is here' message to every other process every $T$ seconds.
- If the message does not arrive within $T + D$ seconds then the process is reported as *Suspected*.
4.2: Distributed Mutual Exclusion

- Problem known from operating systems (there: *critical sections*)
- How to achieve mutual exclusion only with messages

**Application-Level Protocol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enter()</td>
<td>enter critical section – block if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resourceAccesses()</td>
<td>access shared resources in critical section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit()</td>
<td>leave critical section – other processes may enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Essential Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME1: Safety</td>
<td>At most one process may execute the critical section at a time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2: Liveness</td>
<td>Requests to enter and exist the critical section eventually succeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME3: ordering</td>
<td>requests enter the critical section according to the happened-before relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance of algorithms for mutual exclusion

- Bandwidth consumed: proportional to the number of messages sent in each entry and exit operation
- Client delay at each entry and exit operation
- Throughput rate of several processes entering the critical section
- Throughput is measured by the synchronization delay between one process exiting the critical section and the next process entering it
- Short synchronization delay correspond to high throughput
Central Server Algorithm

- Simplest solution
- Request are handled by queues
- Performance
  - Entering the critical section: two messages (*request*, *grant*)
  - Leaving the critical section: one message (*release*)
- Server is performance bottleneck

from *Distributed Systems – Concepts and Design*, Coulouris, Dollimore, Kindberg
Ring Based Algorithm

- Simplest distributed solution
- Arrange processes as ring (not related to physical network)
- A token (permission to enter critical section) is passed around
- Conditions ME1 (safety) and ME2 (liveness) are met
- ME3: → ordering is not fulfilled
- Continuous consumption of bandwidth
- Synchronisation delay is between 1 and \( n \) messages.

from *Distributed Systems – Concepts and Design*, Coulouris, Dollimore, Kindberg
The Algorithm of Ricart and Agrawala

- Mutual exclusion between \( n \) peer processes \( p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n \) which
  - have unique numeric identifiers
  - possess communication channels to one another
  - keep Lamport clocks attached to the messages

- Process states
  - released: outside the critical section
  - wanted: wanting to enter critical section
  - held: being in the critical section

- Each process released immediately answers a request to enter the critical section
- The process with held does not reply to requests until it is finished
- If more than one process requests the entry, the first one collecting the \( n - 1 \) replies is allowed to enter the critical section.
- If the Lamport clocks of the latest messages do not differ, the numeric ID is used to break the tie.
The Algorithm of Ricart and Agrawala

On initialization
state := RELEASED;

To enter the section
state := WANTED;
Multicast request to all processes;
T := request’s timestamp;
Wait until (number of replies received = (N – 1));
state := HELD;

On receipt of a request \(<T_i, p_i>\) at \(p_j\) \((i \neq j)\)
if (state = HELD or (state = WANTED and \((T, p_j) < (T_i, p_i)\)))
then
queue request from \(p_i\) without replying;
else
reply immediately to \(p_i\);
end if

To exit the critical section
state := RELEASED;
reply to any queued requests;
The Algorithm of Ricart and Agrawala

- Mutual exclusion properties
  - ME1 (safety): processes in state \texttt{held} prevent other ones from entering the CS
  - ME2 (liveness): follows from the ordering
  - ME3 (ordering): follows from the use of Lamport clocks

- Cost of gaining access: $2(n - 1)$ messages
  - $n - 1$ for multicast of request
  - $n - 1$ for replies

- Client delay for requesting entry: a round-trip message

- Synchronization delay is one message transmission time
Maekawa’s Voting algorithm

- Reduce the number of messages by asking a subset
- For each process $p_i$ choose a voting set $V_i$ such that
  1. $p_i \in V_i$
  2. $V_i \cap V_j \neq \emptyset$ for all $i,j$
  3. $|V_i| = k$ for all $i$ (fairness)
  4. Each process occurs in at most $m$ voting sets
- Minimal choice of $\max\{m, k\}$ is $k$, $m \in \Theta(\sqrt{n})$.
- The optimal solution can be approximated by placing all nodes in a square matrix and choosing the row and column as voting set.
Maekawa’s Voting algorithm

