

Stabilizing Agreement is Impossible in Delayed Message Passing Models

STEPHAN FELBER[†] and HUGO RINCON GALEANA[‡], TU Wien, Austria

Most distributed computing research has focused on terminating problems like consensus and similar agreement problems. Non-terminating problems have been studied exhaustively in the context of self-stabilizing distributed algorithms, however, which may start from arbitrary initial states and can tolerate arbitrary transient faults. Somehow in-between is the stabilizing consensus problem, where the processes start from a well-defined initial state but do not need to decide irrevocably and need to agree on a common value only eventually. Charron-Bost and Moran studied stabilizing consensus in synchronous dynamic networks controlled by a message adversary. They introduced the simple and elegant class of min-max algorithms, which allow to solve stabilizing consensus under every message adversary that (i) allows at least one process to reach all other processes infinitely often, and (ii) does so within a bounded (but unknown) number of rounds. Moreover, the authors proved that (i) is a necessary condition. The question whether (i) is also sufficient, i.e., whether (ii) is also necessary, was left open. We answer this question by proving that stabilizing consensus is impossible if (ii) is dropped, i.e., even if some process reaches all other processes infinitely often but only within finite time. We accomplish this by introducing a novel class of arbitrarily delayed message adversaries, which also allows us to establish a connection between terminating task solvability under some message adversary to stabilizing task solvability under the corresponding arbitrarily delayed message adversary. Finally, we outline how to extend this relation to terminating task solvability in asynchronous message passing with guaranteed broadcasts, which highlights the asynchronous characteristics induced by arbitrary delays.

CCS Concepts: • **Computer systems organization** → **Fault-tolerant network topologies**; • **Networks** → **Network properties**; • **Theory of computation** → **Distributed algorithms**; *Randomness, geometry and discrete structures.*

Additional Key Words and Phrases: distributed systems, dynamic networks, dynamic graphs, message adversaries, stabilizing agreement, asynchronous message passing

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the DMAC project (P32431) [†], [‡], the Doctoral College Resilient Embedded Systems, which is run jointly by the TU Wien’s Faculty of Informatics and the UAS Technikum Wien [‡], and the financial support of Najla Amira Ochoa Leonor [‡]. We would like to thank Ulrich Schmid and Kyrill Winkler for their helpful remarks, which undoubtedly improved this paper.

1 INTRODUCTION

Agreement tasks, and in particular consensus, have always been a cornerstone for distributed computing, not only because of its practical applicability, but also because agreement tasks characterize very precisely the computational limits of a distributed system model. Understanding such limitations does not only enable us to analyze particular models, but also sheds new light on the impact that certain properties, such as synchrony, impose on the system. The celebrated FLP impossibility result for instance [11] shows the effect of both asynchrony and crash-resilience on consensus solvability. Similarly, other properties such as the presence of byzantine faults [18], link-failures [4], in the context of synchronous message passing [8, 23, 24], and even in the context of asynchronous shared memory [16] impair consensus solvability.

Although research in distributed systems has mainly focused on *terminating* distributed tasks, there exist interesting applications and problems that are inherently *non-terminating*. For instance, asymptotic consensus [3, 5], stabilizing consensus [1, 7], and approximate consensus [6, 9] are distributed tasks where processes are explicitly not required to terminate on a fixed final value, but they should rather eventually and continuously converge to stable configurations. Such tasks

are not only of a theoretical interest, but are also essential for implementing practical distributed problems such as clock synchronization [17, 22] and sensor fusion [2].

In this paper we focus on stabilizing agreement, a non-terminating instance of consensus. As with consensus, in stabilizing agreement, each process starts with its own input value and eventually all processes must agree on a common value from the set of input values. A fundamental difference is that while in terminating consensus each process must eventually output a fixed decision, in stabilizing agreement processes can change their decision value *finitely often*. However, it is required that all processes eventually stabilize on the *same* value.

More specifically, we analyze stabilizing agreement in the synchronous message adversary setting. In this setting processes communicate in a round-by-round fashion by sending messages through uni-directional links at each round. However, not all of the communication links are available at each round. This is abstracted by modeling the dynamic network as a directed graph sequence. Charron-Bost and Moran [7] provided a class of algorithms, called MinMax Algorithms, for solving stabilizing agreement in the context of synchronous message adversaries given just two constraints: (i) there exists a process (also known as a perpetual broadcaster) that is able to reach all other process infinitely often, and (ii) the broadcasting time (in terms of rounds) is bounded by an unknown constant k . Charron-Bost and Moran showed that (i) is necessary for solving stabilizing agreement under synchronous message adversaries, while at the same time they leave the open question of whether or not (i) is also sufficient for solving stabilizing agreement.

In this paper we provide a synchronous message adversary model, the Delayed Lossy-Link Model, that satisfies (i), but where stabilizing consensus is impossible, thus negatively answering Charron-Bost and Moran's open question. Furthermore, we show that there is an equivalence between stabilizing tasks in the Delayed Lossy-Link Model, and terminating tasks in the Lossy-Link model. This equivalence implicitly shows a computability trade-off between termination and delay-freedom within the scope of synchronous message passing and, to the best of our knowledge, draws a "diagonal" equivalence between models and tasks.

In the last section, we follow the intuition that arbitrary delays introduce enough uncertainty to eliminate the advantages of synchronous models and reduce it to a newly introduced asynchronous version.

We define the Broadcastable Asynchronous Message Passing Model where we assume that processes are embedded in a system with a linear global time, but do not have access to a global clock. Processes communicate by sending messages through uni-directional links taking steps defined by a protocol in a step-by-step fashion. In contrast to the round-by-round execution of asynchronous message passing, we assume that steps (also called asynchronous rounds) happen at different global time points. In contrast to other asynchronous message passing models, such as the $\mathcal{AMP}_{n,f}$ analyzed by Raynal and Stainer [19], we do not assume eventual delivery of sent messages but require, that at any given time, some process will eventually be able to broadcast, (possibly via message relays) to all other processes.

1.1 Contributions and Paper organization

First, in Section 1 we provide a brief overview of agreement tasks and stabilizing tasks in general. We also describe our main contributions and overall paper structure while also referencing and showcasing some of the relevant existing related work.

In Section 2 we provide a precise computational model for processes as well as the general setting for Message Adversaries in the synchronous message passing system. In this section we also include the model for Broadcastable Asynchronous Message Passing.

In Section 3 we briefly recall the Min-Max algorithms introduced by Charron-Bost and Moran, and we also introduce some original definitions that will be necessary for stating the main results.

We also provide a Min-Max algorithm extension that allows stabilizing agreement to be solved whenever the dynamic diameter is functionally-bounded.

In Section 4 we establish our main results, namely, the stabilizing agreement impossibility for the Delayed Lossy-Link model, and the equivalence between terminating tasks in the Lossy-Link model, and the Delayed Lossy-Link model. We also show that the Delayed Lossy-Link model is equivalent to the Broadcastable Asynchronous Message Passing model with 2 processes.

Finally in Section 6 we revisit our main results and formulate some corresponding insights regarding stabilizing tasks, termination and synchrony. We also list some research directions and open questions that we consider that might be interesting to focus on future related work.

1.2 Related Work

Interest in stabilizing tasks, and in particular stabilizing agreement in a dynamic network is fairly recent. To the best of our knowledge, the work presented by Charron-Bost and Moran [7] constitutes the first findings regarding stabilizing agreement in the synchronous message adversary setting.

We briefly touch upon the crash-resilient asynchronous message passing model $\mathcal{AMP}_{(n,f)}$ studied by Raynal and Stainer [19]. Our main focus in the asynchronous setting however, is directed to a novel asynchronous message passing model, namely the broadcastable asynchronous message passing model \mathcal{BAMP}_n .

2 THE MODEL OF COMPUTATION

We consider a set of n processors $\Pi = \{p_1, p_2, \dots\}$ with unique id's $p.id$. Processes execute a distributed protocol \mathcal{P} , modeled as a state machine $\langle \text{states}, \text{inits}, (T, S) \rangle$, where states is the set of states, $\text{inits} \subseteq \text{states}$ is the set of initial states, S^r maps a state to one message intended for all other processes and T^r maps a state and a set of received messages to a new state. Processes are initially *passive*, meaning they do not perform any transitions and are also not aware of passing rounds. A vector of states containing one state per process is called a configuration C^r , a sequence of configurations is called a run, usually denoted by σ, ρ . The initial configuration is denoted by $C^0 = (\text{state}_{p_1}^0, \text{state}_{p_2}^0, \dots)$ denoting the external problem *inputs*.

We model the full history independently of the underlying model as a rooted directed acyclic graph (abbreviated as DAG), called the *view* view_p of process p . The leafs are initial states and internal nodes ψ_q represent process q state transitions where ψ_q 's children $\text{children}(\psi_q)$ are messages p received in that step. The length of a view $|\text{view}_p|$ denotes its longest path (i.e., the amount of vertices in it). We can restrict the view of process p to the view p has of q , denoted by $\text{view}_p|_q$, defined as the largest q -rooted sub-DAG in $\text{view}_p|_q \in \text{view}_p$. We set that the sub-DAG must be a true subset, implying that $\text{view}_p|_p \neq \text{view}_p$ denotes p 's view before the last step. Further, $\text{view}_p|_d$ denotes p 's view d steps ago, i.e., d repeated view restrictions $\text{view}_p|_p \dots |_p$. For example, procedure 1 maintains a view independent of the underlying model.

Procedure 1 maintains a view for a process, given its received messages for this step. We recognize that this construction requires some sort of round tags for each added node in order to distinguish nodes of the same process of different rounds, but spare it for the sake of simplicity. We assume that every process broadcasts its own view, and initially assigns the task-specific input value to it.

