

Vertical Atomic Broadcast and Passive Replication (Extended Version)

Manuel Bravo

Informal Systems, Madrid, Spain

Gregory Chockler

University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

Alexey Gotsman

IMDEA Software Institute, Madrid, Spain

Alejandro Naser-Pastoriza

IMDEA Software Institute, Madrid, Spain

Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Spain

Christian Roldán

IMDEA Software Institute, Madrid, Spain

Abstract

Atomic broadcast is a reliable communication abstraction ensuring that all processes deliver the same set of messages in a common global order. It is a fundamental building block for implementing fault-tolerant services using either active (aka state-machine) or passive (aka primary-backup) replication. We consider the problem of implementing reconfigurable atomic broadcast, which further allows users to dynamically alter the set of participating processes, e.g., in response to failures or changes in the load. We give a complete safety and liveness specification of this communication abstraction and propose a new protocol implementing it, called Vertical Atomic Broadcast, which uses an auxiliary service to facilitate reconfiguration. In contrast to prior proposals, our protocol significantly reduces system downtime when reconfiguring from a functional configuration by allowing it to continue processing messages while agreement on the next configuration is in progress. Furthermore, we show that this advantage can be maintained even when our protocol is modified to support a stronger variant of atomic broadcast required for passive replication.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Distributed computing models

Keywords and phrases Reconfiguration, consensus, replication

Funding This work was partially supported by the projects BYZANTIUM, DECO and PRODIGY funded by MCIN/AEI, and REDONDA funded by the CHIST-ERA network.

1 Introduction

Replication is a widely used technique for ensuring fault tolerance of distributed services. Two common replication approaches are *active* (aka state-machine) replication [32] and *passive* (aka primary-backup) replication [5]. In active replication, a service is defined by a deterministic state machine and is executed on several replicas, each maintaining a copy of the machine. The replicas are kept in sync using *atomic broadcast* [9], which ensures that client commands are delivered in the same order to all replicas; this can be implemented using, e.g., Multi-Paxos [20].

In contrast, in passive replication commands are executed by a single replica (the *leader* or *primary*), which propagates the state updates induced by the commands to the other replicas (*followers* or *backups*). This approach allows replicating services with non-deterministic operations, e.g., those depending on timeouts or interrupts. But as shown in [3, 16, 18],



© Manuel Bravo, Gregory Chockler, Alexey Gotsman, Alejandro Naser-Pastoriza, and Christian Roldán;

licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

38th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2024).

Editor: Dan Alistarh; Article No. 7; pp. 7:1–7:41



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

implementing it requires propagating updates from the leader to the followers using a stronger primitive than the classical atomic broadcast. This is because in passive replication, a state update is incremental with respect to the state it was generated in. Hence, to ensure consistency between replicas, each update must be applied by a follower to the same state in which it was generated by the leader. Junqueira et al. formalized the corresponding guarantees by the notion of *primary-order atomic broadcast (POabcast)* [17, 18], which can be implemented by protocols such as Zab [17], viewstamped replication [29] or Raft [30].

The above implementations of atomic or primary-order atomic broadcast require replicating data among $2f + 1$ replicas to tolerate f failures. This is expensive: in principle, storing the data at $f + 1$ replicas is enough for it survive f failures. Since with only $f + 1$ replicas even a single replica failure will block the system, to recover we need to *reconfigure* it, i.e., change its membership to replace failed replicas with fresh ones. Unfortunately, processes concurrently deciding to reconfigure the system need to be able to agree on the next configuration; this reduces to solving consensus, which again requires $2f + 1$ replicas [21]. The way out of this conundrum is to use a separate *configuration service* with $2f + 1$ replicas to perform consensus on configurations. In this way we use $2f + 1$ replicas to only store configuration metadata and $f + 1$ replicas to store the actual data. This *vertical approach*, layering replication on top of a configuration service, was originally proposed in RAMBO [26] for atomic registers and in *Vertical Paxos* [22] for single-shot consensus. Since then it has been used by many practical storage systems [2, 7, 10, 13]. These often use reconfiguration not only to deal with failures, but also to make changes to a functional configuration: e.g., to move replicas from highly loaded machines to lightly loaded ones, or to change the number of machines replicating the service [25, 28, 38].

Unfortunately, while the space of atomic broadcast protocols with $2f + 1$ replicas has been extensively explored, the design of such protocols in vertical settings is poorly understood. Even though one can obtain a vertical solution for atomic broadcast by reducing it to Vertical Paxos, this would make it hard to ensure the additional properties required for passive replication. Furthermore, both Vertical Paxos and similar protocols [3] stop the system as the very first step of reconfiguration, which increases the downtime when reconfiguring from a functional configuration. Due to the absence of a theoretically grounded and efficient atomic broadcast protocol for vertical settings, the designs used in industry are often ad hoc and buggy. For example, until recently the vertical-style protocol used in Kafka, a widely used streaming platform, contained a number of bugs in its failure handling [13]. In this paper we make several contributions to improve this situation.

First, we give a complete safety and liveness specification of *reconfigurable atomic broadcast*, sufficient for active replication (§3). We then propose its implementation in a vertical system with $f + 1$ replicas and an external configuration service, which we call *Vertical Atomic Broadcast (VAB)* (§4). In contrast to prior vertical protocols [3, 22], our implementation allows the latest functional configuration to continue processing messages while agreement on the next configuration is in progress. This reduces the downtime when reconfiguring from a functional configuration from 4 message delays in the prior solutions to 0. We rigorously prove that the protocol correctly implements the reconfigurable atomic broadcast specification, including both safety and liveness.

We next consider the case of passive replication (which we review in §5). We propose *speculative primary-order atomic broadcast (SPOabcast)*, which we show to be sufficient for implementing passive replication in a reconfigurable system (§6). A key novel aspect of SPOabcast is that SPOabcast is able to completely eliminate the downtime induced by a *Primary Integrity* property of the existing POabcast [17, 18]. This property requires the

leader of a new configuration to suspend normal operation until an agreement is reached on which messages broadcast in the previous configurations should survive in the new one: in passive replication, these messages determine the initial service state at the leader. Instead, SPOabcast allows the leader to *speculatively* deliver a tentative set of past messages before the agreement on them has been reached, and then to immediately resume normal broadcasting. SPOabcast guarantees that, if a process delivers a message m_2 broadcast by the new leader, then prior to this the process will also deliver every message m_1 the leader speculatively delivered before broadcasting m_2 . This helps ensure that the process applies the update in m_2 to the same state in which the leader generated it, as required for the correctness of passive replication.

We show that SPOabcast can be implemented by modifying our Vertical Atomic Broadcast protocol. The use of speculative delivery allows the resulting protocol to preserve VAB's downtime of 0 when reconfiguring from a functional configuration. It thus allows using Vertical Atomic Broadcast to replicate services with non-deterministic operations.

Overall, we believe that our specifications, protocols and correctness proofs provide insights into the principles underlying existing reconfigurable systems, and can serve as a blueprint for building future ones.

2 System Model

We consider an asynchronous message-passing system consisting of an (infinite) universe of processes \mathcal{P} which may fail by *crashing*, i.e., permanently stopping execution. A process is *correct* if it never crashes, and *faulty* otherwise. Processes are connected by reliable FIFO channels: messages are delivered in FIFO order, and messages between non-faulty processes are guaranteed to be eventually delivered. The system moves through a sequence of *configurations*. A configuration C is a triple $\langle e, M, p_i \rangle$ that consists of an epoch $e \in \mathbb{N}$ identifying the configuration, a finite set of processes $M \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ that belong to the configuration, and a distinguished *leader* process $p_i \in M$. We denote the set of configurations by Config . In contrast to static systems, we do not impose a fixed global bound on the number of faulty processes, but formulate our availability assumptions relative to specific configurations (§3).

Reconfiguration is the process of changing the system configuration. We assume that configurations are stored in an external *configuration service* (CS), which is reliable and wait-free. The configuration service provides three atomic operations. An operation `compare_and_swap`($e, \langle e', M, p_i \rangle$) succeeds iff the epoch of the last stored configuration is e ; in this case it stores the provided configuration with a higher epoch $e' > e$. Operations `get_last_epoch`() and `get_members`(e) respectively return the last epoch and the members associated with a given epoch e .

In practice, a configuration service can be implemented under partial synchrony using Paxos-like replication over $2f + 1$ processes out of which at most f can fail [21] (as is done in systems such as Zookeeper [16]). Our protocols use the service as a black box, and as a result, do not require any further environment assumptions about timeliness [11] or failure detection [6].

3 Specification

In this section we introduce *reconfigurable atomic broadcast*, a variant of atomic broadcast [9] that allows reconfiguration. The broadcast service allows a process to send an *application message* m from a set Msg using a call `broadcast`(m). Messages are delivered using a

7:4 Vertical Atomic Broadcast and Passive Replication

notification `deliver(m)`. Any process may initiate system reconfiguration using a call `reconfigure()`. If successful, this returns the new configuration C arising as a result; otherwise it returns \perp . Each process participating in the new configuration then gets a notification `conf_changed(C)`, informing it about C . In practice, `reconfigure` would take as a parameter a description of the desired reconfiguration. For simplicity we abstract from this in our specification, which states broadcast correctness for any results of reconfigurations.

We record the interactions between the broadcast and its users via *histories* h – sequences of *actions* a of one of the following forms:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{broadcast}_i(m), \quad \text{deliver}_i(m), \quad \text{conf_changed}_i(C), \\ & \text{reconfig_req}_i, \quad \text{reconfig_resp}_i(C), \quad \text{introduction}_i(C), \end{aligned}$$

where $p_i \in \mathcal{P}$, $m \in \text{Msg}$ and $C \in \text{Config}$. Each action is parameterized by a process p_i where it occurs (omitted when irrelevant). The first three actions respectively record invocations of `broadcast`, `deliver` and `conf_changed`. The next pair of actions record calls to and returns from the `reconfigure` function. Finally, the `introduction` action records the moment when this function stores the new configuration in the configuration service.