On initialization
    state := RELEASED;
    voted := FALSE;

For $p_i$ to enter the critical section
    state := WANTED;
    Multicast request to all processes in $V_i$;
    Wait until (number of replies received = $K$);
    state := HELD;

On receipt of a request from $p_i$ at $p_j$
    if (state = HELD or voted = TRUE)
        then
            queue request from $p_i$ without replying;
        else
            send reply to $p_i$;
            voted := TRUE;
        end if

For $p_i$ to exit the critical section
    state := RELEASED;
    Multicast release to all processes in $V_i$;

On receipt of a release from $p_i$ at $p_j$
    if (queue of requests is non-empty)
        then
            remove head of queue – from $p_k$, say;
            send reply to $p_k$;
            voted := TRUE;
        else
            voted := FALSE;
        end if
Maekawa’s Voting algorithm

- Mutual exclusion properties
  - ME1 (safety): follows from the intersections of $V_i$ and $V_j$
  - ME2 (liveness): not guaranteed.
- Sanders improved this algorithm to achieve ME2 and ME3 (not presented here)
- Cost
  - 2$k$ per entry to the critical section
  - $k$ for exit
  - $O(\sqrt{n})$ messages
- Client delay for requesting entry: a round-trip message
- Synchronization delay is a round-trip message
Mutual Exclusion

Fault Tolerance

- What happens when messages are lost
- What happens when process crashes

- All of the above algorithms presented fail
- We will revisit this problem
4.3: Elections

Election Algorithm

- An algorithm for choosing a unique process from a set of processes $p_1, \ldots, p_n$.
- A process *calls the election* if it initiates a run of an election algorithm.
- Several elections could run in parallel where subset of processes are *participants* or *non-participants*.
- We assume processes have numeric IDs and that wlog. the process with the highest ID will be chosen.

Requirements

- **E1: Safety** During the run each participant has either elected $i = \perp$ or elected $i = P$, where $P$ is the non-crashed process with the largest ID.
- **E2: Liveness** All participating processes $p_i$ eventually set elected $i \neq \perp$ or crash.
Ring-Based Election: Algorithm of Chang and Roberts

- Each process $p_i$ has a communication channel to the next process in the ring $p_{(i+1) \mod n}$
- Messages are sent clockwise
- Assumption: no failures occur
- Non-participants are marked
- When a process receives an election message, it compares the identifier
  - If the arrived ID is greater, it forwards it
  - if the arrived ID is smaller and the process participates, it replaces it with its ID
  - if the arrived ID equals the process ID, the process is elected and sends an elected message around (with its ID).

Note: The election was started by process 17. The highest process identifier encountered so far is 24. Participant processes are shown darkened.
Ring-Based Election: Algorithm of Chang and Roberts

- E1 (Safety): follows directly
- E2 (Liveness): follows in the absence of crashes and communication errors
- Worst-case performance if a single node participates in the process
- Time: $3n - 1$ messages for the election
- Not very practical algorithm fault-prone and high communication overhead
- Assumes a-priori knowledge (ring topology)

Note: The election was started by process 17. The highest process identifier encountered so far is 24. Participant processes are shown darkened.
The Bully Algorithm of Garcia & Molina

- The distributed system is assumed to be synchronous
  - i.e. after a timeout period $T$ a missing answer is interpreted as crash
  - reliable failure detector
  - fail-stop model

- Message types
  - $election$: Announces an election
  - $answer$: Answers election message (contains ID)
  - $coordinator$: Announces the identity of the elected process

- Any process may trigger an $election$

- Every process receiving an $election$ messages sends an $answer$ and starts a new one (if it has not started one before).