The considered computational models $\mathcal{AMP}_{n,f}$, \mathcal{BAMP} and \mathcal{SMP} all produce runs and only differ in the adversarial modeling. $\mathcal{AMP}_{n,f}$ and \mathcal{BAMP} are similar in the sense that there is no synchrony available, but whereas $\mathcal{AMP}_{n,f}$ guarantees message delivery under the threat of f benign crashes, \mathcal{BAMP} only guarantees eventual indirect broadcasts but process cannot crash.

Procedure 1: update(Messages : {view_p, ...})

```

1  Wp ← ({p}, ∅)
   /* A p-rooted DAG with no other nodes */
2  foreach viewx ∈ Messages do
3  |   V(Wp) ← V(Wp) ∪ V(viewx)
4  |   E(Wp) ← E(Wp) ∪ (p, x) ∪ E(viewx)
5  return W
    
```

2.1 Synchronous Message Passing SMP_n

Starting rounds for each process are provided in the vector $\text{start} \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})^\Pi$ where $\text{start}(p)$ denotes the first round where p takes a step, start_p may be ∞ in the case when p stays passive forever. A run is *active* iff all processes eventually wake up. Once a process p becomes active in every round it may send messages to other processes. Processes communicate by exchanging messages through unidirectional links in a round by round fashion where not every sent message arrives. We represent the round communication by a directed graph $\mathbb{G} = \langle \Pi, E \rangle$ where the vertices $p, q \in V(\mathbb{G})$ (abbreviated as $p, q \in \mathbb{G}$), correspond to set of processes Π and are connected via an edge $(p, q) \in E(\mathbb{G})$ (abbreviated as $p \rightarrow q \in \mathbb{G}(r)$) iff the message sent from process p to process q arrives in round r . We call such a graph \mathbb{G} a *round communication graph*. Rounds are *communication-closed* in the sense that a message which did not arrive in a round will also not arrive in any later round. In \mathbb{G}^a we restrict the round graph to the active processes, i.e., in $E^a(\mathbb{G}^a(r))$ we only keep edges from and to already active processes. By $In_p^a(\mathbb{G})$ we denote the set of incoming active neighbors of process p $In_p^a(\mathbb{G}) = \{q \mid p \leftarrow q \in \mathbb{G}^a\}$.

An infinite sequence of communication graphs $\mathbb{G}(r) = \langle \Pi, E_r \rangle$, where $r \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the current round, is a *communication pattern* or a *dynamic graph* and a set of communication patterns is called a *network model*, *communication predicate*, or a *message adversary*, we will use the latter here.

As every process is deterministic, a run is completely determined by an initial configuration C^0 together with a communication pattern $\mathbb{G}(r)$ and a starting round vector start :

$$\text{state}_p^{r+1} = \begin{cases} T_p(\text{state}_p^r, \bigcup_{q \in In_p^a(\mathbb{G}(r))} S_q(\text{state}_q^r)) & \text{if } r \geq \text{start}(p) \\ C_p^0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The round r configuration of a run is denoted by $\text{start} + C^0 \cdot \mathbb{G}(r)$, where start will be omitted iff it is the 1-vector, i.e., all processes start in round 1.

The product of two graphs $\mathbb{G}(r) \circ \mathbb{G}(r)'$ is defined as

$$E(\mathbb{G}(r) \circ \mathbb{G}(r)') = \{p \rightarrow q \mid (\exists q') p \rightarrow q' \in \mathbb{G}(r) \wedge q' \rightarrow q \in \mathbb{G}(r)'\}.$$

We set $\mathbb{G}(r : r') = \mathbb{G}(r) \circ \mathbb{G}(r+1) \circ \dots \circ \mathbb{G}(r')$ and define it to be the graph containing only self loops when $r > r'$ and $\mathbb{G}(r : r) = \mathbb{G}(r)$ by its definition. We extend this definition from the natural numbers to ∞ by defining

$$\overline{\mathbb{G}}(r) = \mathbb{G}(r : \infty) = \langle V(\mathbb{G}(r)), \bigcup_{r' \geq r} E(\mathbb{G}(r')) \rangle,$$

denoted as the *integral graph* $\overline{\mathbb{G}}$. Intuitively $\mathbb{G}(r : \infty)$ collects all possible message chains starting from round r .

With this we define the limit superior of a graph sequence by $\mathbb{G}(\infty) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{G}(r : \infty)$ containing all edges appearing in infinite rounds.

in particular, the graph $\overline{\mathbb{G}(\infty)}$ is equal to the transitive closure of $\mathbb{G}(\infty)$, $\overline{\mathbb{G}(\infty)} = [\mathbb{G}(\infty)]^+$. We call the round $\text{stro}_{\mathbb{G}(r)}$ starting from which only edges from $\mathbb{G}(\infty)$ appear, the *stabilization round*, $\text{stro}_{\mathbb{G}(r)} = \min\{r \mid (\forall r' > r) \mathbb{G}(r') \subseteq \mathbb{G}(\infty)\}$. Note that after the stabilization round, every edge 'appears infinitely often', i.e., for every edge $p \rightarrow q$ in round $r > \text{stro}_{\mathbb{G}(r)}$ there exists a round $r' > r$ such that p reaches q again.

We call process p a root of a graph $\mathbb{G}(r)$ iff there is an edge from p to all other processes in $\mathbb{G}(r)$. The set of root processes is called the *root component* and the graph is called rooted, if its root component is non-empty. We call the *kernel* $\text{Ker}(\mathbb{G})$ of a dynamic graph $\mathbb{G}(r)$ the set of processes that reach all other processes infinitely often

$$\text{Ker}(\mathbb{G}) = \{p \mid (\forall q)p \rightarrow q \in \overline{\mathbb{G}(\infty)}\},$$

and its members are called *perpetual broadcaster* of the communication pattern $\mathbb{G}(r)$.

Additionally we set $\mathbb{G}(r, r')$ to be the restriction of the sequence \mathbb{G} to the rounds r to r' $\mathbb{G}(r, r') = (\mathbb{G}(r), \mathbb{G}(r+1), \dots, \mathbb{G}(r'))$, where $\mathbb{G}(r, r')$ is the graph containing only self-loops if $r > r'$ and $\mathbb{G}(r, r') = \mathbb{G}(r)$ when $r = r'$. If $\mathbb{G}(r)$ is a finite prefix, we denote its length by $|\mathbb{G}(r)| \in \mathbb{N}$, *end* is the last index, so $\mathbb{G}(\text{end})$ is the last communication graph. This also extends the previous notion, so $\mathbb{G}(r; \text{end})$ denotes the sub-sequence starting from r to the end.

In *SMP*, one layer in a view corresponds to one round and is a subset of the round communication graph. We say a specific graph sequence *induces* a view at round r , written as $\mathbb{G} : \text{view}_p^r$, iff the view produced via procedure 1 is equal to $\mathbb{G} : \text{view}_p^r$ at round r , assuming a trivial starting vector. Here we can see a view as a graph sequence, where we model rounds where the processes are unsure whether sent messages arrived as silent rounds. We index the resulting graph sequence by the amount of rounds *passed*, so the current round is round $\text{view}_p(0)$, the previous round is $\text{view}_p(-1)$ and so on. Note that both representations are equi-expressible and can be, in the case of *SMP*, translated into each other. We say the view of process p is *certain* up to round R , if p can fully reconstruct the active communication graph sequence \mathbb{G}^a up to round R . This is possible if, and only if, p knows what all other processes have received up to round R .

2.2 Asynchronous Message Passing $\mathcal{AMP}_{n,f}$

Processes again communicate by exchanging messages through unidirectional links, albeit without any bound on the time it takes the message to arrive. Processes also take steps asynchronously considering their current state together with all messages received since the last transition. Additionally, we allow f processes to silently crash, meaning they do not change their state anymore and cease to send any additional messages.

We assume that there exists a linear, global time \mathbb{T} , not available to the processes, which is frequently assumed to be either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{N} . We model the time it takes a message to arrive at a process via a fair (i.e., any sent message eventually arrives) *message schedule* $\text{msched} : \Pi \times \Pi \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$, mapping a sender, a recipient and a message to a point in time when the message arrives. Process transitions are determined by a fair (i.e., any correct process takes an infinite amount of steps) process *schedule* $\text{sched} : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \Pi \cup \{\perp\}$, mapping a point in time to the process taking a step considering all previously received messages. \perp denotes that at this point no process transitions. Given a point in time t , we denote the next time point where p is scheduled by $\text{next}_p(t) = \min\{u > t \mid \text{sched}(u) = p\}$. Similarly, the set of time instants where p has already taken a step by the given time t is denoted by $\text{past}_p = \{u \leq t \mid \text{sched}(u) = p\}$, and $\text{prev}_p(t) = \max(\text{past}_p(t))$ denotes the time of the previous step. By $\text{In}_p(t)$ we denote the set of messages process p has received since p 's

last step, defined as

$$In_p(t) = \bigcup_{q \in \Pi} \{(u, q) \in \text{past}_q(t) \times q \mid \text{prev}_p(t) < \text{msched}(q, p, u) \leq \text{next}_p(t)\}.$$

Process crashes are modeled in a process-indexed crash-vector $\text{crash} \in (\mathbb{T} \cup \{\infty\})^\Pi$ where $\text{crash}(p)$ denotes the point in time where p crashes. $\text{crash}(p) = \infty$ denotes a *correct*, i.e., non-crashing process. $\text{prev}_p(t) = \emptyset$ iff p has not yet taken any steps and $\text{next}_p(t) = \emptyset$ iff p has crashed by the time t .

As every process is deterministic, a run is completely determined by an initial configuration C^0 together with a message schedule msched , schedule sched and a crash-vector crash :

$$\text{state}_p^t = \begin{cases} T_p(\text{state}_p^{\text{prev}_p(t)}, \bigcup_{(u,q) \in In_p(t)} S_q(\text{state}_q^u)) & \text{if } \text{prev}_p(t) \neq \emptyset \wedge t < \text{crash}(p) \\ C_p^0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

We define the influence relation $p \xrightarrow[t, t']{t'} q$ to formalize the intuition that process p reaches process q via a causal message chain and therefore *influences* q 's state.