For a history h we let h_k be the k -th action in h , and we write $a \in h$ if a occurs in h . We also write $_$ for an irrelevant value. We only consider histories where calls to and returns from `reconfigure` match, and a process may perform at most one `introduction` action during the execution of `reconfigure`. For simplicity we assume that all application messages broadcast in a single execution are unique:

$$\forall m, k, l. h_k = \text{broadcast}(m) \wedge h_l = \text{broadcast}(m) \implies k = l. \quad (1)$$

For a history h , a partial function `epochOf` : $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ returns the epoch of the action in h with a given index. This is the epoch of the latest preceding `conf_changed` at the same process:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{epochOf}(k) = e \iff & (\exists i, l, a. h_k = a_i \wedge h_l = \text{conf_changed}_i(\langle e, _, _ \rangle) \wedge l < k \wedge \\ & \forall l'. l < l' < k \implies h_{l'} \neq \text{conf_changed}_i(\langle _, _, _ \rangle)). \end{aligned}$$

When `epochOf`(k) = e , we say that the action h_k occurs in e .

Reconfigurable atomic broadcast is defined by the properties over histories h listed in Figure 1. Properties 1 and 2 are self-explanatory. Property 3 ensures that processes cannot deliver messages in contradictory orders. Property 4 disallows executions where sequences of messages delivered at different processes diverge.

The liveness requirements of reconfigurable atomic broadcast are given by Property 5. Property 5a asserts a termination guarantee for reconfiguration requests. As shown by Spiegelman and Keidar [35], wait-free termination is impossible to support even for reconfigurable read/write registers, which are weaker than atomic broadcast. Hence, the guarantee given by Property 5a is similar to obstruction-freedom [14]. Let us say that a configuration C is *activated* when all its members get `conf_changed(C)` notifications. Property 5a asserts that, in a run with finitely many reconfigurations, the last reconfiguration request invoked by a correct process and executing in isolation must eventually succeed to introduce a configuration C , which must then become activated if all its members are correct. Properties 5b-c state liveness guarantees for the configuration C similar to those of the classical atomic broadcast. Property 5b asserts that any message broadcast by a (correct) member of C eventually gets delivered to all members of C . Property 5c additionally ensures that the members of C eventually deliver all messages delivered by any process in any configuration.

As in prior work [1, 3, 36], the liveness of our protocols is premised on the following assumption, which limits the power of the environment to crash configuration members.

1. Basic Configuration Change Properties.

a. Any epoch e is associated with unique membership and leader:

$$\forall e, i, j, M_1, M_2. \text{conf_changed}(\langle e, M_1, p_i \rangle) \in h \wedge \text{conf_changed}(\langle e, M_2, p_j \rangle) \in h \implies p_i = p_j \wedge M_1 = M_2$$

b. If a process p_i joins a configuration $C = \langle _, M, _ \rangle$, then p_i is a member of M :

$$\forall i, M. \text{conf_changed}_i(_, M, _) \in h \implies p_i \in M$$

c. Processes join configurations with monotonically increasing epochs:

$$\forall e_1, e_2, i, k, l. h_k = \text{conf_changed}_i(e_1, _, _) \wedge h_l = \text{conf_changed}_i(e_2, _, _) \wedge k < l \implies e_1 < e_2$$

d. Any configuration a process joins is introduced; a configuration is introduced at most once:

$$\forall C. (\text{conf_changed}(C) \in h \implies \text{introduction}(C) \in h) \wedge (\forall k, l. h_k = \text{introduction}(C) \wedge h_l = \text{introduction}(C) \implies k = l)$$

2. **Integrity.** A process delivers a given application message m at most once, and only if m was previously broadcast:

$$\forall m, i, k, l. h_k = \text{deliver}_i(m) \wedge h_l = \text{deliver}_i(m) \implies k = l \wedge \exists j. h_j = \text{broadcast}(m) \wedge j < k$$

3. **Total Order.** If some process delivers m_1 before m_2 , then any process that delivers m_2 must also deliver m_1 before this:

$$\forall m_1, m_2, i, j, k, l, l'. h_k = \text{deliver}_i(m_1) \wedge h_l = \text{deliver}_i(m_2) \wedge k < l \wedge h_{l'} = \text{deliver}_j(m_2) \implies \exists k'. h_{k'} = \text{deliver}_j(m_1) \wedge k' < l'$$

4. **Agreement.** If p_i delivers m_1 and p_j delivers m_2 , then either p_i delivers m_2 or p_j delivers m_1 :

$$\forall m_1, m_2, i, j. \text{deliver}_i(m_1) \in h \wedge \text{deliver}_j(m_2) \in h \implies (\text{deliver}_i(m_2) \in h \vee \text{deliver}_j(m_1) \in h)$$

5. **Liveness.** Consider an execution with finitely many reconfiguration requests (**reconfig_req**), and let r be the last reconfiguration request to be invoked. Suppose that r is invoked by a correct process and no other reconfiguration call takes steps after r is invoked. Then r terminates, having introduced a configuration $C = \langle e, M, p_i \rangle$: **reconfig_resp**(C). Furthermore, if all processes in M are correct, then:

- a. all processes in M deliver **conf_changed**(C);
- b. if $p_i \in M$ broadcasts m while in e , then all processes in M eventually deliver m ;
- c. if a process delivers m , then all processes in M eventually deliver m .

■ **Figure 1** Properties of reconfigurable atomic broadcast over a history h .

► **Assumption 1 (Availability).** Let $C = \langle e, M, _ \rangle$ be an introduced configuration, i.e., such that **introduction**(C) $\in h$. Then at least one member of M does not crash before another configuration $C' = \langle e', _, _ \rangle$ with $e' > e$ is activated.

Our protocols use the period of time when some member of M is guaranteed not to crash to copy its state to the members of a new configuration.

Finally, we note that in the case of a single static configuration, our specification in Figure 1 corresponds to the classical notion of atomic broadcast [9].

```

1 epoch  $\leftarrow 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ 
2 new_epoch  $\leftarrow 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ 
3 next  $\leftarrow 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ 
4 init_len  $\leftarrow -1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ 
5 last_delivered  $\leftarrow -1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ 
6 members  $\in 2^{\mathcal{P}}$ 
7 leader  $\in \mathcal{P}$ 
8 msg[]  $\in \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Msg} \cup \{\perp\}$ 
9 status  $\in \{\text{LEADER}, \text{FOLLOWER}, \text{FRESH}\}$ 
10 function broadcast( $m$ ):
11   send FORWARD( $m$ ) to leader
12 when received FORWARD( $m$ ) from  $p_j$ 
13 // function broadcast( $m$ ):
14   pre:  $p_i = \text{leader}$ 
15   msg[next]  $\leftarrow m$ 
16   send ACCEPT( $e, k, m$ )
17     to members  $\setminus \{p_i\}$ 
18     next  $\leftarrow \text{next} + 1$ 
19 when received ACCEPT( $e, k, m$ ) from  $p_j$ 
20   pre: status = FOLLOWER  $\wedge$  epoch =  $e$ 
21   msg[ $k$ ]  $\leftarrow m$ 
22   send ACCEPT_ACK( $e, k$ ) to  $p_j$ 
23 when received ACCEPT_ACK( $e, k$ )
24   from all members  $\setminus \{p_i\}$ 
25   pre: status = LEADER  $\wedge$  epoch =  $e$ 
26   send COMMIT( $e, k$ ) to members
27 when received COMMIT( $e, k$ )
28   pre: status  $\in \{\text{LEADER}, \text{FOLLOWER}\} \wedge$ 
29     epoch =  $e \wedge k = \text{last\_delivered} + 1$ 
30   last_delivered  $\leftarrow k$ 
31   deliver(msg[ $k$ ])

```

■ **Figure 2** Vertical Atomic Broadcast at a process p_i : normal operation.

4 The Vertical Atomic Broadcast Protocol

In Figures 2 and 3 we present a protocol implementing the specification of §3, which we call *Vertical Atomic Broadcast (VAB)* by analogy with Vertical Paxos [22]. For now the reader should ignore the code in blue. At any given time, a process executing the protocol participates in a single configuration, whose epoch is stored in a variable `epoch`. The membership of the configuration is stored in a variable `members`. Every member of a given configuration is either the leader or a *follower*. A `status` variable at a process records whether it is a LEADER, a FOLLOWER, or is in a special FRESH state used for new processes. A `leader` variable stores the leader of the current configuration. We assume that the system starts in an initial active configuration with epoch 0.

Normal operation. When a process receives a call `broadcast(m)`, it forwards m to the leader of its current configuration (line 10). Upon receiving m (line 12), the leader adds it to an array `msg`; a `next` variable points to the first free slot in the array (initially 0). The leader then sends m to the followers in an `ACCEPT(e, k, m)` message, which carries the leader’s epoch e , the position k of m in the `msg` array, and the message m itself.

A process acts on the `ACCEPT` message (line 19) only if it participates in the corresponding epoch. It stores m in its local copy of the `msg` array and sends an `ACCEPT_ACK(e, k)` message to the leader of e . The application message at position k is *committed* if the leader of e receives `ACCEPT_ACK` messages for epoch e and position k from all followers of its configuration (line 22). In this case the leader notifies all the members of its configuration that the application message can be safely delivered via a `COMMIT` message. A process delivers application messages in the order in which they appear in its `msg` array, with `last_delivered` storing the last delivered position (line 25).