- If a process knows it has the highest ID (based on the answers) it sends the $coordinator$ message to all processes

- If answers of lower IDs fail to arrive within time $T$ the sender considers itself a coordinator and sends the $coordinator$ message
The Bully Algorithm of Garcia & Molina

- If a process receives an *election* message it sends back an *answer* messages and begins another election — if it has not begun an election.
- If a process knows it has the highest ID it sends the *coordinator* message.
- New arriving processes with higher ID “bully” existing coordinators.
The Bully Algorithm of Garcia & Molina

- E2: liveness condition is guaranteed if messages are transmitted reliably
- E1: safety condition: Not guaranteed if processes are replaced by processes with the same identifier
- different conclusions on which is the coordinator process
- E1 not guaranteed if the timeout value is too small
- In the worst case the algorithm needs $O(n^2)$ messages for $n$ processes
4.4: Multicast communication

- With a single call of \textit{multicast}(g, m) a process sends a message to all members of the group \( g \)
- Using \textit{deliver}(m), received messages are delivered on participating processes
- \textit{Efficiency}
  - Number of messages, transmission time
- \textit{Delivery guarantees}
  - ordering
  - receipt
  - e.g. IP Multicast does not guarantee ordering of success
4.4: Multicast communication

- **System Model**
  - multicast\((g, m)\): sends the message \(m\) to all members of group \(g\)
  - deliver\((m)\): delivers a message to the process (message has been received by lower level)
  - sender\((m)\): sender of a message \(m\) (within the message header)
  - group\((m)\): group of a message \(m\) (within the message header)

- Allowed senders
  - closed group: senders must be members of a group
  - open group: any process can send a message to the group
Basic Multicast

- \(B\text{-}multicast(g, m)\): for each process \(p \in g\), \(send(p, m)\)
- \(B\text{-}deliver(m)\): if message \(m\) is received at \(p\) return the message \(m\)

Ack Implosion

- if too many processes participate
- if \(send\) uses acknowledgments, some of them could be dropped
- then the messages could be retransmitted
- further \(acks\) are lost due to full buffers etc.
Reliable Multicast

- **Safety: Integrity**
  - Every message is delivered at most once
  - Receiver of \( m \) is a member of \( \text{group}(m) \)
  - Sender has initiated a \( \text{multicast}(g,m) \)

- **Liveness: Validity**
  - If a correct process multicasts a message then it eventually delivers \( m \) (to itself)

- **Agreement**
  - If a correct process delivers \( m \) then all other processes eventually deliver \( m \)
Implementing Reliable Multicast over Basic Multicast

On initialization

\[ \text{Received} := \{ \}; \]

For process \( p \) to \( R \)-multicast message \( m \) to group \( g \)

\[ \text{B-multicast}(g, m); \quad \text{// } p \in g \text{ is included as a destination} \]

On \( B \)-deliver\((m)\) at process \( q \) with \( g = \text{group}(m) \)

if \( (m \notin \text{Received}) \)

then

\[ \text{Received} := \text{Received} \cup \{ m \}; \]

if \( (q \neq p) \) then \( \text{B-multicast}(g, m) \); end if

\[ \text{R-deliver} \; m; \]

end if

Each message needs to be sent \(|g|\) times!
Implementing Reliable Multicast over IP Multicast

- **$R$-multicast($g$, $m$)** for sending process $p$
  - Sender increments a (sending) sequence number $S_g^p$ for group $g$ after each message
  - Sequence number sent with message
  - Acknowledgements of all received messages with $\langle q, R_q^g \rangle$ are piggy backed with message
  - Negative Acknowledgments: by received sequence number $R_q^g$ causes retransmission of message

- **$R$-deliver($g$)** for receiving process $q$
  - $R_q^g$ is the sequence number of the latest message it has delivered.
  - It is sent with each acknowledgment and allows the sender (and all receivers) to learn about missing messages
  - Process $q$ delivers a message $m$ (with piggy backed $S$) only if $S = R_q^g + 1$.
  - Messages with $S > R_q^g + 1$ are kept in a hold-back queue
  - Messages with $S < R_q^g + 1$ are erased
  - After delivery $R_q^g := R_q^g + 1$
Hold-Back Queue for Arriving Multicast Messages
Ordered Multicast