DEFINITION 1 (INFLUENCE). *We say that p at time t influences q at a time s , where $t < s$, iff*

$$p \xrightarrow[t, s]{t'} q \begin{cases} (\exists t' \in [t, s]) s = \text{msched}(p, q, t') \wedge \text{sched}(t') = p \\ (\exists p') (\exists t' \in (t, s]) p \xrightarrow[t', t']{t'} p' \wedge s = \text{msched}(p', q, t') \wedge \text{sched}(t') = p' \end{cases}$$

Views in $\mathcal{AMP}_{n,f}$ do not admit the same correspondence between levels and rounds, nevertheless they can also be built by procedure 1. Again, the view of process p is *certain* up to time t , if p can causally reconstruct the message schedule msched . This is possible if, and only if, p knows what all other processes have received up to time t , i.e., when $q \xrightarrow[t, s]{t'} p$ holds.

2.3 Tasks and stabilizing Tasks

We model classically terminating problems as *tasks*, by mapping valid input vectors (indexed by the processes) to a set of possible output vectors (also indexed by the processes). Formally, a task is a three-tuple $\langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta \rangle$, where the validity map $\Delta : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{O}}$ is computable. Tasks are widely used in the literature to uniformly capture problems in distributed setting, see for example [13, 14, 20].

DEFINITION 2 (TASKS). *A protocol \mathcal{P} solves a task iff for every run σ*

$$(\exists \psi \in \Delta(D_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma(0)))) (\exists r > 0) D_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma(r)) = \psi.$$

Where $D_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a protocol-specific function mapping configurations to vectors in the task-domain.

We will assume that \mathcal{I} is finite. Note that this assumption is not too strong, since many tasks, for instance consensus and agreement tasks in general, can be stated as tasks with an uninterpreted set of values $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, one per process.

Since state machines in our model run indefinitely we indicate termination by setting some defined variable to a value different from usually \perp . We intuitively extend the normal task definition to *stabilizing tasks* by dropping the requirement that processes need to terminate and thus also know *when* to terminate. Instead processes need to just eventually *remain* at one and the same output vector forever and can therefore arbitrarily (but only finitely often), "change their minds". We denote the class of terminating tasks within a model \mathcal{M} as $TERM(\mathcal{M})$.

DEFINITION 3 (STABILIZING TASKS). *A protocol \mathcal{P} solves a task iff for every run σ*

$$(\exists \psi \in \bar{\Delta}(D_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma(0)))) (\exists r' > 0 : \forall r > r') D_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma(r)) = \psi.$$

Note that this way any traditional task immediately extends to a stabilizing task without any further work. For example the *consensus* task interpreted as a stabilizing task is precisely known as the *stabilizing agreement* problem, introduced in Section 3. We denote $STAB(\mathcal{M})$ as the class of stabilizing tasks within a model \mathcal{M} .

Further we also define the notion of *weak f -crash-resilient* tasks, denoting a task that can tolerate f arbitrary crashes.

DEFINITION 4 (WEAK CRASH-RESILIENT TASK/STABILIZING TASK). *We say that a stabilizing task $\langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \overline{\Delta} \rangle$ is f -crash resilient if for any input configuration I_S with a set S of correct processes such that $O_S \in \overline{\Delta}(I_S)$, then for any subset $S' \subset S$ such that $|S'| \geq n - f$, $O_{S'} \in \overline{\Delta}(I_{S'})$.*

Note, for example, that any agreement task can be seen as weakly crash-resilient.

2.4 The Lossy-Link and Delayed Lossy-Link Message Adversaries

We will focus on two particular message adversaries defined on only two processes, i.e. $\Pi = \{\circ, \bullet\}$. First, we will consider a setting where the communication link between \circ and \bullet is allowed to drop at most one message per round. Hence, this model is known as the Lossy-Link Message Adversary. We can also think of it as the message adversary \mathbb{G}^ω where $\mathbb{G} = \{\circ \rightarrow \bullet, \circ \leftarrow \bullet, \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet\}$.

DEFINITION 5 (LOSSY-LINK MESSAGE ADVERSARY). *A graph sequence \mathbb{G} belongs to the Lossy-Link message adversary, abbreviated as LL, iff for any round r , $\mathbb{G}(r) \in \{\circ \rightarrow \bullet, \circ \leftarrow \bullet, \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet\}$*

Note that the Lossy-Link message adversary has a non-empty kernel, as some communication happens in every round and therefore one of the processes is necessarily a perpetual broadcaster. Although consensus is impossible at the Lossy-Link message adversary, we will show that stabilizing agreement is solvable in the Lossy-Link message adversary.

We now consider a slightly different setting where the communication link between \circ and \bullet is indeed allowed to drop both messages during a communication round. Nevertheless, the communication link cannot permanently isolate both processes. It follows that communication between \circ and \bullet must happen infinitely often, albeit with arbitrarily many silence rounds in between. Hence, we call this message adversary the *Delayed Lossy-Link* message adversary.

DEFINITION 6 (DELAYED LOSSY-LINK MESSAGE ADVERSARY). *We say that a graph sequence $\mathbb{G}(r)$ belongs to the Delayed Lossy-Link Message Adversary, abbreviated as DLL, iff for any round r ,*

$$\mathbb{G}(r) \in \mathbb{G} = \{\circ \rightarrow \bullet, \circ \leftarrow \bullet, \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet, \circ \cdots \bullet\},$$

and for any suffix $\mathbb{G}'(r)$ of $\mathbb{G}(r)$, $\mathbb{G}'(r) \neq (\circ \cdots \bullet)^\omega$, where $\circ \cdots \bullet$ denotes the silent round graph and is technically not an element of the graph, but denotes the non-existence of any other edge. Formally $\circ \cdots \bullet \in \mathbb{G}(r) \leftrightarrow \mathbb{G}(r) \cap \{\circ \rightarrow \bullet, \circ \leftarrow \bullet, \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet\} = \emptyset$.

Any communication pattern σ in the DLL is essentially a silence-padded LL communication pattern.

DEFINITION 7 (DELAYED PATTERN). *Let \mathbb{G} be a graph sequence in the DLL message adversary. There exists exactly one graph sequence \mathbb{H} in the LL message adversary together with a sequence of numbers $D = d_1, d_2, \dots$, such that \mathbb{H} padded by D silence rounds every round is equal to \mathbb{G} :*

$$\mathbb{H}(1), \circ \cdots \bullet^{D(1)}, \mathbb{H}(2), \circ \cdots \bullet^{D(2)}, \dots = \mathbb{G}.$$

We call \mathbb{H} the wait-free core of \mathbb{G} and conversely \mathbb{G} is a delayed variant of \mathbb{H} .

As the Delayed Lossy-Link is a 'weaker' (i.e., by containment) than the Lossy-Link message adversary, it directly follows that consensus is also not solvable at the Delayed Lossy-Link message adversary.

We can extend this definition to silence-free (i.e. sub-LL) message adversaries.

DEFINITION 8 (DELAYED MESSAGE ADVERSARY). *Let \mathcal{M} be a 2-process silence-free message adversary, i.e., $\mathcal{M} \subseteq LL$. We define the delayed message adversary of \mathcal{M} , $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$ as*

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}) = \{\sigma \mid (\exists \sigma' \in \mathcal{M}) \sigma' \text{ is the wait-free core of } \sigma\}$$

Note that any delayed message adversary also has a non-empty kernel, however, we will show that stabilizing agreement is not solvable in the Delayed Lossy-Link message adversary.

2.5 The Broadcastable Asynchronous Message Passing Model $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,f}$

The message schedule fairness is a bit too strong for analyzing agreement tasks, even in the presence of $n - 1$ crashes and with just the trivial failure detector. We formalize this claim in the following theorem that shows that any stabilizing agreement task is solvable in the $\mathcal{AMP}_{(n,n-1)}$ model, motivating the introduction of the following, weaker $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,f}$ model.

The previous definition relaxes the validity condition by admitting any partial output that is obtained from crashing a larger valid output.

THEOREM 1. *Let $T = \langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \bar{\Delta} \rangle$ be a weak crash-resilient stabilizing task. Then, T is solvable in the $\mathcal{AMP}_{(n,n-1)}$ model.*

PROOF. Let $\delta : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ be any function that such that $\delta(S) \in \bar{\Delta}(S)$ for any $S \in \mathcal{I}$. Since we assume that T is solvable at some model \mathcal{M} , then there exists a computable map $\delta : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ such that $\delta(S) \in \bar{\Delta}(S)$ for any (partial) input configuration $S \in \mathcal{I}$. Consider the following stabilizing protocol for $\mathcal{AMP}_{(n,n-1)}$:

Algorithm 2: Algorithm that solves a stabilizing task T in $\mathcal{AMP}_{(n,n-1)}$.

```

1 x ← input
2 (viewo, initialStates) ← ( $\emptyset$ , x)
3 decision =  $\delta$ (initialStates)
4 def T(Messages: {(initialStates, viewo), ... }):
5   | (viewo, initialStates) ← update(Messages)
6   | decision ←  $\delta$ (initialStates)
7 def S():
8   | return (viewo, initialStates)
    
```

Let $P \subseteq \Pi$ be the set of non-crashing processes of a run $r \in \mathcal{AMP}_{(n,n-1)}$. Let C be the set of processes that communicate at least once to some process $p \in P$ before crashing. Note that $P \subseteq C$. It follows from the model assumptions of $\mathcal{AMP}_{(n,n-1)}$ that there is a time t_0 after which all processes in P have received all the input values from C either directly or indirectly through other processes in P . It follows from Algorithm 2 that after time t_0 all of the processes in P decide on $\delta(x_C)|_P$, i.e. each process on P decides according to $\delta(x_C)$. It follows from the hypothesis that $\delta(x_C)|_P \in \Delta(x_C)$. Therefore Algorithm 2 solves T .