Reconfiguration: probing. Any process can initiate a reconfiguration, e.g., to add new processes or to replace failed ones. Reconfiguration aims to preserve the following invariant, key to proving the protocol correctness.

```

29 function reconfigure():
30   var  $e, M, e_{\text{new}}, M_{\text{new}}$ 
31    $e \leftarrow \text{get\_last\_epoch}()$  at CS
32    $e_{\text{new}} \leftarrow e + 1$ 
33   repeat
34     if  $e \geq 0$  then
35        $M \leftarrow \text{get\_members}(e)$  at CS
36       send PROBE( $e_{\text{new}}, e$ ) to  $M$ 
37       wait until received
38         PROBE_ACK( $\_, e_{\text{new}}$ )
39         from a process in  $M$ 
40        $e \leftarrow e - 1$ 
41   until received PROBE_ACK(TRUE,  $e_{\text{new}}$ )
42   from some  $p_j$ 
43    $M_{\text{new}} \leftarrow \text{compute\_membership}()$ 
44   if compare_and_swap( $e_{\text{new}} - 1, (e_{\text{new}}, M_{\text{new}}, p_j)$ )
45     at CS /* introduction( $(e_{\text{new}}, M_{\text{new}}, p_j)$ ) */
46     then
47       send NEW_CONFIG( $e_{\text{new}}, M_{\text{new}}$ ) to  $p_j$ 
48       return  $(e_{\text{new}}, M_{\text{new}}, p_j)$ 
49     else
50       return  $\perp$ 
51
52 when received PROBE( $e_{\text{new}}, e$ ) from  $p_j$ 
53   pre:  $e_{\text{new}} \geq \text{new\_epoch}$ 
54    $\text{new\_epoch} \leftarrow e_{\text{new}}$ 
55   if epoch  $\geq e$  then
56     send PROBE_ACK(TRUE,  $e_{\text{new}}$ ) to  $p_j$ 
57   else
58     send PROBE_ACK(FALSE,  $e_{\text{new}}$ ) to  $p_j$ 
59
60 when received NEW_CONFIG( $e, M$ )
61   from  $p_j$ 
62   pre:  $\text{new\_epoch} = e$ 
63   status  $\leftarrow$  LEADER
64   epoch  $\leftarrow e$ 
65   members  $\leftarrow M$ 
66   leader  $\leftarrow p_i$ 
67   next  $\leftarrow \max\{k \mid \text{msg}[k] \neq \perp\} + 1$ 
68   init_len  $\leftarrow$  next - 1
69   conf_changed( $e, M, p_i$ )
70   // conf_changed( $e, M, p_i,$ 
71     //  $\text{msg}[\text{last\_delivered} + 1.. \text{init\_len}]$ )
72   send NEW_STATE( $e, \text{msg}, M$ )
73   to members  $\setminus \{p_i\}$ 
74
75 when received NEW_STATE( $e, \text{msg}, M$ )
76   from  $p_j$ 
77   pre:  $\text{new\_epoch} \leq e$ 
78   status  $\leftarrow$  FOLLOWER
79   epoch  $\leftarrow e$ 
80   new_epoch  $\leftarrow e$ 
81   msg  $\leftarrow \text{msg}$ 
82   leader  $\leftarrow p_j$ 
83   conf_changed( $e, M, p_j$ )
84   // conf_changed( $e, M, p_j, \perp$ )
85   send NEW_STATE_ACK( $e$ ) to  $p_j$ 
86
87 when received NEW_STATE_ACK( $e$ )
88   from all members  $\setminus \{p_i\}$ 
89   pre:  $\text{new\_epoch} = \text{epoch} = e$ 
90   for  $k = 1.. \text{init\_len}$  do
91     send COMMIT( $e, k$ ) to members

```

■ **Figure 3** Vertical Atomic Broadcast at a process p_i : reconfiguration

► **Invariant 1.** Assume that the leader of an epoch e sends COMMIT(e, k) while having $\text{msg}[k] = m$. Whenever any process p_i has epoch = $e' > e$, it also has $\text{msg}[k] = m$.

The invariant ensures that any application message committed in an epoch e will persist at the same position in all future epochs e' . This is used to establish that the protocol delivers application messages in the same order at all processes.

To ensure Invariant 1, a process performing a reconfiguration first *probes* the previous configurations to find a process whose state contains all messages that could have been committed in previous epochs, which will serve as the new leader. The new leader then transfers its state to the followers of the new configuration. We say that a process is *initialized* at an epoch e when it completes the state transfer from the leader of e ; it is at this moment that the process assigns e to its `epoch` variable, used to guard the transitions at lines 18, 22, 25. Our protocol guarantees that a configuration with epoch e can become activated only after all its members have been initialized at e . Probing is complicated by the fact that there may be a series of failed reconfiguration attempts, where the new leader fails before initializing all its followers. For this reason, probing may require traversing epochs from the current one down, skipping epochs that have not been activated.

In more detail, a process p_r initiates a reconfiguration by calling `reconfigure` (line 29). The process picks an epoch number e_{new} higher than the current epoch stored in the


7:8 Vertical Atomic Broadcast and Passive Replication

configuration service and then starts the probing phase. The process p_r keeps track of the epoch being probed in e and the membership of this epoch in M . The process initializes these variables when it obtains the information about the current epoch from the configuration service. To probe an epoch e , the process sends a `PROBE(e_{new}, e)` message to the members of its configuration, asking them to join the new epoch e_{new} (line 36). Upon receiving this message (line 46), a process first checks that the proposed epoch e_{new} is \geq the highest epoch it has ever been asked to join, which is stored in `new_epoch` (we always have `epoch \leq new_epoch`). In this case, the process sets `new_epoch` to e_{new} . Then, if the process was initialized at an epoch \geq the epoch e being probed, it replies with `PROBE_ACK(TRUE, e_{new})`; otherwise, it replies with `PROBE_ACK(FALSE, e_{new})`.

If p_r receives at least one `PROBE_ACK(FALSE, e_{new})` from a member of e (line 37), p_r can conclude that e has not been activated, since one of its processes was not initialized by the leader of this epoch. The process p_r can also be sure that e will never become activated, since it has switched at least one of its members to the new epoch. In this case, p_r starts probing the preceding epoch $e - 1$. Since no application message could have been committed in e , picking a new leader from an earlier epoch will not lose any committed messages and thus will not violate Invariant 1. If p_r receives some `PROBE_ACK(TRUE, e_{new})` messages, then it ends probing: any process p_j that replied in this way can be selected as the new leader (in particular, p_r is free to maintain the old leader if this is one of the processes that replied).

Reconfiguration: initialization. Once the probing finds a new leader p_j (line 39), the process p_r computes the membership of the new configuration using a function `compute_membership` (line 40). We do not prescribe any particular implementation for this function, except that the new membership must contain the new leader p_j . In practice, the function would take into account the desired changes to be made by the reconfiguration. Once the new configuration is computed, p_r attempts to store it in the configuration service using a `compare_and_swap` operation. This succeeds if and only if the current epoch in the configuration service is still the epoch from which p_r started probing, which implies that no concurrent reconfiguration occurred during probing. In this case p_r sends a `NEW_CONFIG` message with the new configuration to the new leader and returns the new configuration to the caller of `reconfigure`; otherwise, it returns \perp . A successful `compare_and_swap` also generates an `introductionr` action for the new configuration, which is used in the broadcast specification (§3).

When the new leader receives the `NEW_CONFIG` message (line 53), it sets `status` to `LEADER`, `epoch` to the new epoch, and stores the information about the new configuration in `members` and `leader`. The leader also sets `next` to the first free slot in the `msg` array and saves its initial length in a variable `init_len`. The leader then invokes `conf_changed` for the new configuration. In order to finish the reconfiguration, the leader needs to transfer its state to the other members of the configuration. To this end, the leader sends a `NEW_STATE` message to them, which contains the new epoch and a copy of its `msg` array (line 63; a practical implementation would optimize this by sending to each process only the state it is missing). Upon receiving a `NEW_STATE` message (line 64), a process overwrites its `msg` array with the one provided by the leader, sets its `status` to `FOLLOWER`, `epoch` to the new epoch, and `leader` to the new leader. The process also invokes `conf_changed` for the new configuration. It then acknowledges its initialization to the leader with an `NEW_STATE_ACK` message. Upon receiving `NEW_STATE_ACK` messages from all followers (line 74), the new leader sends `COMMITs` for all application messages from the previous epoch, delimited by `init_len`. These messages can be safely delivered, since they are now stored by all members of epoch e .



■ **Figure 4** The behavior of the protocol during reconfiguration.

Example. Figure 4 gives an example illustrating the message flow of reconfiguration. Assume that the initial configuration 1 consists of processes p_1 , p_2 and p_3 . Following a failure of p_3 , a process p_r initiates reconfiguration to move the system to a new configuration 2. To this end, p_r sends $\text{PROBE}(2, 1)$ to the members of configuration 1. Both processes p_1 and p_2 respond to p_r with $\text{PROBE_ACK}(\text{TRUE}, 2)$. The process p_r computes the membership of the new configuration, replacing p_3 by a fresh process p_4 , and stores the new configuration in the configuration service, with p_2 as the new leader. Next, p_r sends a NEW_CONFIG message to p_2 .

Assume that after receiving this message p_2 fails, prompting p_r to initiate yet another reconfiguration to move the system to a configuration 3. To this end, p_r sends $\text{PROBE}(3, 2)$ to the members of configuration 2, and p_4 responds with $\text{PROBE_ACK}(\text{FALSE}, 3)$. The process p_r concludes that epoch 2 has not been activated and starts probing the preceding epoch 1: it sends $\text{PROBE}(3, 1)$ and gets a reply $\text{PROBE_ACK}(\text{TRUE}, 3)$ from p_1 , which is selected as the new leader. The process p_r computes the new set of members, replacing p_3 by a fresh process p_5 , stores the new configuration in the configuration service, and sends a NEW_CONFIG message to the new leader p_1 . This process invokes the `conf_changed` upcall for the new configuration and sends its state to the followers in a NEW_STATE message. The followers store the state, invoke `conf_changed` upcalls and reply with NEW_STATE_ACK s. Upon receiving these, p_1 sends COMMIT s for all application messages in its state.

Steady-state latency and reconfiguration downtime. A configuration is *functional* if it was activated and all its members are correct. A configuration is *stable* if it is functional and no configuration with a higher epoch is introduced. The *steady-state latency* is the maximum number of message delays it takes from the moment the leader p_i of a stable configuration receives a broadcast request for a message m and until m is delivered by p_i . It is easy to see that our protocol has the steady-state latency of 2 (assuming self-addressed messages are received instantaneously), which is optimal [21].