- **FIFO Ordering**
  - If a process casts $\text{multicast}(g, m)$ before $\text{multicast}(g, m')$
  - then $m$ is delivered before $m'$
  - in each process of group $g$

- **Causal Ordering**:
  - If $\text{multicast}(g, m) \rightarrow \text{multicast}(g, m')$
  - then $m$ is delivered before $m'$
  - $\rightarrow$ is based only on messages within the group $g$

- **Total Ordering**:
  - If a process delivers $m$ before $m'$
  - then $m$ is delivered before $m'$ on any other process of $g$
4. Coordination and Agreement

4.4. Multicast communication

Total, FIFO and Causal Ordering

- **Total Ordering**
- **FIFO Ordering**
- **Causal Ordering**

![Diagram showing Total, FIFO, and Causal Ordering](image_url)
**Bulletin Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A.Hanlon</td>
<td>Mach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>G.Joseph</td>
<td>Microkernels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A.Hanlon</td>
<td>Re: Microkernels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>T.L’Heureux</td>
<td>RPC performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M.Walker</td>
<td>Re: Mach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **FIFO Ordering**
- **Causal Ordering**
- **Total Ordering**
Implementing FIFO Ordering Multicast

- Use sequence numbers for each message
  - $S^p_g$ for each sender process $p$ and group $g$
  - $R^p_g$ for the last message delivered to process $p$ of group $g$
- Multicast over IP Multicast satisfies FIFO ordering
- Essential components for FIFO ordering:
  - Sender piggy backs $S^p_g$ on the message
  - Receiver checks whether received message satisfies $S = R^q_g + 1$
  - and delivers $m$ and sets $R^q_g := R^q_g + 1$.
  - if $S > R^q_g + 1$ it puts $m$ into the hold-back queue
- In combination of a reliable multicast we obtain a reliable FIFO ordering multicast algorithm
Implementing Total Ordering Multicast with a Sequencer

1. Algorithm for group member $p$

On initialization: $r_g := 0$;

To TO-multicast message $m$ to group $g$
  \[ B\text{-multicast}(g \cup \{ \text{sequencer}(g) \}, \langle m, i \rangle); \]

On B-deliver($\langle m, i \rangle$) with $g = \text{group}(m)$
  \begin{itemize}
  \item Place $\langle m, i \rangle$ in hold-back queue;
  \item \textit{On B-deliver($m_{\text{order}} = \langle \text{"order"}, i, S \rangle$) with $g = \text{group}(m_{\text{order}})$}
    \begin{itemize}
    \item wait until $\langle m, i \rangle$ in hold-back queue and $S = r_g$;
    \item \textit{TO-deliver $m$; }  // (after deleting it from the hold-back queue)
  \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}
  $r_g = S + 1$;

2. Algorithm for sequencer of $g$

On initialization: $s_g := 0$;

On B-deliver($\langle m, i \rangle$) with $g = \text{group}(m)$
  \[ B\text{-multicast}(g, \langle \text{"order"}, i, s_g \rangle); \]
  \[ s_g := s_g + 1; \]
Implementing Total Ordering Multicast using ISIS

- Used in the ISIS toolkit of Birman & Joseph
- Each participating process proposes a sequence number for a message:
  - All proposed message numbers are unique
  - The sender chooses the maximum of all proposals and sends this information (piggy backed with the next messages)
  - This agreed sequence number defines the ordering of the hold-back-queue
  - The smallest elements of the hold-back queue can be delivered as the first element
- Does not imply causal nor FIFO ordering
Implementing Causal Ordering

- Uses vector clocks to keep causal ordering (piggy backed to messages)
- Vector clock $V^g_i[i]$ counts all multicast messages of process $i$ in group $g$
- hold-back queue reflects vector clocks

Algorithm for group member $p_i$ $(i = 1, 2..., N)$

On initialization
$$V^g_i[j] := 0 \ (j = 1, 2..., N);$$

To CO-multicast message $m$ to group $g$
$$V^g_i[i] := V^g_i[i] + 1;$$
$$B$-multicast($g, <V^g_i, m>);$  