The reciprocal is trivial, since $\mathcal{AMP}_{(n,n-1)}$ itself is a model where T can be solved as a stabilizing $n - 1$ crash resilient task. \square

In our novel \mathcal{BAMP} , we therefore relax the message delivery condition on `msched` from guaranteed eventual delivery, to the existence of a perpetual broadcaster reaching everybody else infinitely often, called *broadcast-liveness*. Basically Definition 9 mirrors the definition of a perpetual broadcaster, intuitively implying that a broadcast-live message adversary has a non-empty kernel.

DEFINITION 9 (BROADCAST-LIVENESS). *We say that a message schedule msched is broadcast-live iff*

$$(\exists p \in \Pi)(\forall q \in \Pi)(\forall t : \exists s > t) p \xrightarrow[t,s]{} q$$

Naturally, we say that a message schedule is broadcast-live if all of its runs are broadcast-live, leading us to define a novel, generic asynchronous message passing model, the *Broadcast-Live Asynchronous Message Passing* model $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,f}$.

DEFINITION 10 (THE BROADCAST-LIVE ASYNCHRONOUS MESSAGE PASSING MODEL $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,f}$). *We say that a run in an asynchronous message passing setting with n processes, $\sigma \in \mathcal{BAMP}_{n,f}$ iff the message schedule satisfies the Broadcast-Liveness condition Definition 9.*

In Section 5.2 we show that already the $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$ model is equivalent to the DLL message adversary.

3 STABILIZING AGREEMENT

We motivate the stabilizing agreement problem as a weakening of the well known consensus problem. It resembles consensus in the sense that all processes need to agree on a common value, but critically does not require the processes to *know when* they agree. Stabilizing agreement also weakens the 'decision action' from a single-shot event, to sort of a perpetual guessing which eventually needs to converge on the same value.

We model the stabilizing agreement problem as a *stabilizing task* $\bar{\Delta} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{O}}$.

- (1) Validity: the stabilized upon value is the input value of some process.

$$(\forall \phi \in \mathcal{I}) (\forall \psi \in \bar{\Delta}(\phi)) (\exists q \in \Pi) (\forall p \in \Pi) \phi(q) = \psi(p).$$

- (2) Agreement: all processes stabilize on the same value.

$$(\forall \psi \in \mathcal{O}) (\forall p, q \in \Pi) \psi(p) = \psi(q).$$

Our first observation will be the lower bound for stabilizing agreement solve-ability from [7, Theorem 6], stating that stabilizing agreement is impossible in a dynamic graph sequence with an empty kernel.

THEOREM 2 (FROM [7, THEOREM 6]). *There is no algorithm that solves stabilizing agreement in a network model containing a dynamic graph sequence with an empty kernel.*

We refer to the original authors for a rigorous proof. Intuitively, the impossibility stems from the fact that an *empty kernel* sequence partitions the processes into at least two disjoint sets, where they hear of each other only finitely often, i.e., there are no processes able to disseminate information to everybody else infinitely often. As processes may "wake up" arbitrarily late during the run, they can collectively "miss" that window of possible communication and simply never hear of the other processes.

3.1 MinMax-algorithms

In the same paper, Charron-Bost, Moran introduced the very elegant class of MinMax-algorithms, that are specified on just a subset of non-empty kernel sequences, namely any sequence where information distribution is bounded by some number of rounds. Intuitively, this means that silence periods are bounded, albeit by an unknown number.

DEFINITION 11 (FROM [7, DEFINITION 4]). *We call dynamic graph sequence $\mathbb{G}(r)$ rooted with delay T , if for every positive integer r $\mathbb{G}(r : r + T - 1)$ is rooted. $\mathbb{G}(r)$ is rooted with bounded delay if it is rooted with delay for some fixed T .*

A graph sequence that is rooted with bounded delay has a non empty kernel ¹.

PROPOSITION 1 (FROM [7, PROPOSITION 5]). *If $\mathbb{G}(r)$ is a dynamic graph sequence that is rooted with bounded delay T , then there exists a round s , such that*

$$(\forall r \geq s)(\forall p) \text{In}_p(\mathbb{G}(r : r + T)) \cap \text{Ker}(\mathbb{G}) \neq \emptyset.$$

PROOF. As $\mathbb{G}(r)$ is rooted with bounded delay T , we can construct a sequence of roots, one for each round U_1, U_2, \dots , where

$$U_i = \{p \mid (\forall q) p \rightarrow q \in \mathbb{G}(i : i + T - 1)\}.$$

Note that every U_i is non-empty by assumption. We prove that after the stabilization round $\text{stro}_{\mathbb{G}}$, every U_i is a subset of the kernel $U_i \subseteq \text{Ker}(\mathbb{G})$, implying that every process hears from a member of the kernel within T rounds.

Assume not and there exists a round $j > \text{stro}_{\mathbb{G}}$ such that its U_j contains a process $q \in U_j$ that is not part of the kernel $q \notin \text{Ker}(\mathbb{G})$. By the definition of U_j , q is part of the root of $\mathbb{G}(j : j + T)$. As j happens after the stabilization round, every edge of every round graph from j to $j + T$ is 'repeated infinitely' often, i.e., is part of the limit superior $\mathbb{G}(\infty)$. As q is a member of the kernel of $\mathbb{G}(j : j + T)$ there is a path from q to all other processes. As every edge in every path is in $\mathbb{G}(\infty)$, every path is repeated infinitely often (following the definition of $\mathbb{G}(\infty)$), implying q reaches all other processes infinitely often, implying q is part of the kernel, contradicting our assumption. \square

MinMax-algorithms work on dynamic graph sequences bounded by some T , in two separate phases that can be described by two separate update rules. In the first phase (the *min-phase*) the lowest input value is flooded over all processes by broadcasting the smallest value received so far,

$$\text{current_min}_p = \min_{q \in \text{In}_p(\mathbb{G}(1:\Theta))} (x_q)$$

This stabilizes at every process p in some round Θ as there are only finitely many values each process can receive.

Note that processes in the kernel $\text{Ker}(\mathbb{G})$ stabilize on a value that is *at least as large* as all other stabilized values.

Assume not and there exists a process q not in the kernel with a larger value; then q eventually hears from a process in the kernel and updates to a value that is at least as small as the value from the kernel.

In the second phase (the *max-phase*) every process decides on the largest value received over the latest T rounds. We already argued that after round Θ all processes have observed the lowest value they will receive in $\mathbb{G}(r)$ and have stabilized. By choosing the maximum of the received lowest values in the interval $[\Theta + 1, r]$, every process eventually chooses the same maximum, because eventually all processes receive a value from the kernel, which is, after round Θ , the maximum

$$y_p = \max_{q \in \text{In}_p(\mathbb{G}(\Theta+1:r))} (\text{current_min}_q).$$

The round Θ is dependent on the dynamic graph sequence $\mathbb{G}(r)$ and not known to the processes. But, as Θ is fixed, we can approximate it using any function $\Theta(r) : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that both intervals $[1, \Theta(r)]$ and $[\Theta(r) + 1, r]$ grow monotonically. The first phase interval $[1, \Theta(r)]$ only needs to eventually include the actual Θ itself, which is guaranteed as Θ is fixed. The second interval

¹Note that Proposition 1 differs from [7, Proposition 5] in the bound and the proof for it, as [7, Proposition 5] contains a slight mistake: consider the delayed fully connected graph sequence $\mathbb{G}(r) = (\Pi \times \Pi, \emptyset^{T-1})^\omega$. $\mathbb{G}(r)$ has a non-empty kernel $\text{Ker}(\mathbb{G}) = \Pi$ and is bounded by T , but following [7, Proposition 5] we calculate $\text{In}_p(\mathbb{G}(t : t + T(n - n)))$ which is \emptyset for all rounds that are not totally connected.

$[\Theta(r) + 1, r]$ needs to eventually always include a message from the kernel, which is guaranteed by Proposition 1 as T is also fixed.

3.2 Stabilizing agreement in the Lossy-Link Model

Any round graph in the Lossy-Link message adversary has a bounded rootedness of $T = 1$ in the sense of [7, Definition 4] and therefore we can directly employ a MinMax algorithm with a known bound of 1. Rootedness denotes the maximum number of edges in the shortest path between any two processes. Any Lossy-Link graph is trivially rooted.

THEOREM 3. *The Lossy-Link adversary has a rootedness of $T = 1$, meaning every round-graph $\mathbb{G}(r)$ contains at least one process that directly reaches everybody else:*

$$\forall r : \exists p : \forall q : p \rightarrow q \in \mathbb{G}(r).$$

PROOF. By a case analysis on the set of possible round graphs $\{\circ \rightarrow \bullet, \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet, \circ \leftarrow \bullet\}$, where each of them has one process reaching all other processes via a direct edge. \square

This proves that stabilizing agreement is solvable in the non-delayed Lossy-Link message adversary. This stands in sharp contrast to the following section, where arbitrary delays imply impossibility.

4 STABILIZING AGREEMENT IS IMPOSSIBLE IN DELAYED MODELS

The following two sections provide two independent characterizations of stabilizing agreement in the DLL message adversary, both result in an impossibility. First we construct a forever conflicted run directly. Then we equate any terminating task in the LL message adversary with a stabilizing task in the DLL message adversary. As Section 5.1 works with tasks in general, and not specifically with agreement, we believe it is of independent interest.

4.1 Stabilizing Agreement in the DLL Message Adversary

We restrict the proof of impossibility to the two process case given the previously introduced DLL message adversary. So throughout this section, we only consider $\Pi = \{\circ, \bullet\}$ and any sequence is *admissible* iff it is part of the DLL message adversary. By σ we will denote an admissible *infinite* graph sequence, π denotes an admissible *prefix* and following the standard word notation ε denotes the prefix of length 0, which is trivially admissible. We lead this proof by contradiction, so for the remainder of this section, assume there exists a *stabilizing protocol* \mathcal{P} specified on any admissible sequence σ such that it stabilizes in any valid execution where start is just the trivial 1-vector.