The system may be reconfigured not only in response to a failure, but also to make changes to a functional configuration: e.g., to move replicas from highly loaded machines to lightly loaded ones, or to change the number of machines replicating the service [25,28,38]. As modern online services have stringent availability requirements, it is important to minimize the period of time when a service is unavailable due to an ongoing reconfiguration. More precisely, suppose the system is being reconfigured from a functional configuration C to a

stable configuration C' . The reconfiguration *downtime* is the maximum number of message delays it takes from the moment C is disabled and until the leader of C' is ready to broadcast application messages in the new configuration.

As we argue in §7, existing vertical solutions for atomic broadcast stop the system as the first step of reconfiguration [3], resulting in the reconfiguration downtime of at least 4 (2 message delays to disable the latest functional configuration plus at least 2 message delays to reach consensus on the next configuration and propagate the decision). In contrast, our protocol achieves the downtime of 0 by keeping the latest functional configuration active while the probing of past configurations and agreement on a new one is in progress.

► **Theorem 1.** *The VAB protocol reconfigures a functional configuration with 0 downtime.*

Proof. Suppose that the current configuration C with an epoch e is functional. Note that the normal path of our protocol is guarded by preconditions `epoch = e`, so that C can broadcast and deliver application messages as long as this holds at all its members (lines 19, 23 and 26). Assume now that a process p_r starts reconfiguring the system to a new configuration C' with epoch $e + 1$. The process p_r will send `PROBE` messages to the members of C and, since C is functional, p_r will only get replies `PROBE_ACK(TRUE, e + 1)`. Handling a `PROBE` message only modifies the `new_epoch` variable, not `epoch`. Therefore, C can continue processing broadcasts while p_r is probing its members, storing C' in the configuration service, and sending `NEW_CONFIG(e + 1, _)` to the leader p_i of C' . When the new leader p_i handles `NEW_CONFIG(e + 1, _)`, it will set `epoch = e + 1`, disabling the old configuration. However, the leader will at once be ready to broadcast messages in the new configuration, as required. ◀

Correctness. Our protocol achieves the above 0-downtime guarantee without violating correctness. Informally, this is because it always chooses the leader of the new configuration from among the members of the latest activated configuration, and a message can only be delivered in this configuration after having been replicated to all its members. Hence, the new leader will immediately know about all previously delivered messages, including those delivered during preliminary reconfiguration steps. The following theorem (proved in §A) states the correctness of our protocol.

► **Theorem 2.** *The VAB protocol correctly implements reconfigurable atomic broadcast as defined in Figure 1.*

5 Passive Replication

The protocol presented in the previous section can be used to build reconfigurable fault-tolerant services via *active* (aka state-machine) replication [32]. Here a service is defined by a deterministic state machine and is executed on several replicas, each maintaining a copy of the machine. All replicas execute all client commands, which they receive via atomic broadcast. Together with the state machine's determinism, this ensures that each command yields the same result at all replicas, thus maintaining an illusion of a centralized fault-tolerant service.

In the rest of the paper, we focus on an alternative approach of building reconfigurable fault-tolerant services via *passive* (aka primary-backup) replication [5]. Here commands are only executed by the leader, which propagates the state changes induced by the commands to the other replicas. This allows replicating services with non-deterministic operations, e.g., those depending on timeouts or interrupts.

Formally, we consider services with a set of states \mathcal{S} that accept a set of commands \mathcal{C} . A command $c \in \mathcal{C}$ can be executed using a call `execute(c)`, which produces its return value.

Command execution may be non-deterministic. To deal with this, the effect of executing a command c on a state $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ is defined by transition relation $\Sigma \xrightarrow{c} \langle r, \delta \rangle$, which produces a possible return value r of c and a *state update* δ performed by the command. The latter can be applied to any state Σ' using a function $apply(\Sigma', \delta)$, which produces a new state. For example, a command **if** $x = 0$ **then** $y \leftarrow 1$ **else** $y \leftarrow 0$ produces a state update $y \leftarrow 1$ when executed in a state with $x = 0$. A command assigning x to a random number may produce an update $x \leftarrow 42$ if the random generator returned 42 when the leader executed the command.

We would like to implement a service over a set of fault-prone replicas that is linearizable [15] with respect to a service that atomically executes commands on a single non-failing copy of the state machine. The latter applies each state update to the machine state Σ immediately after generating it, as shown in Figure 5. Informally, this means that commands appear to clients as if produced by a single copy of the state machine in Figure 5 in an order consistent with the *real-time order*, i.e., the order of non-overlapping command invocations.

5.1 Passive Replication vs Atomic Broadcast

As observed in [3, 16, 18], implementing passive replication requires propagating updates from the leader to the followers using a stronger primitive than atomic broadcast. To illustrate why, Figure 6 gives an incorrect attempt to simulate the specification in Figure 5 using our reconfigurable atomic broadcast (ignore the code in blue for now). This attempt serves as a strawman for a correct solution we present later. Each process keeps track of the epoch it belongs to in `cur_epoch` and the leader of this epoch in `cur_leader`. To execute a command (line 5), a process sends the command, tagged by a unique identifier, to the leader. It then waits until it hears back about the result.

A process keeps two copies of the service state – a *committed* state Σ and a *speculative* state Θ ; the latter is only used when the process is the leader. When the leader receives a command c (line 10), it executes c on its speculative state Θ , producing a return value r and a state update δ . The leader immediately applies δ to Θ and distributes the triple of the command identifier, its return value and the state update via atomic broadcast. When a process (including the leader) delivers such a triple (line 15), it applies the update to its committed state Σ and sends the return value to the process the command originated at, determined from the command identifier. When a process receives a `conf_changed` upcall (line 18), it stores the information received in `cur_epoch` and `cur_leader`. If the process is the leader of the new epoch, it also initializes its speculative state Θ to the committed state Σ .

In passive replication, a state update is incremental with respect to the state it was generated in. Thus, to simulate the specification in Figure 5, it is crucial that the committed state Σ at a process delivering a state update (line 16) be the same as the speculative state Θ from which this state update was originally derived (line 12). This is captured by the following invariant. Let $\Sigma_i(k)$ denote the value of Σ at process p_i before the k -th action in the history (and similarly for Θ).

► **Invariant 2.** *Let h be a history of the algorithm in Figure 6. If $h_k = \text{deliver}_i(m)$, then there exist j and $l < k$ such that $h_l = \text{broadcast}_j(m)$ and $\Sigma_i(k) = \Theta_j(l)$.*

Unfortunately, if we use atomic broadcast to disseminate state updates in Figure 6, we may violate Invariant 2. We next present two examples showing how this happens and how this leads to violating linearizability. The examples consider a replicated counter x with two commands – an increment ($x \leftarrow x + 1$) and a read (**return** x). Initially $x = 0$, and then two clients execute two increments.

7:12 Vertical Atomic Broadcast and Passive Replication

```

1  $\Sigma \leftarrow \Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ 
2 function execute( $c$ ):
3    $\Sigma \xrightarrow{c} \langle r, \delta \rangle$ 
4    $\Sigma \leftarrow \text{apply}(\Sigma, \delta)$ 
5   return  $r$ 

```

■ **Figure 5** Passive replication specification.

<pre> 1 cur_epoch $\in \mathbb{N}$ 2 cur_leader $\in \mathcal{P}$ 3 $\Sigma \leftarrow \Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ // committed state 4 $\Theta \leftarrow \Theta_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ // speculative state 5 function execute(c): 6 $id \leftarrow \text{get_unique_id}()$ 7 send EXECUTE(id, c) to cur_leader 8 wait until receive RESULT(id, r) 9 return r 10 when received EXECUTE(id, c) 11 pre: cur_leader = p_i 12 $\Theta \xrightarrow{c} \langle r, \delta \rangle$ 13 $\Theta \leftarrow \text{apply}(\Theta, \delta)$ 14 broadcast($\langle id, r, \delta \rangle$) </pre>	<pre> 15 upon deliver($\langle id, r, \delta \rangle$) 16 $\Sigma \leftarrow \text{apply}(\Sigma, \delta)$ 17 send RESULT(id, r) to origin(id) 18 upon conf_changed($\langle e, M, p_j \rangle$) 19 // conf_changed($\langle e, M, p_j \rangle, \sigma$) 20 cur_epoch $\leftarrow e$ 21 cur_leader $\leftarrow p_j$ 22 if $p_i = p_j$ then 23 $\Theta \leftarrow \Sigma$ 24 // $\langle _, _, \delta_1 \rangle \dots \langle _, _, \delta_k \rangle \leftarrow \sigma$ 25 // forall $l = 1..k$ do $\Theta \leftarrow \text{apply}(\Theta, \delta_l)$ </pre>
---	---

■ **Figure 6** Passive replication on top of broadcast: code at process p_i .

Example 1. The two increments are executed by the same leader. The first one generates an update $\delta_1 = (x \leftarrow 1)$ and a speculative state $\Theta = 1$. Then the second generates $\delta_2 = (x \leftarrow 2)$. Atomic broadcast allows processes to deliver the updates in the reverse order, with δ_1 applied to a committed state $\Sigma = 2$. This violates Invariant 2. Assume now that after the increments complete we change the configuration to move the leader to a different process. This process will initialize its speculative state Θ to the committed state $\Sigma = 1$. If the new leader now receives a read command, it will return 1, violating the linearizability with respect to Figure 5.

Example 2. The first increment is executed by the leader of an epoch e , which generates $\delta_1 = (x \leftarrow 1)$. The second increment is executed by the leader of an epoch $e' > e$ before it delivers δ_1 and, thus, in a speculative state $\Theta = 0$. This generates $\delta_2 = (x \leftarrow 1)$. Finally, the leader of e' delivers δ_1 and then δ_2 , with the latter applied to a committed state $\Sigma = 1$. This is allowed by atomic broadcast yet violates Invariant 2. It also violates linearizability similarly to Example 1: if now the leader of e' receives a read, it will incorrectly return 1.

5.2 Primary-Order Atomic Broadcast

To address the above problem, Junqueira et al. proposed *primary-order atomic broadcast* (POabcast) [17,18], which strengthens the classical atomic broadcast. We now briefly review POabcast and highlight its drawbacks, which motivates an alternative proposal we present in the next section. In our framework we can define POabcast by adding the properties over histories h in Figure 7 to those of Figure 1. This yields a reconfigurable variant of POabcast that we call *reconfigurable primary-order atomic broadcast* (RPOabcast). RPOabcast also modifies the interface of reconfigurable atomic broadcast (§3) by only allowing a process to call **broadcast** if it is the leader of its current configuration.