On $B$-deliver($<V^g_j, m>$) from $p_j$, with $g = \text{group}(m)$
place $<V^g_j, m>$ in hold-back queue;
wait until $V^g_j[j] = V^g_i[j] + 1$ and $V^g_j[k] \leq V^g_i[k] \ (k \neq j);$  
CO-deliver $m$;  
// after removing it from the hold-back queue  
$$V^g_i[j] := V^g_i[j] + 1;$$
4.5: Consensus

- $n$ processes $p_1, \ldots, p_n$
- at most $f$ processes have arbitrary (Byzantine) failures
- Every process starts in the undecided state and proposes a value $v_i$
- Eventually all correct processes $p_i$
  - choose the decided state
  - and choose the same value $d_i \in \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$
  - and stay in this state
**Consensus Problem**

- **Termination**: Eventually each correct process $p_i$ is decided by setting variable $d_i$.
- **Agreement**: The decision value $d_i$ of all correct processes is the same.
- **Integrity**: If all correct process proposed the same value $v$, then $d_i = v$ for all correct $p_i$.

- Possible decision functions: *majority, minimum, maximum, ...*

- Byzantine failures can cause irritating and adversarial messages.

- System crashes may not be detected.
Byzantine Generals Problem

- $n$ generals have to agree on attack or retreat
- one of them is the commander and issues the order
- at most $f$ generals are traitors (possibly also the commander) and have adversarial behavior
- all correct generals have eventually to agree on the commander decision if he acts correctly

Consensus Problem

- **Termination**: Eventually each correct process $p_i$ is decided by setting variable $d_i$
- **Agreement**: The decision value $d_i$ of all correct processes is the same
- **Integrity**: If the commander is correct then all correct processes choose the commander's proposal
Interactive Consistency

- $n$ processes need to agree on a vector of values
- Each process proposes a value $v_i$
- A correct process eventually decides on a vector $d_i = \{d_{i,1}, \ldots, d_{i,n}\}$ where

$$d_{i,j} = v_j \text{ if } p_j \text{ is correct}$$

**Interactive Consistency**

- **Termination**: Eventually each correct process $p_i$ is decided by setting variable $d_i$
- **Agreement**: The decision value $d_i$ of all correct processes is the same
- **Integrity**: If the $p_j$ is correct then all correct processes $p_i$ set $d_{i,j} = v_j$
The Relationship between Consensus Problems

Assume solutions to Consensus (C), Byzantine generals (BG), interactive consistency (IC)

\[
C_i(v_1, \ldots, v_n) = \text{consensus decision value of } p_i \text{ for proposals } v_i \\
BG_i(j, v) = \text{BG decision value of } p_i \text{ for commander } p_j \text{ proposal } v_j \\
IC_i(v_1, \ldots, v_n)[j] = j\text{-th position of interactive consistency decision vector of } p_i \text{ for proposals } v_i
\]

Solving IC from BG

- In parallel \( n \) Byzantine generals problems are solved
- each process \( p_i \) acts as commander once

\[
IC_i(v_1, \ldots, v_n)[j] = BG_i(v)
\]
The Relationship between Consensus Problems

Solving \( C \) from \( IC \)

- \( \text{majority} \) returns the most often parameter or \( \bot \) if no such value exists
- For all \( i = 1, \ldots, n \)
  \[
  C_i(v_1, \ldots, v_n) = \text{majority}(IC_i(v_1, \ldots, v_n)[1], \ldots, IC_i(v_1, \ldots, v_n)[n])
  \]

Solving \( BG \) from \( C \)

- The commander \( p_j \) sends its proposed value to itself and each other process
- All processes run consensus with the values \( v_1, \ldots, v_n \) received from the commander
- For all \( i = 1, \ldots, n \)
  \[
  BG_i(j, v) = C_i(v_1, \ldots, v_n)
  \]
Consensus in a Synchronous System