Before presenting our first impossibility result, we need to define some concepts and notation that is relevant to the proof.

DEFINITION 12. *We define the following concepts and notation relative to a communication pattern σ , a prefix π , and a stabilizing protocol \mathcal{P}*

- We denote the current decision value of protocol \mathcal{P} in the prefix π of process \circ (resp. \bullet) by $\delta_{\circ}(\pi)$ (resp. $\delta_{\bullet}(\pi)$).
- We denote the stable decision of a process \circ (resp. \bullet) at communication pattern σ is denoted by $\bar{\delta}_{\circ}(\sigma)$ (resp. $\bar{\delta}_{\bullet}(\sigma)$).
- We denote the stable decision configuration at a communication pattern σ by $\bar{\delta}(\sigma)$.

DEFINITION 13 (STABILIZATION ROUND). *We denote the stabilization round of a communication pattern σ under the protocol \mathcal{P} by $\bar{r}(\sigma)$. More precisely:*

$$\bar{r}(\sigma) = \min\{r \mid (\forall r' \geq r) \delta_{\circ}(\sigma(1:r')) = \delta_{\bullet}(\sigma(1:r')) = \bar{\delta}(\sigma)\}.$$

In the following, we will define the concept of *conflicted* prefixes of a communication pattern. The notion of a *conflicted* prefix is closely related to the bi-valency concept. As with bi-valency, this concept also captures the essence of a configuration that is not yet viable as a permanent decision. However, since stabilizing protocols are permitted to change their decisions at any round, then there might be a stable configuration that has a forever bivalent run.

DEFINITION 14 (CONFLICTED PREFIX). *Let \mathcal{P} be a stabilizing protocol, and $T = \langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \overline{\Delta} \rangle$ a stabilizing task. We say that a graph prefix π is conflicted at \mathcal{P} with input configuration C^0 , iff $(C^0 \cdot \pi) \notin \overline{\Delta}(C^0)$.*

In the DLL message adversary, it is crucial to consider the additional uncertainty introduced by the unbounded silence periods. Note that silence periods are unbounded in the DLL message adversary, therefore any protocol that hopes to solve a stabilizing task must eventually after some finite silent period settle on a decision value.

DEFINITION 15 (PATIENT PREFIX). *Let \mathcal{P} be a stabilizing protocol, and $T = \langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \overline{\Delta} \rangle$ a stabilizing task. We say that a graph prefix π is patient at \mathcal{P} with input configuration C^0 , iff for any $k > 0$,*

$$\delta_{\circ}(C^0 \cdot \pi) = \delta_{\circ}(C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^k) \text{ and } \delta_{\bullet}(C^0 \cdot \pi) = \delta_{\bullet}(C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^k).$$

LEMMA 1 (PATIENCE LEMMA). *Let \mathcal{P} be a stabilizing protocol for a task $T = \langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \overline{\Delta} \rangle$, $C^0 \in \mathcal{I}$, and π a graph prefix in the DLL message adversary. There exists $0 \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^k$ is a patient prefix.*

PROOF. Notice that $\pi \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet^{\omega}$ is an admissible execution in the DLL message adversary. Since \mathcal{P} is a stabilizing algorithm, then \circ must eventually stabilize on a decision $\overline{\delta}_{\circ}(C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet^{\omega})$. Note that there must exist a minimal $r_1 \geq 0$ such that

$$(\forall r > r_1) \delta_{\circ}(C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet^r) = \overline{\delta}_{\circ}(C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet^{\omega}).$$

Reciprocally, there must exist a minimal $r_2 \geq 0$ such that

$$(\forall r > r_1) \delta_{\bullet}(C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet^r) = \overline{\delta}_{\bullet}(C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet^{\omega}).$$

Note that $C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet^{r_1}$ is indistinguishable from $C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{r_1}$ to \circ . Symmetrically $C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet^{r_2}$ is indistinguishable from $C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{r_2}$ to \bullet .

Let $k = \max\{r_1, r_2\}$, and consider $\pi' = C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^k$. Note that for any $k', \pi' \cdot k'$ is indistinguishable from $C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet^{k+k'}$ to \circ . Reciprocally $\pi' \cdot k'$ is indistinguishable from $C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet^{k+k'}$ to \bullet .

Since $k + k' \geq k \geq r_1, r_2$; then $\overline{\delta}_{\circ}(C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet^{\omega}) = \delta_{\circ}(\pi' \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{k'}) = \delta_{\circ}(\pi')$. Symmetrically $\overline{\delta}_{\bullet}(C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet^{\omega}) = \delta_{\bullet}(\pi' \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{k'}) = \delta_{\bullet}(\pi')$. It follows that $\pi' = C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^k$ is a patient prefix. \square

Note that Lemma 1 allows us to define the *patience* of a prefix π , with respect to a particular stabilizing protocol \mathcal{P} in the DLL.

DEFINITION 16 (PATIENCE). *Let $C^0 \in \mathcal{I}$ be an input configuration, and π a graph prefix in the DLL, we say that $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is the patience of π with respect to a stabilizing protocol \mathcal{P} , if k is minimal such that $C^0 \cdot \pi \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^k$ is a patient prefix.*

Likewise, we define patient protocols.

DEFINITION 17 (PATIENT PROTOCOL). *Let \mathcal{P} be a stabilizing protocol in the DLL message adversary. We say that \mathcal{P} is patient if the patience of any graph prefix π is 0.*

LEMMA 2. *Let \mathcal{P} be a protocol that solves a stabilizing task T in the DLL message adversary. There exists a patient protocol \mathcal{P}' that solves T .*

PROOF. Consider a graph sequence $\mathbb{G}(r)$. We define inductively a prefix sequence σ' in the following way.

$$\sigma'(0) = \varepsilon; \sigma'(k+1) = \sigma'(k) \cdot \mathbb{G}(k+1) \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{\text{patience}(\sigma'(k) \cdot \mathbb{G}(k+1))}$$

Note that by construction σ' is a sequence of patient prefixes in the DLL. Also from construction σ' converges to a sequence in the DLL, since at each step we append at most a finite amount of silence graphs. Note that from the definition of σ' , $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma'(n)$ cannot have a $\circ \cdots \bullet^\omega$ suffix. Otherwise this would imply that $\mathbb{G}(r)$ also has a $\circ \cdots \bullet^\omega$ suffix, contradicting that $\mathbb{G}(r)$ is an admissible graph sequence in the DLL.

Therefore, we simply set $\delta'(\mathbb{G}(r)) = \delta(\sigma'(r))$. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma'(n) \in \text{DLL}$, then δ' stabilizes in $\mathbb{G}(r)$. \square

THEOREM 4 (STABILIZING AGREEMENT IMPOSSIBILITY IN DLL). *Let \mathcal{P} be an arbitrary stabilizing protocol in the DLL message adversary. There exists a valid communication pattern, σ in DLL, such that \mathcal{P} does not solve stabilizing agreement for σ .*

PROOF. We prove Theorem 4 by contradiction by assuming a protocol \mathcal{P} that solves stabilizing agreement in the DLL message adversary and then we provide an inductive construction of a run that is conflicted infinitely often. More precisely, we define a sequence of patient and conflicted prefixes π_i such that $\pi_i \subsetneq \pi_{i+1}$, and $\cup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_i = \sigma$ is an admissible communication pattern in the DLL message adversary.

Base case: for the base case consider an initial configuration C^0 with differing values $C^0.x_\circ(\varepsilon) \neq C^0.x_\bullet(\varepsilon)$. Due to the validity condition of stabilizing agreement, C^0 is conflicted as both \circ and \bullet must decide on their own value having received no information yet $C^0.y_\circ(\varepsilon) \neq C^0.y_\bullet(\varepsilon)$. Furthermore the empty prefix ε is also patient due to validity and therefore we can define our base case as $\pi_0 = \varepsilon$.

Induction step: assume the patient and conflicted prefix π_k , so for any $r \geq 0$

$$\delta_\circ(\pi_k \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r) \neq \delta_\bullet(\pi_k \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r).$$

It follows from Lemma 1 that there exists an r_1, r_2, r_3 such that $\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{r_1}$, $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{r_2}$, and $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{r_3}$ are patient. Note that for $r = \max\{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$; $\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$, $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$, and $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$ are patient.

We assert that either $\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$, $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$, or $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$ is patient *and conflicted*. Towards a contradiction, let's assume none of the three are conflicted.

Note that $\pi_k \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{r+1}$ is indistinguishable from $\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$ for \circ , implying

$$\delta_\circ(\pi_k \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{r+1}) = \delta_\circ(\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r).$$

Now as $\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$ is patient and by assumption not conflicted, we know that

$$\delta_\circ(\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r) = \delta_\bullet(\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r).$$

Also, for \bullet , $\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$ is indistinguishable from $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$, implying

$$\delta_\bullet(\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r) = \delta_\bullet(\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r).$$

Again, as $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$ is patient and by assumption not conflicted, we know that

$$\delta_\bullet(\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r) = \delta_\circ(\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r).$$

Also for \circ , $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$ is indistinguishable from $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$, implying

$$\delta_\circ(\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r) = \delta_\circ(\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r).$$

Again, as $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$ is patient and by assumption not conflicted, we know that

$$\delta_\circ(\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r) = \delta_\bullet(\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r).$$

Finally, observe that $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r$ is indistinguishable from $\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{r+1}$ for \bullet , implying

$$\delta_\bullet(\pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r) = \delta_\bullet(\pi_k \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^{r+1}).$$

But this contradicts our induction hypothesis that π_k was patient and conflicted!