Property 6 (Local Order) restricts the delivery order of messages broadcast in the same epoch: they must be delivered in the order the leader broadcast them. Property 7 (Global Order) restricts the delivery order of messages broadcast in different epochs: they must be delivered in the order of the epochs they were broadcast in. Finally, Property 8 (Primary Integrity) ensures that the leader of an epoch e' does not miss relevant messages from previous epochs: each message broadcast in an epoch $e < e'$ either has to be delivered by the leader before entering e' , or can never be delivered at all. Local and Global Order trivially imply Property 3 (Total Order), so we could omit it from the specification. POabcast is stronger than plain atomic broadcast: the latter can be implemented from the former if each process forwards messages to be broadcast to the leader of its configuration.

► **Proposition 3.** *Reconfigurable atomic broadcast can be implemented from RPOabcast.*

When the passive replication protocol in Figure 6 is used with POabcast instead of plain atomic broadcast, Invariant 2 holds, and the protocol yields a service linearizable with respect to the specification in Figure 5 [18]. In particular, Local Order disallows Example 1 from §5.1, and Primary Integrity disallows Example 2 (which does not violate either Local or Global Order). POabcast can be obtained from our Vertical Atomic Broadcast (VAB) algorithm in §4 as follows. First, VAB already guarantees both Local and Global Order: e.g., this is the case for Local Order because processes are connected by reliable FIFO channels.

► **Theorem 4.** *VAB guarantees Local and Global order.*

Second, to ensure Primary Integrity, neither the new leader nor the followers invoke `conf_changed` upon receiving `NEW_CONFIG` (line 61) or `NEW_STATE` (line 71). Instead, the leader first waits until it receives `NEW_STATE_ACK` messages from all followers (line 74) and tells the processes to deliver all application messages from the previous epoch via `COMMIT` messages. Only once a process delivers all these application messages does it invoke `conf_changed` for the new configuration (and if the process is the leader, starts broadcasting).

Deferring the invocation of `conf_changed` at the leader is the key to guarantee Primary Integrity. On the one hand, it ensures that, before the newly elected leader of an epoch e' generates `conf_changed`, it has delivered all application messages that could have been delivered in previous epochs: Invariant 1 from §4 guarantees that the leader's initial log includes all such messages. On the other hand, the leader can also be sure that any message broadcast in an epoch $< e'$ but not yet delivered can *never* be delivered by any process. This is because, by the time the leader generates `conf_changed`, all followers in e' have overwritten their log with that of the new leader.

Since deferring `conf_changed` results in deferring the start of broadcasting by the leader, the modified VAB protocol has a reconfiguration downtime of 2 messages delays. This cost is inherent: the lower bound of Friedman and van Renesse [12] on the latency of Strong Virtually Synchronous broadcast (a variant of POabcast) implies that any solution must have a non-zero downtime. In the next section we circumvent this limitation by introducing a weaker variant of POabcast, which we show sufficient for passive replication.

6 Speculative Primary-Order Atomic Broadcast

We now introduce *speculative primary-order atomic broadcast* (SPOabcast), a weaker variant of POabcast that allows implementing passive replication with minimal downtime. During reconfiguration, SPOabcast allows the new leader to deliver messages from previous epochs *speculatively* – without waiting for them to become durable – and start broadcast right away.

7:14 Vertical Atomic Broadcast and Passive Replication

6. **Local Order.** If the leader of some epoch e receives $\text{broadcast}(m_1)$ before receiving $\text{broadcast}(m_2)$, then any process that delivers m_2 must also deliver m_1 before m_2 :

$$\forall m_1, m_2, i, j, k, l, l'. h_k = \text{broadcast}_i(m_1) \wedge h_l = \text{broadcast}_i(m_2) \wedge k < l \wedge \text{epochOf}(k) = \text{epochOf}(l) \wedge h_{l'} = \text{deliver}_j(m_2) \implies \exists k'. h_{k'} = \text{deliver}_j(m_1) \wedge k' < l'$$

7. **Global Order.** Assume the leaders of e and $e' > e$ receive $\text{broadcast}(m_1)$ and $\text{broadcast}(m_2)$ respectively. If a process p_i delivers m_1 and m_2 , then it must deliver m_1 before m_2 :

$$\forall m_1, m_2, i, k, k', l, l'. h_k = \text{broadcast}(m_1) \wedge h_l = \text{broadcast}(m_2) \wedge \text{epochOf}(k) < \text{epochOf}(l) \wedge h_{k'} = \text{deliver}_i(m_1) \wedge h_{l'} = \text{deliver}_i(m_2) \implies k' < l'$$

8. **Primary Integrity.** Assume some process delivers an application message m originally broadcast in an epoch e . If any process p_i joins an epoch $e' > e$, then p_i must deliver m before joining e' :

$$\forall m, i, k, l, l', e, e'. h_k = \text{broadcast}(m) \wedge \text{epochOf}(k) = e \wedge h_l = \text{deliver}(m) \wedge h_{l'} = \text{conf_changed}_i((e', _, _)) \wedge e < e' \implies \exists k'. h_{k'} = \text{deliver}_i(m) \wedge k' < l'$$

■ **Figure 7** Properties of reconfigurable primary-order atomic broadcast over a history h .

9. **Basic Speculative Delivery Properties.** A process p_i can speculatively deliver a given application message m at most once in a given epoch and only if p_i is the leader of the epoch, m has previously been broadcast, and m has not yet been delivered by p_i :

$$\forall i, j, k, \sigma. h_k = \text{conf_changed}_i((_, _, p_j), \sigma) \implies (\sigma \neq \perp \implies p_i = p_j) \wedge (\forall m_1, m_2 \in \sigma. m_1 \neq m_2) \wedge (\forall m \in \sigma. (\exists l. h_l = \text{broadcast}(m) \wedge l < k) \wedge (\neg \exists l. h_l = \text{deliver}_i(m) \wedge l < k))$$


10. **Prefix Consistency.**

- a. Consider m_1 and m_2 broadcast in different epochs. Assume that a process p_i delivers m_2 , and a process p_j broadcasts m_2 in an epoch e' . Then p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 iff p_j delivers m_1 before joining e' or speculatively delivers m_1 when joining e' :

$$\forall m_1, m_2, i, j, k_0, l_0, k, l, l', \sigma, e'. h_{k_0} = \text{broadcast}(m_1) \wedge h_{l_0} = \text{broadcast}(m_2) \wedge \text{epochOf}(k_0) \neq \text{epochOf}(l_0) \wedge h_k = \text{deliver}_i(m_2) \wedge h_l = \text{broadcast}_j(m_2) \wedge h_{l'} = \text{conf_changed}_j((e', _, p_j), \sigma) \wedge \text{epochOf}(l) = e' \implies ((\exists k'. h_{k'} = \text{deliver}_i(m_1) \wedge k' < k) \iff ((\exists l''. h_{l''} = \text{deliver}_j(m_1) \wedge l'' < l) \vee m_1 \in \sigma))$$

- b. Consider m_1 and m_2 broadcast in different epochs. Assume that a process p_i delivers m_2 , and a process p_j speculatively delivers m_2 when joining an epoch e' . Then p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 iff p_j delivers m_1 before joining e' or speculatively delivers m_1 before m_2 when joining e' :

$$\forall m_1, m_2, i, j, k_0, l_0, k, l, \sigma, e'. h_{k_0} = \text{broadcast}(m_1) \wedge h_{l_0} = \text{broadcast}(m_2) \wedge \text{epochOf}(k_0) \neq \text{epochOf}(l_0) \wedge h_k = \text{deliver}_i(m_2) \wedge h_l = \text{conf_changed}_j((e', _, p_j), \sigma) \wedge m_2 \in \sigma \implies ((\exists k'. h_{k'} = \text{deliver}_i(m_1) \wedge k' < k) \iff ((\exists l'. h_{l'} = \text{deliver}_j(m_1) \wedge l' < l) \vee \sigma = _m_1_m_2_))$$



■ **Figure 8** Properties of speculative primary-order atomic broadcast over a history h . Property 10 replaces Property 8 from Figure 7. The tables summarize its action orderings: the actions at the top happen before the actions at the bottom.

SPOabcast specification. SPOabcast modifies the interface of reconfigurable atomic broadcast (§3) in two ways. First, like in POabcast, a process can call `broadcast` only if it is the leader. Second, the `conf_changed` upcall for a configuration C carries an additional argument σ : `conf_changed(C, σ)`. When the upcall is invoked at the leader of C , σ is a sequence of messages *speculatively delivered* to the leader (σ is not used at followers). SPOabcast is defined by replacing Primary Integrity in the definition of POabcast by the properties in Figure 8. Property 9 is self-explanatory. Property 10 (Prefix Consistency) constrains how speculative deliveries are ordered with respect to ordinary deliveries and broadcasts. For the ease of understanding, in Figure 8 we summarize these orderings in tables.

Part (a)/“only if” of Prefix Consistency is a weaker form of Primary Integrity. Assume that the leader p_j of an epoch e' broadcasts a message m_2 . The property ensures that for any message m_1 delivered before m_2 at some process p_i , the leader p_j has to either deliver m_1 before joining e' or *speculatively deliver m_1 when joining e'* . As we demonstrate shortly, the latter option, absent in Primary Integrity, allows our implementation of SPOabcast to avoid extra downtime during reconfiguration. Part (a)/“if” conversely ensures that, if the leader p_j speculatively delivers m_1 before broadcasting m_2 , then m_1 must always be delivered before m_2 . This ensures that the speculation performed by the leader p_j is correct if any of the messages it broadcasts (e.g., m_2) are ever delivered at any process. Part (b) of Prefix Consistency ensures that the order of messages in a sequence speculatively delivered at a `conf_changed` upcall cannot contradict the order of ordinary delivery.