- Assume that there are no arbitrary errors
- Given a synchronous distributed systems (fail-stop model)
- Use basic multicast for $f + 1$ rounds
- Multicast all known values of all participants
- $Values^r_i$ denotes the set of proposed variables at the beginning of round $r$
- Reduce communication overhead by multicasting only freshly arrived variables $Values^r_i - Values^{r-1}_i$
- Choose the minimum of all known values as final value
Consensus in a Synchronous System

Algorithm for process $p_i \in g$; algorithm proceeds in $f + 1$ rounds

On initialization

$$Values_i^1 := \{v_i\}; \quad Values_i^0 = \{\};$$

In round $r \ (1 \leq r \leq f + 1)$

$B$-multicast($g$, $Values_i^r - Values_i^{r-1}$); // Send only values that have not been sent

$$Values_i^{r+1} := Values_i^r;$$

while (in round $r$)

{}

On $B$-deliver($V_j$) from some $p_j$

$$Values_i^{r+1} := Values_i^{r+1} \cup V_j;$$

After $(f + 1)$ rounds

Assign $d_i = \text{minimum}(Values_i^{f+1});$
Consensus in a Synchronous System

- There are no arbitrary errors only processes that crash and are correctly detected
- Given a synchronous distributed systems (fail-stop model)
- Correctness
  - Assume that two processes $p_i$ and $p_j$ have different values at round $r$
  - Then, in round $r - 1$ at least one process $p_k$ has sent different values to $p_i$ and $p_j$
  - Then, $p_k$ has crashed in this round
  - Since the number of crashes is limited to $f$ there are not enough crashes to cover each of the $f + 1$ rounds
Byzantine Generals Problem in a Synchronous System

- Assume that there are **Byzantine** errors
- Given a synchronous distributed system
  - crashes are detected
  - other wrong behavior can not detected, e.g. strange messages
- messages are not (digitally) signed
- at most $f$ faulty processes

Impossibility of a solution of the Byzantine generals problem
[Lamport, Shostak, Pease 1982]

- The byzantine generals problem cannot be solved for $n = 3$ and $f = 1$.
- The byzantine generals problem cannot be solved for $n \leq 3f$. 
Impossibility of a solution of the Byzantine generals problem for $n = 3$

- The Byzantine generals problem with arbitrary failures cannot be solved for $n = 3$ and $f = 1$ in a synchronous system.
  - a faulty commander sending different values to his generals
  - cannot be distinguished from a faulty general forwarding wrong values
Solution of the Byzantine Generals Problem

- Assume that there are Byzantine errors
- Given a synchronous distributed system
- Messages are not (digitally) signed
- At most $f$ faulty processes

Solution of the Byzantine generals problem [Pease, Shostak, Lamport 1980]

- The byzantine generals problem can be solved for $n = 4$ and $f = 1$.
- The byzantine generals problem can be solved for $n \geq 3f + 1$. 
Solution for Four Generals and One Faulty Process

- The Byzantine Generals problem can be solved for $n \geq 4$ and $f = 1$.

Algorithm of Pease et al.

1. The commander sends a value to all other generals (lieutenants).
2. All lieutenants send the received value to all other lieutenants.
3. The commander chooses its value; the lieutenants compute the majority of all received values.

- Since $n \geq 4$ the majority function always can be computed if at most one process is faulty.
- If the commander crashes very early then all lieutenants agree on $\perp$. 
More About the Byzantine Generals Problems

- For $f > 1$ the algorithm can be used recursively
  - Complexity: $f + 1$ rounds and $O(n^{f+1})$ messages
  - The time complexity of $f + 1$ rounds is optimal

- With the help of signed messages
  - any number of faulty generals $f < n$ can be dealt with
  - with signed messages the Byzantine Generals problem can be solved in $f + 1$ rounds with $O(n^2)$ messages [Dolev & Strong 1983]

- For asynchronous systems with crash failures
  - No algorithm can reach consensus even if only one processor is faulty [Fischer, Lynch, Paterson 1985]
  - Each algorithm that tries to reach consensus can be confronted with a faulty process which influences the result if it continues (instead of crashing)
End of Section 4