We set π_{k+1} as any of the prefixes from $\{\pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r, \pi_k \cdot \circ \rightarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r, \pi_k \cdot \circ \leftarrow \bullet \cdot \circ \cdots \bullet^r\}$ that are conflicted. Now consider $\sigma = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k$. Note that σ is a valid communication pattern of the DLL message adversary. Furthermore, since each π_k is a conflicted prefix, then σ is conflicted infinitely often, i.e., never agrees. This contradicts our assumption that \mathcal{P} solves stabilizing agreement. \square

5 EQUIVALENCES TO OTHER MODELS

5.1 Terminating Tasks in the LL message adversary are equivalent to Stabilizing Tasks in the DLL message adversary

Furthermore, we can show that stabilizing tasks in the Delayed Lossy-Link message adversary are equivalent to terminating tasks in the Lossy-Link message adversary. Intuitively this is because the empty graph adds enough uncertainty to effectively disable any waiting strategy and forces protocols to adopt fixed decision values. We prove this by providing two simulating algorithms, one for the Lossy-Link message adversary and one for the Delayed Lossy-Link message adversary, where each simulate a given protocol on the other message adversary. For details and further considerations on correctness of such a simulation, we refer to [10].

We define a procedure rmv that takes a process history $view$ in the DLL message adversary, and outputs a *simulated history* in the Lossy-Link message adversary. In the simulated history $rmv(view)$, the simulating process pretends that discernible silence rounds, i.e. the rounds where it knows that no communication happened, did not occur in the history.

DEFINITION 18 (DISCERNIBLE SILENT ROUND). *Let $view_\circ$ be a history of a process \circ up to a round $k > 0$. We say that a round $r < k$ is discernibly silent for \circ iff \circ there is a round $r < r' \leq k$ such that \circ received a message from \bullet in round r' and neither \circ nor \bullet received a message at round r .*

Note that only a suffix can be non-discernibly silent. As soon as \circ receives a message all previous rounds are either discernibly silent, or turn into rounds where communication happened. Now consider the following procedure rmv which removes all discernibly silent rounds from the given history $view_\circ$. Note that, the view here is seen as a negatively indexed graph sequence. All non-discernible silent rounds, i.e., those where \circ is not sure whether or not they are truly silent rounds, are left untouched.

LEMMA 3 (rmv CORRECTNESS). *Let \mathbb{G} be a graph sequence in the DLL message adversary, and \mathbb{H} its wait-free core. Let $\mathbb{G} : view_\circ^r$ be the history sequence of a process \circ induced by $\mathbb{G}(r)$ and $\mathbb{H} : view_\circ^k$ the history sequence of \circ induced by $\mathbb{H}(k)$. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a R such that for all $r > R$, $rmv(\mathbb{G} : view_\circ^r)$ contains $\mathbb{H} : view_\circ^k$ as a sub-history*

$$(\forall k)(\exists R)(\forall r > R) \mathbb{H} : view_\circ^k \subseteq rmv(\mathbb{G} : view_\circ^r).$$

PROOF. First notice that any view returned by rmv is a valid view induced by a LL sequence. Further note that if process \circ receives a message from \bullet at a round $r + 1$, then \circ can determine all discernibly silent rounds up to round r .

We distinguish two cases. Either \circ receives an infinite amount of messages from \bullet , or not.

Procedure 3: $\text{rmv}(\text{view}_\circ)$

```

1  $\text{simRound} \leftarrow 0$ 
2  $\text{view}'_\circ \leftarrow \varepsilon$ 
3 foreach  $0 \geq r > -|\text{view}_\circ|$  do
4   if  $(\text{view}_\circ(r) \neq \circ \cdots \bullet)$  then
5      $\text{view}'_\circ(\text{simRound}) \leftarrow \text{view}_\circ(r)$ 
6      $\text{simRound} \leftarrow \text{simRound} - 1$ 
7   if  $(\forall r' > r) \text{view}_\circ(r) = \circ \cdots \bullet)$  then
8      $\text{view}'_\circ(\text{simRound}) \leftarrow \circ \rightarrow \bullet$ 
9      $\text{simRound} \leftarrow \text{simRound} - 1$ 
10 return  $\text{view}'_\circ$ 

```

- If \circ receives messages from \bullet infinitely often, then the amount of discernibly silent rounds for \circ grows arbitrarily and thus also the length of $\mathbb{H} : \text{view}_\circ^k$ matching the prefix of $\text{rmv}(\mathbb{G} : \text{view}_\circ^r)$.
- Now assume that \circ receives messages from \bullet only finitely often, then there exists a last round $r + 1$ where \circ receives a message from \bullet . Note that up to round r all silent rounds are discernible and thus for some k $\mathbb{H} : \text{view}_\circ^k$ matches the prefix of $\text{rmv}(\mathbb{G} : \text{view}_\circ^r)$. As no further messages are received by \circ , rmv only appends edges from $\circ \rightarrow \bullet$ starting from k . By assumption, there are no more edges $\circ \leftarrow \bullet$ in $\mathbb{G}(r)$ starting from R , therefore $\mathbb{H}(r)$ has a suffix of \rightarrow^ω starting from k , which matches the output of rmv .

□

THEOREM 5. *Let $T = \langle I, O, \Delta \rangle$ be a task, where I is the set of valid input configurations, O is the set of valid output configurations, and $\Delta : I \rightarrow 2^O$ is the validity map. T is solvable as a terminating task in the Lossy-Link message adversary iff it is solvable as a stabilizing task in the Delayed Lossy-Link message adversary.*

As we will prove Theorem 5 via a simulation algorithm (i.e. a simulation state-machine) we necessarily introduce new states that we deterministically map back to states of the simulated protocol \mathcal{P} via a function D . This slightly changes the validity definition of solving the simulated task T given a run $C^0(\phi), C^1, \dots$ to:

$$(\exists \phi \in \Delta(C^0)) \exists r : D(C^r) = \phi,$$

where the simulators initial state is parameterized by an initial state ϕ of the simulated protocol \mathcal{P} .

Similarly, a simulator *solves* a stabilizing task iff every run $C^0(\phi), C^1, \dots$ stabilizes on one legal configuration:

$$(\exists \phi \in \bar{\Delta}(C^0)) (\exists r' > 0 : \forall r > r') : D(C^r) = \phi.$$

where the simulators initial state is again parameterized by an initial state ϕ of the simulated protocol \mathcal{P} .

PROOF. We prove both directions separately.

Terminating:LL \rightarrow stabilizing:DLL Assume that T is solvable as a terminating task in the Lossy-Link message adversary using the protocol \mathcal{P} and consider the following protocol simulating \mathcal{P} on a valid Lossy-Link communication graph sequence:

Algorithm 4: Algorithm that simulates a LL terminating protocol as a stabilizing protocol in the DLL message adversary. The pseudocode assumes the running process has id \circ .

```

1 (view $_{\circ}$ , initialStates)  $\leftarrow$  ( $\emptyset$ , input)
2 simState  $\leftarrow$  sim $_{\mathcal{P}}$ (view $_{\circ}$ , initialStates)
3 def T(Messages: {(view $_{\circ}$ , initialStates), ... }):
4   | (view $_{\circ}$ , initialStates)  $\leftarrow$  update(Messages)
5   | simState  $\leftarrow$  sim $_{\mathcal{P}}$ (rmv(view $_{\circ}$ ), initialStates)
6 def S():
7   | return (view $_{\circ}$ , initialStates)
    
```

Where *view* is the process communication history, *rmv* is a function that eliminates discernible silent rounds from *view*, and *sim* simulates the execution of a protocol \mathcal{P} with a given history *view*. More precisely:

Procedure 5: *sim*(view $_{\circ}$, initialStates)

```

1 if (view $_{\circ} \neq \emptyset$ ) then
2   | Messages  $\leftarrow$  {S $_{\mathcal{P}}$ (sim $_{\mathcal{P}}$ (view $_{\circ}$  |  $\bullet$ , initialStates),) |  $\bullet \in$  children(view $_{\circ}$ )}
3   | return T $_{\mathcal{P}}$ (sim $_{\mathcal{P}}$ (view $_{\circ}$  |  $\circ$ , initialStates), Messages)
4 else
5   | return initialStates( $\circ$ )
    
```

Note that by Lemma 3 *rmv* produces arbitrary long prefixes of a valid Lossy-Link sequence and \mathcal{P} eventually terminates. By mapping any simulator state to its variable *simState*, $D(q) = q.\text{simState}$ we map the eventually terminated state into $\Delta(\text{input})$.

Stabilizing: DLL \rightarrow Terminating: LL Let us assume that *T* is solvable as a stabilizing task in the DLL message adversary. It follows from Lemma 2 that *T* is solvable via a patient protocol \mathcal{P} . Consider Algorithm 6 where *view $_{\circ}$* is the view of \circ , **update** is the already introduced procedure 1 that updates *view $_{\circ}$* accordingly.

First we will define graph prefixes that are non-viable in an execution tree. Intuitively this tree contains all possible configurations that are not possible terminating configurations according to the task given. In the terminology of bi-valency arguments leaves in the tree are still bivalent configurations where the next round produces only univalent configurations.