Speculative delivery provides weaker guarantees than ordinary delivery, since it does not imply durability. In particular, we allow a message to be speculatively delivered at a process p but never delivered anywhere, e.g., because p crashed. However, in this case Part (a)/“if” of Prefix Consistency ensures that all messages p broadcast after such a non-durable speculative delivery will also be lost. As we show next, this allows us to use SPOabcast to correctly implement passive replication without undermining its durability guarantees.

Passive replication using SPOabcast. The passive replication protocol in Figure 6 requires minimal changes to be used with SPOabcast, highlighted in blue. When the leader of an epoch e receives a `conf_changed` upcall for e (line 19), in addition to setting the speculative state Θ to the committed state Σ , the leader also applies the state updates speculatively delivered via `conf_changed` to Θ (lines 24-25). The leader can then immediately use the resulting speculative state to execute new commands (line 10). We prove the following in §B.

► **Theorem 5.** *The version of the protocol in Figure 6 that uses SPOabcast satisfies Invariant 2 and implements a service linearizable with respect to the specification in Figure 5.*

In particular, part (a)/“only if” of Prefix Consistency disallows Example 2 from §5.1: it ensures that the leader broadcasting δ_2 will be aware of δ_1 , either via ordinary or speculative delivery. More generally, part (a) ensures that, if a process p_i delivers a state update δ_2 broadcast by a leader p_j , then at the corresponding points in the execution, p_i and p_j are aware of the same set of updates (cf. the table in Figure 8). Part (b) of Prefix Consistency furthermore ensures that the two processes apply these updates in the same order. This contributes to validating Invariant 2 and, thus, the specification in Figure 5.

Implementing SPOabcast. To implement SPOabcast we modify the Vertical Broadcast Protocol in Figures 2-3 as follows. First, since `broadcast` can only be called at the leader, we replace lines 10-12 by line 13. Thus, the leader handles `broadcast` calls in the same way it previously handled FORWARD messages. Second, we augment `conf_changed` upcalls

with speculative deliveries, replacing line 61 by line 62, and line 71 by line 72. Thus, the `conf_changed` upcall at the leader speculatively delivers all application messages in its log that have not yet been (non-speculatively) delivered. It is easy to check that these modifications do not change the 0-downtime guarantee of Vertical Atomic Broadcast.

► **Theorem 6.** *The primary-order version of the Vertical Atomic Broadcast protocol is a correct implementation of speculative primary-order atomic broadcast.*

Thus, Theorems 5 and 6 allow us to use VAB to replicate even non-deterministic services while minimizing the downtime from routine reconfigurations, e.g., those for load balancing.

We prove Theorem 6 in §C. Here we informally explain why the above protocol validates the key part (a)/“only if” of Prefix Consistency, weakening Primary Integrity (cf. the explanations we gave regarding the latter at the end of §5.2). On the one hand, as in the ordinary VAB, Invariant 1 from §4 guarantees that the log of a newly elected leader of an epoch e' contains all application messages m_1 that could have been delivered in epochs $< e'$. The new leader will either deliver or speculatively deliver all such messages before broadcasting anything (line 62). On the other hand, if the leader broadcasts a message m_2 , then a follower will only accept it after having overwritten its log with the leader’s initial one, received in `NEW_STATE` (line 64). This can be used to show that, if m_2 is ever delivered, then any message broadcast in an epoch $< e'$ that was not in `NEW_STATE` will never get delivered.

7 Related Work

The *vertical* paradigm of implementing reconfigurable services by delegating agreement on configuration changes to a separate component was first introduced by Lynch and Shvartsman [26] for emulating dynamic atomic registers. It was further applied by Lamport et al. [22] to solve reconfigurable single-shot consensus, yielding the Vertical Paxos family of protocols. Vertical Paxos and its follow-ups [3, 4, 10, 24, 27] require prior configurations to be disabled (“wedged”) at the start of reconfiguration. In contrast, our VAB protocol allows the latest functional configuration to continue processing messages while the agreement on the next configuration is in progress. This results in the downtime of 0 when reconfiguring from a functional configuration. This feature is particularly desirable for atomic broadcast, where we want to keep producing new decisions when reconfiguration is triggered for load balancing rather than to handle failures.

To achieve the minimal downtime, the VAB protocol uses different epoch variables to guard the normal operation (`epoch`) and reconfiguration (`new_epoch`). By not modifying the `epoch` variable during the preliminary reconfiguration steps, the protocol allows the old configuration to operate normally while the reconfiguration is in progress (cf. the proof of Theorem 1 in §4). In contrast, Vertical Paxos uses a single epoch variable (`maxBallot`) for both purposes, thus disabling the current configuration at the start of reconfiguration. Our protocol for SPOabcast further extends the minimal downtime guarantee to the case of passive replication.

Both our VAB and SPOabcast protocols achieve an optimal steady-state latency of two message delays [21]. Although Junqueira et al. [18] show that no POabcast protocol can guarantee optimal steady-state latency if it relies on black-box consensus to order messages, our SPOabcast implementation is not subject to this impossibility result, as it does not use consensus in this manner.

Although the vertical approach has been widely used in practice [2, 7, 10, 31, 37], prior systems have mainly focused on engineering aspects of directly implementing a replicated

state machine for a desired service rather than basing it on a generic atomic broadcast layer. Our treatment of Vertical Atomic Broadcast develops a formal foundation that sheds light on the algorithmic core of these systems. This can be reused for designing future solutions that are provably correct and efficient.

Most reconfiguration algorithms that do not rely on an auxiliary configuration service can be traced back to the original technique of Paxos [20], which intersperses reconfigurations within the stream of normal command agreement instances. The examples of practical systems that follow this approach include SMART [25], Raft [30], and Zookeeper [34]. Other non-vertical algorithms [23] implement reconfiguration by spawning a separate non-reconfigurable state machine for each newly introduced configuration. In the absence of an auxiliary configuration service, these protocols require at least $2f + 1$ processes in each configuration [21], in contrast to $f + 1$ in our atomic broadcast protocols.

The fault-masking protocols of Birman et al. [3] and a recently proposed MongoDB reconfiguration protocol [33] separate the message log from the configuration state, but nevertheless replicate them at the same set of processes. As in non-vertical solutions, these algorithms require $2f + 1$ replicas. They also follow the Vertical Paxos approach to implement reconfiguration, and as a result, may wedge the system prematurely as we explain above.

A variant of Primary Integrity, known as Strong Virtual Synchrony (or Sending View Delivery [8]), was originally proposed by Friedman and van Renesse [12] who also studied its inherent costs. Our SPOabcast abstraction is a relaxation of Strong Virtually Synchrony and primary-order atomic broadcast (POabcast) of Junqueira et al. [17,18]. Keidar and Dolev [19] proposed Consistent Object Replication Layer (COREL) in which every delivered message is assigned a color such that a message is “yellow” if it was received and acknowledged by a member of an operational quorum, and “green” if it was acknowledged by all members of an operational quorum. While the COREL’s yellow messages are similar to our speculative messages, Keidar and Dolev did not consider their potential applications, in particular, their utility for minimizing the latency of passive replication.

References

- 1 Marcos K. Aguilera, Idit Keidar, Dahlia Malkhi, and Alexander Shraer. Dynamic atomic storage without consensus. *J. ACM*, 58(2), 2011.
- 2 Mahesh Balakrishnan, Dahlia Malkhi, John D. Davis, Vijayan Prabhakaran, Michael Wei, and Ted Wobber. CORFU: A distributed shared log. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 31(4), 2013.
- 3 Kenneth Birman, Dahlia Malkhi, and Robbert van Renesse. Virtually synchronous methodology for building dynamic reliable services. In *Guide to Reliable Distributed Systems - Building High-Assurance Applications and Cloud-Hosted Services*, chapter 22. Springer, 2012.
- 4 Manuel Bravo and Alexey Gotsman. Reconfigurable atomic transaction commit. In *Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, 2019.
- 5 Navin Budhiraja, Keith Marzullo, Fred B. Schneider, and Sam Toueg. The primary-backup approach. In *Distributed Systems (2nd Ed.)*. ACM Press/Addison-Wesley, 1993.
- 6 Tushar Deepak Chandra and Sam Toueg. Unreliable failure detectors for reliable distributed systems. *J. ACM*, 43(2), 1996.
- 7 Fay Chang, Jeffrey Dean, Sanjay Ghemawat, Wilson C. Hsieh, Deborah A. Wallach, Michael Burrows, Tushar Chandra, Andrew Fikes, and Robert Gruber. Bigtable: A distributed storage system for structured data. In *Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI)*, 2006.
- 8 Gregory Chockler, Idit Keidar, and Roman Vitenberg. Group communication specifications: A comprehensive study. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 33(4), 2001.