DEFINITION 19 (NON-VIABLE EXECUTION TREES). *For a given input configuration ϕ , \mathcal{W}_{ϕ} is the tree of all non-viable prefixes in the Lossy-Link message adversary. If $D_{\mathcal{P}}(\phi \cdot \varepsilon) \in \overline{\Delta}(D_{\mathcal{P}}(\phi))$, then \mathcal{W}_{ϕ} is the empty tree, and ϕ is viable. Otherwise, we assume that ϕ is the root vertex of \mathcal{W}_{ϕ} .*

A finite prefix of a run $\phi \cdot \pi$ is in $V(\mathcal{W}_{\phi})$ iff $\phi \cdot \pi(1 : \text{end} - 1) \in V(\mathcal{W}_{\phi})$ and $D_{\mathcal{P}}(\phi \cdot \pi(1 : \text{end} - 1)) \notin D_{\mathcal{P}}(\phi)$. We define

$$E(\mathcal{W}_{\phi}) = \{(\pi, \pi') \in V(\mathcal{W}_{\phi}) \times V(\mathcal{W}_{\phi}) \mid (\exists G \in \{\circ \rightarrow \bullet, \circ \leftarrow \bullet, \circ \leftrightarrow \bullet\}) \pi' = \pi \cdot G\}$$

Note that for any C^0 , \mathcal{W}_{C^0} must be finite, otherwise via König's Lemma, there must exist an infinite non-viable path in \mathcal{W}_{C^0} , corresponding to an execution that does not stabilize, contradicting that \mathcal{P} solves *T* in the DLL as a stabilizing task.

Assuming patient protocols, we can conclude that after waiting as long as the tallest tree, both processes can terminate.

COROLLARY 1. *Given any input v , after $h_\circ(v)$ rounds, \circ has a view_\circ that is certain up to round r . We distinguish two cases. If $r > h_\circ(v)$, then \circ is certain about the leaf configuration in the non-viable execution tree and can terminate on that decision. Otherwise $r \leq h_\circ(v)$ and \circ the last message \circ has received from \bullet was in round r . As we assume a patient protocol, \circ also has not changed its output after round r and therefore in any run, the first viable configuration has to contain the same decision \circ had in round r . Therefore \circ can also terminate on its current decision.*

Algorithm 6 just formalizes Corollary 1.

Algorithm 6: Algorithm that simulates a DLL stabilizing protocol as a terminating protocol in the LL message adversary. The pseudocode assumes the running process has id \circ .

```

1  $x \leftarrow \text{input}$ 
2  $(\text{view}_\circ, \text{initialStates}) \leftarrow (\emptyset, x)$ 
3  $\text{decision} = \perp$ 
4 def  $T(\text{Messages}: \{(\text{initialStates}, \text{view}_\circ), \dots\})$ :
5   if  $r < h_\circ(x)$  then
6      $(\text{view}_\circ, \text{initialStates}) \leftarrow \text{update}(\text{Messages})$ 
7   else
8      $r \leftarrow \max\{|G| \mid (G \in \mathcal{W}_\phi) G \text{ induces } \text{view}_\circ\}$ 
9      $\text{decision} \leftarrow \text{sim}(\text{view}_\circ |^{r - |\text{view}_\circ|}, \text{initialStates}).y$ 
10 def  $S()$ :
11   return  $(\text{view}_\circ, \text{initialStates})$ 

```

Therefore Algorithm 6 decides on $C^0 \cdot G_1 \dots G_r$ which is a viable graph sequence. This completes the proof that Algorithm 6 solves T . □

COROLLARY 2. *Let \mathcal{M} be a silence-free 2-process model. A task $T = \langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta \rangle$ is solvable in \mathcal{M} iff it is solvable as a stabilizing task in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$.*

PROOF. Let \mathcal{P} be a protocol that solves T as a terminating task in \mathcal{M} . Recall that Algorithm 4 works by adaptively simulating the wait-free core of any communication pattern σ in DLL. Since any communication pattern $\sigma' \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$ has its wait-free core $\mathbb{H}(\sigma) \in \mathcal{M}$, then we can simulate \mathcal{P} using Algorithm 4 to solve T as a stabilizing task in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$.

Reciprocally, if T is solvable as a stabilizing task in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$ via a stabilizing protocol \mathcal{P} , we can use Algorithm 6 to derive a terminating protocol \mathcal{P}' □

Furthermore, only trivial tasks are solvable with termination in the Delayed Lossy-Link message adversary.

THEOREM 6. *Let $T = \langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta \rangle$ be a task that is solvable with termination in the DLL message adversary. Then T can be solved without communication.*

PROOF. Let \mathcal{P} be a protocol that solves T as a terminating task in the DLL message adversary. Let $C^0 = [x_\circ, x_\bullet] \in \mathcal{I}$ be any input configuration. Since \mathcal{P} solves T with termination, then \circ decides some output value y_\circ after some finite round r_1 for graph sequence $\sigma_{(1,3)} = \circ \rightarrow \bullet^\omega$. Reciprocally \bullet must decide some output value y_\bullet after some finite round r_2 for some graph sequence $\sigma_{(2,1)} = \circ \leftarrow \bullet^\omega$. Let $r = \max\{r_1, r_2\}$, and consider some graph sequence σ that includes $\circ \dots \bullet^r$ as a prefix. Notice that σ includes $\circ \dots \bullet^{r_1}$ and $\circ \dots \bullet^{r_2}$ as prefixes. Furthermore, \circ cannot distinguish between

$\circ \cdots \bullet^{r_1}$ and $\circ \rightarrow \bullet^{r_1}$, and \bullet cannot distinguish between $\circ \cdots \bullet^{r_2}$ and $\circ \leftarrow \bullet^{r_2}$. Therefore \mathcal{P} has an output configuration of $\mu = [y_\circ, y_\bullet]$ at graph sequence σ . Since \mathcal{P} solves T , then μ is a valid output configuration. Notice also that both \circ and \bullet computed y_\circ and y_\bullet without receiving any message. Therefore μ can already be computed at round 0. \square

5.2 Delayed Models and Asynchronous Message Passing

We extend our impossibility result into the asynchronous setting underlining the asynchronous nature introduced by arbitrary delays. In particular, we show that stabilizing tasks in the Broadcastable Asynchronous Message Passing model for 2 processes are equivalent to terminating tasks in the Lossy-Link message adversary, and thus via Theorem 5 also equivalent to stabilizing tasks in the delayed Lossy-Link message adversary.

First we provide a stabilizing protocol in the $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$ model that simulates a terminating protocol in the Lossy-Link message adversary.

THEOREM 7. *Let \mathcal{P} be a protocol that solves a terminating task T in LL. There exists a stabilizing protocol \mathcal{P}' that solves T in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$.*

PROOF. We present Algorithm 7 that maps asynchronous view from the $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$ model into a corresponding simulated synchronous view in the LL message adversary. Intuitively, each processes numbers each of their asynchronous steps, and treats them as synchronous rounds. For instance, if process \circ has received a message from \bullet that includes the state of \bullet at step $r - 1$ before \circ starts its step r , then we simulate that \circ received a message from \bullet at round r .

Algorithm 7: Algorithm that simulates a DLL stabilizing protocol in the $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$ model. The pseudocode assumes the running process has id \circ .

```

1 step◦ ← 0
2 (syncView◦, initialStates) ← (∅, input)
3 simState ← sim℘(view◦, initialStates)
4 def T(Messages: {(syncView◦, initialStates, step◦), ... }):
5     step◦ ← step◦ + 1
6     if syncView◦[step◦] = ∅ then
7         | syncView◦[step◦] ← ◦⋯•
8     foreach (syncView•, initialStates, step•) ∈ Messages do
9         | (syncView◦, initialStates) ←
10        | (syncView◦, initialStates) ∪ (syncView•, initialStates)
11        | syncView◦[step•] ← ◦←•
12    simState ← sim℘(rmv(syncView◦), initialStates)
13 def S():
14     return (syncView◦, initialStates, step◦)
    
```

Assume the simulated graph sequence \mathbb{G} inducing syncView_\circ and syncView_\bullet is not an admissible Delayed Lossy Link sequence, i.e., it has an infinite silent suffix. This implies that neither \circ , nor \bullet add an edge to syncView , implying that neither receive another message contradicting broadcast liveness of $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$.

Since \mathcal{P} is a terminating protocol in the LL and $\mathbb{H}(r)$ is the wait-free core of $\mathbb{G}(r)$, then there exists a termination round k at $\mathbb{H}(r)$. This means that \mathcal{P} terminates with the finite prefix $\mathbb{H}(1, k)$.

Since $\mathbb{H}(r)$ is the wait-free core of $\mathbb{G}(r)$, there exists a $k' \geq k$ such that $\mathbb{H}(1, k)$ is the wait-free core of $\mathbb{G}(1, k')$. Let $t_{\circ} = \max\{\sigma_{\rho}(\circ, \rho_{\circ}(i).time) < \infty \mid 0 \leq i \leq k'\}$. Reciprocally $t_{\bullet} = \max\{\sigma_{\rho}(\bullet, \rho_{\bullet}(i).time) < \infty \mid 0 \leq i \leq k'\}$. Now let $t_{max} = \max\{t_{\circ}, t_{\bullet}\}$. From the definition of t_{max} , all of the messages sent up to step k have already been either delivered or dropped. It follows that after time t_{max} , Algorithm 7 will always estimate the wait-free core of finite prefix $\mathbb{G}(1, k')$, $\mathbb{H}(1, k)$. Since $\mathbb{H}(1, k)$ is a terminating prefix for \mathcal{P} , it follows that Algorithm 7 stabilizes at time t_{max} . Since we assume that $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$ is free from Zeno behavior, there exists a finite step s_f that happens after t_{max} for both \circ and \bullet . Finally, this shows that Algorithm 7 stabilizes at both step s_f and at time t_{max} . \square

Finally, we provide a reciprocal protocol for the DLL message adversary that simulates a corresponding valid history in the $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$ model.

THEOREM 8. *Let \mathcal{P} be a protocol that solves a stabilizing task T in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$. There exists a protocol \mathcal{P}' that solves T as a stabilizing task in DLL.*

PROOF. In order to build a simulated history $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$ history, we simply match the current synchronous round to an asynchronous step. Note that processes do not need to introduce the time parameter, since we assume that it is not available to processes. Nevertheless, we are implicitly simulating an "asynchronous" execution where processes always take steps simultaneously and where messages sent at step r are always received before the next step occurs. Furthermore, the protocols are uniquely defined by the transition, sending and deciding functions, none of which depend on the time parameter, since it is not available to processes. Also since the DLL message adversary always has a perpetual broadcaster, then the simulated history in \mathcal{BAMP}_2 also has a perpetual broadcaster, and therefore satisfies the broadcast-liveness condition.