- 9 Xavier Défago, André Schiper, and Péter Urbán. Total order broadcast and multicast algorithms: Taxonomy and survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 36(4), 2004.
- 10 Aleksandar Dragojević, Dushyanth Narayanan, Edmund B. Nightingale, Matthew Renzelmann, Alex Shamis, Anirudh Badam, and Miguel Castro. No compromises: Distributed transactions with consistency, availability, and performance. In *Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, 2015.
- 11 Cynthia Dwork, Nancy Lynch, and Larry Stockmeyer. Consensus in the presence of partial synchrony. *J. ACM*, 35(2), 1988.
- 12 Roy Friedman and Robbert van Renesse. Strong and weak virtual synchrony in Horus. In *Symposium on Reliable Distributed Systems (SRDS)*, 1996.
- 13 Jason Gustafson. Hardening Kafka replication. Talk at Kafka Summit San Francisco, 2018. URL: <https://www.confluent.io/kafka-summit-sf18/hardening-kafka-replication/>.
- 14 Maurice Herlihy, Victor Luchangco, and Mark Moir. Obstruction-free synchronization: Double-ended queues as an example. In *International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*, 2003.
- 15 Maurice P. Herlihy and Jeannette M. Wing. Linearizability: A correctness condition for concurrent objects. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 12(3), 1990.
- 16 Patrick Hunt, Mahadev Konar, Flavio Paiva Junqueira, and Benjamin Reed. Zookeeper: Wait-free coordination for internet-scale systems. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC)*, 2010.
- 17 Flavio Paiva Junqueira, Benjamin C. Reed, and Marco Serafini. Zab: High-performance broadcast for primary-backup systems. In *Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)*, 2011.
- 18 Flavio Paiva Junqueira and Marco Serafini. On barriers and the gap between active and passive replication. In *Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, 2013.
- 19 Idit Keidar and Danny Dolev. Efficient message ordering in dynamic networks. In *Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, 1996.
- 20 Leslie Lamport. The part-time parliament. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 16(2), 1998.
- 21 Leslie Lamport. Lower bounds for asynchronous consensus. *Distributed Computing*, 19(2), 2006.
- 22 Leslie Lamport, Dahlia Malkhi, and Lidong Zhou. Vertical Paxos and primary-backup replication. In *Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, 2009.
- 23 Leslie Lamport, Dahlia Malkhi, and Lidong Zhou. Reconfiguring a state machine. *SIGACT News*, 41(1), 2010.
- 24 Leslie Lamport and Mike Massa. Cheap Paxos. In *Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)*, 2004.
- 25 Jacob R. Lorch, Atul Adya, William J. Bolosky, Ronnie Chaiken, John R. Douceur, and Jon Howell. The SMART way to migrate replicated stateful services. In *European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys)*, 2006.
- 26 Nancy Lynch and Alex A. Shvartsman. RAMBO: A reconfigurable atomic memory service for dynamic networks. In *Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, 2002.
- 27 John MacCormick, Chandramohan A. Thekkath, Marcus Jager, Kristof Roomp, Lidong Zhou, and Ryan Peterson. Niobe: A practical replication protocol. *ACM Trans. Storage*, 3(4), 2008.
- 28 Neha Narkhede, Gwen Shapira, and Todd Palino. *Kafka: The Definitive Guide*. O'Reilly Media, 2017.
- 29 Brian M. Oki and Barbara H. Liskov. Viewstamped replication: A new primary copy method to support highly-available distributed systems. In *Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, 1988.
- 30 Diego Ongaro and John K. Ousterhout. In search of an understandable consensus algorithm. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC)*, 2014.
- 31 Jun Rao, Eugene J. Shekita, and Sandeep Tata. Using Paxos to build a scalable, consistent, and highly available datastore. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 4(4), 2011.

- 32 Fred B. Schneider. Implementing fault-tolerant services using the state machine approach: A tutorial. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 22(4), 1990.
- 33 William Schultz, Siyuan Zhou, Ian Dardik, and Stavros Tripakis. Design and analysis of a logless dynamic reconfiguration protocol. In *Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems (OPODIS)*, 2021.
- 34 Alexander Shraer, Benjamin Reed, Dahlia Malkhi, and Flavio Paiva Junqueira. Dynamic reconfiguration of primary/backup clusters. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC)*, 2012.
- 35 Alexander Spiegelman and Idit Keidar. On liveness of dynamic storage. In *Colloquium on Structural Information and Communication Complexity (SIROCCO)*, 2017.
- 36 Alexander Spiegelman, Idit Keidar, and Dahlia Malkhi. Dynamic reconfiguration: Abstraction and optimal asynchronous solution. In *Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, 2017.
- 37 Robbert van Renesse and Fred B. Schneider. Chain replication for supporting high throughput and availability. In *Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI)*, 2004.
- 38 Michael J. Whittaker, Neil Giridharan, Adriana Szekeres, Joseph M. Hellerstein, Heidi Howard, Faisal Nawab, and Ion Stoica. Matchmaker Paxos: A reconfigurable consensus protocol. *J. Syst. Res.*, 1(1), 2021.

A

 Proof of Correctness for Vertical Atomic Broadcast (Theorem 2)

3. Let e be an epoch such that all its members at some point set their `epoch` variable to e . Then the leader p_j of any epoch $e' > e$ has `epoch` $\geq e$ right before receiving `NEW_CONFIG`($e', _$).
4. If the leader of an epoch e sends `NEW_STATE`($e, msg, _$) such that $msg[k] = m$, then there exists an epoch $e' < e$ such that the leader of e' has previously sent `ACCEPT`(e', k, m).

■ **Figure 9** Invariants maintained by Vertical Atomic Broadcast.

Our proof of Theorem 2 relies on auxiliary Invariants 3 and 4 in Figure 9, in addition to Invariant 1 from §4. Invariant 3 ensures that if an epoch e has been activated, then the leader of any epoch $e' > e$ must have been initialized at an epoch $\geq e$. Informally, this holds because, when probing to look for a leader of e' , we only skip epochs that are not activated and will never be (§4). Hence, probing cannot go lower than an activated epoch e . Invariant 4 gives the key argument for Integrity: it ensures that any message in the `msg` array of a process has been broadcast before. We next prove the key Invariant 1.

Proof of Basic Configuration Change Properties.

- Property (1a). Line 41 guarantees that there exists a single `NEW_CONFIG`(e, M) message. From this the required follows trivially.
- Property (1b). Let p_i be a process that calls `conf_changed`($e, M, _$) for an epoch e . Assume first that p_i calls it when handling `NEW_CONFIG`(e, M). This message is only sent to the leader of e , which is guaranteed to be included in M by the constraint on `compute_membership`($_$). Assume now that p_i calls `conf_changed`($e, M, _$) when handling a `NEW_STATE`($e, _, _$) message. Then the property follows from line 63. Hence, any process that calls `conf_changed`($e, M, _$) is member of M .
- Property (1c). By lines 47 and 65, the `epoch` variable at a process does not decrease. Thus, $e_1 \leq e_2$. Furthermore, by line 41 there exists a single `NEW_CONFIG` message per epoch. Therefore, each process calls `conf_changed` at most once per epoch and $e_1 < e_2$, as required.
- Property (1d). Consider a configuration $C = \langle e, _, p_j \rangle$ and assume that a process p_i invokes `conf_changed`(C). Then the leader p_j must have earlier received `NEW_CONFIG`($e, _$). By line 41, this occurs when `compare_and_swap`($_, C$) succeeds. Therefore, `introduction`(C) is invoked before p_i invokes `conf_changed`(C). Moreover, line 41 guarantees that there exists a single `introduction`(C) action. ◀

Proof of Invariant 1. We prove the invariant by induction on e' . Assume the invariant holds for each $e' < e''$. We now show that it holds for $e' = e''$ by induction on the length of the protocol execution. We only consider the most interesting transition in line 64, where a process p_i receives `NEW_STATE`($e'', msg'', _$) from the leader of e'' and sets `msg` to msg'' (line 69). We show that $msg''[k] = m$, so that after this transition p_i has $msg[k] = m$, as required. Let p_j be the leader of e'' , i.e., the process that sends `NEW_STATE`($e'', msg'', _$), and let $e_0 < e''$ be the value of `epoch` at p_j right before receiving the `NEW_CONFIG`($e'', _$) message at line 53. By the premise of the invariant, some process sends the message `COMMIT`(e, k). Then at some point all members of e set their `epoch` variable to e , so by Invariant 3 we get $e \leq e_0$.

Consider first the case when $e < e_0$. Since $e_0 < e''$, by the induction hypothesis, p_j has $msg[k] = m$ when it sends `NEW_STATE`($e'', msg, _$), which implies the required. Assume now

that $e = e_0$. There are two possibilities: either p_j is the leader of e , or it is a follower in e . We only consider the latter case, since the former is analogous. By the premise of the invariant, some process sends $\text{COMMIT}(e, k)$ while having $\text{msg}[k] = m$. Then either each follower in e receives $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$ and replies with $\text{ACCEPT_ACK}(e, k)$, or each follower in e receives $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}', _)$ with $\text{msg}'[k] = m$ and replies with $\text{NEW_STATE_ACK}(e)$. In particular, this is the case for p_j , and by lines 19 and 65, p_j must handle one of these messages before it handles $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e', _)$. After handling one of the above messages and while $\text{epoch} = e$, p_j does not overwrite $\text{msg}[k]$, so that $\text{msg}[k] = m$. Then p_j has $\text{msg}[k] = m$ before handling $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e', _)$. Hence, p_j has $\text{msg}[k] = m$ when it sends $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}, _)$, which implies the required. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Invariant 3. Since p_j was chosen as the leader of e' , we know that this process replied with $\text{PROBE_ACK}(\text{TRUE}, e')$ to a message $\text{PROBE}(e', e^*)$ from a process executing $\text{reconfigure}()$, where $e^* < e'$. Therefore, p_j was a member at the epoch e^* that was being probed.

When a process handles $\text{PROBE}(e', _)$, it sets new_epoch to e' . Then, by line 65, a process cannot set epoch to an epoch $< e'$ after handling $\text{PROBE}(e', _)$. By the premise of the invariant, at some point all members of e set their epoch variable to e . Since $e' > e$, if a member of e handles $\text{PROBE}(e', _)$, then it must have set $\text{epoch} = e$ before. Thus, no member of e can reply with $\text{PROBE_ACK}(\text{FALSE}, e')$.