It follows that $\mathcal{P}' = (T_{\mathcal{P}'}, D_{\mathcal{P}'}, S_{\mathcal{P}'}) = \mathcal{P} = (T_{\mathcal{P}}, D_{\mathcal{P}}, S_{\mathcal{P}})$. \square

THEOREM 9. $TERM(LL) \cong STAB(DLL) \cong STAB(\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0})$

PROOF. It follows directly from Theorems 5, 7 and 8. \square

This constitutes, to the best of our knowledge, the first distributed computability equivalence between terminating tasks and non-terminating tasks. Furthermore, it naturally extends not only our stabilizing agreement impossibility result to the $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,f}$ but also any other terminating task impossibility in the Lossy-Link message adversary.

COROLLARY 3. *Let T be a terminating task that is not solvable in the Lossy-Link message adversary. It follows that T is not solvable as a stabilizing task in the $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,f}$ model. In particular stabilizing agreement is not solvable in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,f}$.*

PROOF. Note that any protocol \mathcal{P} that solves T as a stabilizing task in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,f}$ can also be used to solve stabilizing task in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}$ by crashing f processes and forcing a single process to simulate $n - f - 1$ different processes. From Theorem 9 $STAB(\mathcal{BAMP}_{2,0}) \equiv TERM(LL)$, therefore T is not solvable as a stabilizing task in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,f}$. \square

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper we provided the first stabilizing agreement impossibility result in message passing systems where we assume a dynamic communication network, but just a non-empty kernel is guaranteed. While, it has been shown that a non-empty kernel is necessary for solving stabilizing agreement in [7], we prove that it is not sufficient for solving stabilizing agreement.

At the core of the stabilizing agreement impossibility in our newly introduced Delayed Lossy-Link message adversary lies the fact that padding the communication with arbitrary silence rounds greatly impairs the decision power of stabilizing protocols. This is formally shown by Lemma 2, which establishes that any protocol in the Delayed Lossy-Link message adversary should alter its decision only when receiving some message. This protocol limitation in turn enables us to establish the impossibility by building a generalized bivalent configuration proof that prevents stabilization.

Furthermore, the equivalence shown in Theorem 9 sheds a new light on both synchrony and termination, namely that there is a diagonal trade-off between termination in wait-free models, arbitrary silence rounds in synchronous message passing, and broadcast-live asynchrony. Most surprisingly, this equivalence equates the Lossy-Link consensus impossibility to stabilizing agreement impossibility in Synchronous Message Passing with perpetual broadcasters, and stabilizing agreement impossibility in Broadcast-live Asynchronous Message Passing.

Finally, it should be noted that although our DLL message adversary assumes asynchronous starts, this is not the source of the impossibility, and the consensus impossibility still holds when considering synchronous starts. This follows from the fact that protocols in the DLL message adversary are equivalent to patient protocols, which are immune to asynchronous starts by definition.

6.1 Future work

The natural next step would be to understand the implications on self-stabilization and other forms of non-terminating problems in distributed computing. For instance, it would make sense to consider a model where input values are updated dynamically. Although our results do not translate immediately, the fact that MinMax algorithms are able to deal with late starts suggests that an effort in this direction could yield interesting results.

Another interesting direction is to explore further the connection between termination requirements, synchrony assumptions and liveness conditions. In particular, it would be interesting to find a precise correspondence between message adversaries, failure detectors and liveness conditions that would allow us to characterize stabilizing task solvability via strongest message adversaries, weakest failure detectors or weakest liveness conditions [10, 20, 21].

Finally we consider that understanding the role of knowledge within the context of stabilizing tasks might eventually lead to an epistemic characterization of stabilizing agreement tasks in a similar way to the common knowledge characterization of consensus [15]. Furthermore, developing an epistemic logic framework for stabilizing agreement might also prove useful for introducing byzantine failures into our model [12].

REFERENCES

- [1] Dana Angluin, Michael J. Fischer, and Hong Jiang. 2006. Stabilizing Consensus in Mobile Networks. In *Distributed Computing in Sensor Systems*, Phillip B. Gibbons, Tarek Abdelzaher, James Aspnes, and Ramesh Rao (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 37–50.
- [2] Jón Atli Benediktsson and Philip H. Swain. 1992. Consensus theoretic classification methods. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern.* 22, 4 (1992), 688–704. <https://doi.org/10.1109/21.156582>
- [3] Dimitri P. Bertsekas and John N. Tsitsiklis. 1989. *Parallel and Distributed Computation: Numerical Methods*. Athena Scientific, Belmont, MA.
- [4] Martin Biely, Ulrich Schmid, and Bettina Weiss. 2011. Synchronous consensus under hybrid process and link failures. *Theoretical Computer Science* 412, 40 (2011), 5602–5630. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2010.09.032> Stabilization, Safety and Security.
- [5] V.D. Blondel, J.M. Hendrickx, A. Olshevsky, and J.N. Tsitsiklis. 2005. Convergence in Multiagent Coordination, Consensus, and Flocking. In *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. 2996–3000. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2005.1582620>
- [6] Bernadette Charron-Bost, Matthias Függer, and Thomas Nowak. 2015. Approximate Consensus in Highly Dynamic Networks: The Role of Averaging Algorithms. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, Magnús M. Halldórsson, Kazuo Iwama, Naoki Kobayashi, and Bettina Speckmann (Eds.). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 9135. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 528–539. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-47666-6_42
- [7] Bernadette Charron-Bost and Shlomo Moran. 2021. MinMax algorithms for stabilizing consensus. *Distributed Comput.* 34, 3 (2021), 195–206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00446-021-00392-9>
- [8] Étienne Coulouma, Emmanuel Godard, and Joseph G. Peters. 2015. A characterization of oblivious message adversaries for which Consensus is solvable. *Theoretical Computer Science* 584 (2015), 80–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2015.01.024>
- [9] Danny Dolev, Nancy Lynch, Shlomit S. Pinter, Eugene W. Stark, and William E. Weihl. 1986. Reaching approximate agreement in the presence of faults. *J. ACM* 33, 3 (July 1986), 499–516.
- [10] Stephan Felber. 2021. *On the strongest message adversary for directed dynamic networks*. Master’s thesis. Technische Universität Wien, Wien. <https://doi.org/10.34726/hss.2022.87145>
- [11] Michael J. Fischer, Nancy A. Lynch, and Michael S. Paterson. 1985. Impossibility of Distributed Consensus with One Faulty Process. *J. ACM* 32, 2 (April 1985), 374–382. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3149.214121>
- [12] Krisztina Fruza, Roman Kuznets, and Ulrich Schmid. 2021. Fire! Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science, 139–153. <https://doi.org/10.4204/eptcs.335.13> Accepted: 2022-08-04T17:28:43Z.
- [13] Eli Gafni. 2010. Distributed computing: a Glimmer of a theory. In *Algorithms and theory of computation handbook: general concepts and techniques* (2 ed.). Chapman & Hall/CRC, 29.
- [14] Hugo Rincon Galeana, Sergio Rajsbaum, and Ulrich Schmid. 2022. Continuous Tasks and the Asynchronous Computability Theorem. (2022), 27.
- [15] Joseph Y. Halpern and Yoram Moses. 1990. Knowledge and common knowledge in a distributed environment. *J. ACM* 37, 3 (jul 1990), 549–587. <https://doi.org/10.1145/79147.79161>
- [16] Maurice Herlihy and Nir Shavit. 1994. The Asynchronous Computability Theorem for t-Resilient Tasks. *Conference Proceedings of the Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* (08 1994). <https://doi.org/10.1145/167088.167125>
- [17] Jennifer Lundelius and Nancy Lynch. 1984. A New Fault-Tolerant Algorithm for Clock Synchronization. In *Proc. 3rd ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*. 75–88.
- [18] Hammurabi Mendes, Christine Tasson, and Maurice Herlihy. 2014. Distributed Computability in Byzantine Asynchronous Systems. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* (New York, New York) (*STOC '14*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 704–713. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2591796.2591853>
- [19] Michel Raynal and Julien Stainer. 2013. Synchrony weakened by message adversaries vs asynchrony restricted by failure detectors. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM symposium on Principles of distributed computing - PODC '13*. ACM Press, Montréal, Québec, Canada, 166. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2484239.2484249>
- [20] Michel Raynal and Julien Stainer. 2013. Synchrony weakened by message adversaries vs asynchrony restricted by failure detectors. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*. ACM Press, Montréal, Québec, Canada, 166–175. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2484239.2484249>
- [21] Ulrich Schmid, Manfred Schwarz, and Kyrill Winkler. 2018. On the Strongest Message Adversary for Consensus in Directed Dynamic Networks. In *Structural Information and Communication Complexity*, Zvi Lotker and Boaz Patt-Shamir (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 102–120.
- [22] Josef Widder and Ulrich Schmid. 2007. Booting clock synchronization in partially synchronous systems with hybrid process and link failures. *Distributed Computing* 20, 2 (2007), 115–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00446-007-0026-0>

- [23] Kyrill Winkler, Ami Paz, Hugo Rincon Galeana, Stefan Schmid, and Ulrich Schmid. 2023. The Time Complexity of Consensus Under Oblivious Message Adversaries. In *14th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2023) (Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), Vol. 251)*, Yael Tauman Kalai (Ed.). Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, 100:1–100:28. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2023.100>
- [24] Kyrill Winkler, Ulrich Schmid, and Yoram Moses. 2020. A Characterization of Consensus Solvability for Closed Message Adversaries. In *DROPS-IDN/v2/document/10.4230/LIPIcs.OPODIS.2019.17*. Schloss-Dagstuhl - Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.OPODIS.2019.17>

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009

This figure "sample-franklin.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2402.09168v1>