Probing ends when at least one process sends a $\text{PROBE_ACK}(\text{TRUE}, e')$ message. Thus, the probing phase could have not gone beyond e , so that $e \leq e^* < e'$. Let $e_0 < e'$ be the value of epoch at p_j right before receiving the $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e', _)$ message at line 53. By the protocol, we know that the transition $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e', _)$ is triggered after p_j was probed in epoch $e^* \geq e$. Furthermore, by line 50 when p_j handled $\text{PROBE}(e', e^*)$, it had $\text{epoch} \geq e^*$. Then $e \leq e^* \leq e_0$, as required. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Invariant 4. Let p_i be the leader of e . We prove the invariant by induction on e . Assume that the invariant holds for all $e < e^*$. We now show it for $e = e^*$. According to the protocol, the process p_i sends $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}, _)$ with $\text{msg}[k] = m$ when it handles the message $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e, _)$ at line 53. Let $e'' < e$ be the epoch at p_i just before handling $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e, _)$. At this moment we have $\text{msg}[k] = m$ at p_i . Then either p_i has received a message $\text{NEW_STATE}(e'', \text{msg}'', _)$ with $\text{msg}''[k] = m$ or a message $\text{ACCEPT}(e'', k, m)$ has been sent. The former case is immediate by the induction hypothesis. The latter gives us what we wanted to prove. \blacktriangleleft

► Lemma 7. *Assume that the leader p_i of an epoch e_1 sends $\text{COMMIT}(e_1, k)$ while having $\text{msg}[k] = m_1$, and the leader p_j of an epoch e_2 sends $\text{COMMIT}(e_2, k)$ while having $\text{msg}[k] = m_2$. Then $m_1 = m_2$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $e_1 \leq e_2$. The lemma trivially holds if $e_1 = e_2$. Assume now that $e_1 < e_2$. By Invariant 1, when p_j sends $\text{COMMIT}(e_2, k)$, it has $\text{msg}[k] = m_1$. But then $m_2 = \text{msg}[k] = m_1$, as required. \blacktriangleleft

► Lemma 8. *Assume that the leader of an epoch e_1 sends $\text{COMMIT}(e_1, k_1)$ while having $\text{msg}[k_1] = m$, and the leader of an epoch e_2 sends $\text{COMMIT}(e_2, k_2)$ while having $\text{msg}[k_2] = m$. Then $k_1 = k_2$.*

Proof. Since the leader p_i of e_1 sends $\text{COMMIT}(e_1, k_1)$ while having $\text{msg}[k_1] = m$, it must previously send either $\text{ACCEPT}(e_1, k_1, m)$ or $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}, _)$ with $\text{msg}[k] = m$. In the latter case, by Invariant 4, for some epoch $e'_1 < e_1$ the leader of e'_1 sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e'_1, k_1, m)$.

Thus, in both cases for some epoch $e''_1 \leq e_1$ the leader of e''_1 sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e''_1, k_1, m)$. We analogously establish that for some epoch $e''_2 \leq e_2$ the leader of e''_2 sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e''_2, k_2, m)$. Either leader sends the ACCEPT message upon receiving a $\text{FORWARD}(m)$ message, generated when a process calls $\text{broadcast}(m)$. By (1), there is a unique $\text{broadcast}(m)$ call, and thus a unique $\text{FORWARD}(m)$ message. This implies $e''_1 = e''_2$ and $k_1 = k_2$, as required. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Integrity. We first prove that m is broadcast before its delivered. Assume that a process p_i delivers m . Then p_i handles a $\text{COMMIT}(e, k)$ message for some epoch e and has $\text{msg}[k] = m$ at that moment. Consider first the case when the leader of e sends $\text{COMMIT}(e, k)$ because it receives an $\text{ACCEPT_ACK}(e, k)$ message from every follower. This implies that the leader p_j has sent an $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m')$ message to all followers. After p_i handles $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m')$ (or sends it if $p_i = p_j$) and while $\text{epoch} = e$, p_i does not overwrite $\text{msg}[k]$, and hence, it has $\text{msg}[k] = m'$. Since p_i has $\text{msg}[k] = m$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e, k)$, then $m = m'$. Therefore, p_j sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$. Then p_j has received a $\text{FORWARD}(m)$ message from some process, which must have previously called $\text{broadcast}(m)$. The latter process thus broadcast m before p_i delivered it, as required.

Consider now the case when the leader of e sends $\text{COMMIT}(e, k)$ because it receives a NEW_STATE_ACK message from every follower. Let $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}, _)$ be the message sent by the leader of e . We have $\text{msg}[k] = m$. By Invariant 4 there exists an epoch $e' < e$ in which its leader sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e', k, m)$. The leader does this upon receiving a $\text{FORWARD}(m)$ message from some process, which must have previously called $\text{broadcast}(m)$. The latter process thus broadcast m before p_i delivered it, as required.

Finally, we prove that p_i delivers m at most once. Indeed, if p_i delivered m twice, then it would receive $\text{COMMIT}(m, k_1)$ and $\text{COMMIT}(m, k_2)$ for some $k_1 \neq k_2$. But this contradicts Lemma 8. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Total Order. Assume that a process p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 , and that a process p_j delivers m_2 . Then:

- p_i receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e_1, k_1)$ sent by the leader of an epoch e_1 , and p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when receiving this message;
- p_i receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e_2, k_2)$ sent by the leader of an epoch e_2 , and p_i has $\text{msg}[k_2] = m_2$ when receiving this message; and
- p_j receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k'_2)$ sent by the leader of an epoch e'_2 , and p_j has $\text{msg}[k_2] = m'_2$ when receiving this message.

It is easy to see that when the leaders of e_1 , e_2 and e'_2 send the COMMIT messages, they must have $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$, $\text{msg}[k_2] = m_2$ and $\text{msg}[k'_2] = m'_2$, respectively. Then by Lemma 8, $k'_2 = k_2$. Since $k_1 < k_2$, before delivering m_2 the process p_j has to deliver a message m'_1 at position k_1 . Then:

- p_j receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e'_1, k_1)$ from the leader of an epoch e'_1 , and p_j has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m'_1$ when receiving this message.

Then the leader of e'_1 has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m'_1$ when sending the COMMIT message. Hence, by Lemma 7, $m'_1 = m_1$. We have thus shown that p_j delivers m_1 before m_2 , as required. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Agreement. Assume that a process p_i delivers m_1 and a process p_j delivers m_2 . Then:

- p_i receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e_1, k_1)$ sent by the leader of an epoch e_1 , and p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when receiving this message;
- p_j receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e_2, k_2)$ sent by the leader of an epoch e_2 , and p_j has $\text{msg}[k_2] = m_2$ when receiving this message.

It is easy to see that when the leaders of e_1 and e_2 send the COMMIT messages, they must have $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ and $\text{msg}[k_2] = m_2$, respectively. Without loss of generality, assume that $k_1 \leq k_2$. If $k_1 = k_2$, then by Lemma 7, $m_1 = m_2$, which trivially implies the required. Assume now that $k_1 < k_2$. Then before delivering m_2 at position k_2 , process p_j must deliver a message m'_1 at position k_1 . Then:

- p_j receives a message COMMIT(e'_1, k_1) sent by the leader of an epoch e'_1 , and p_j has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m'_1$ when receiving this message.

Then the leader of e'_1 has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m'_1$ when sending the COMMIT message. Hence, by Lemma 7, $m'_1 = m_1$. We have thus shown that p_j delivers m_1 , as required. ◀

We next prove the first part of the Property 5a, ensuring that a new configuration will be introduced. This is the most interesting part due to its use of Assumption 1 (Availability).

► **Theorem 9.** *Consider an execution with finitely many reconfiguration requests, and let r be the last reconfiguration request to be invoked. Suppose that r is invoked by a correct process and no other reconfiguration requests take steps after r is invoked. Then r succeeds to introduce a configuration.*

Proof. The process p_r executing r starts by querying the configuration service to find the latest introduced configuration. Let e be the epoch of this configuration. We first prove that the probing by p_r eventually terminates. The probing procedure proceeds by iterations in epoch-descending order, starting by probing the members of e . The process p_r only moves to the next iteration after receiving at least one reply from a member of the epoch being probed, provided no process has replied with PROBE_ACK(TRUE, $e + 1$). Consider an arbitrary epoch e' such that $e' \leq e$. If p_r is probing the members of e' , then p_r has received a PROBE_ACK(FALSE, $e + 1$) from at least one member of each epoch e^* such that $e' < e^* \leq e$. Furthermore, because of line 48 and the check in line 65, none of configurations with these epochs will ever become activated. Since no reconfiguration request other than r takes steps after r is invoked, no configuration with an epoch $> e$ can be introduced, and thus, activated. Then by Assumption 1 (Availability), at least one member p_j of e' is guaranteed to receive the PROBE($e + 1, e'$) message sent by p_r . Furthermore, since no configuration with an epoch $> e$ is introduced, no PROBE message for an epoch $> e + 1$ could have been issued. Then p_j has $\text{new_epoch} \leq e + 1$ when it receives PROBE($e + 1, e'$). Therefore, by line 47, p_j handles PROBE($e + 1, e'$) and replies to p_r . Hence, for each epoch e' that p_r probes, either p_r will eventually move to probe the previous epoch, or the probing phase will terminate. If the probing phase does not terminate for any epoch > 0 , then p_r will eventually reach the initial epoch 0. We have shown that p_r will receive at least one reply from a member of 0. The condition at line 50 trivially holds for this member, and thus it will reply to p_r with PROBE_ACK(TRUE, $e + 1$). Hence, the probing procedure is guaranteed to finish. After probing finishes, p_r attempts to store the new configuration into the configuration service. Since no reconfiguration request other than r takes steps after r is invoked, no configuration could have been introduced while p_r was probing, and its compare_and_swap will succeed, as required. ◀

Proof of Liveness. Let r be the last reconfiguration request such that r is invoked by a correct process p_r , and every other reconfiguration request does not take any steps after the r 's invocation. By Theorem 9, p_r introduces a configuration $C = \langle e, M, p_i \rangle$. Assume that all processes in M are correct. We first prove Property 5a of Liveness.

5a. After introducing C , p_r sends NEW_CONFIG(e, M) to p_i , the leader of C . We assumed that no reconfiguration request but r takes any steps after r 's invocation. Thus, no

reconfiguration request may produce a $\text{PROBE}(e', _)$ such that $e' > e$. This implies that all the processes in M have $\text{new_epoch} \leq e$ at any time. Furthermore, the fact that p_i is picked as the leader guarantees that p_i has handled $\text{PROBE}(e, _)$. Therefore, p_i sets $\text{new_epoch} = e$ before p_r introduces C . Line 47 guarantees that p_i has $\text{new_epoch} = e$ when it receives $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e, M)$. Then p_i invokes $\text{conf_changed}(C)$ and sends $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, _, _)$ to its followers in M . We have established that all the processes in M have $\text{new_epoch} \leq e$ at any time. Then when a follower receives a $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, _, _)$ message, the precondition in line 65 is satisfied and the follower invokes $\text{conf_changed}(C)$, as required.

By Property 5a, all processes in M deliver $\text{conf_changed}(C)$. Therefore, every process in M sets epoch to e . We assumed that no reconfiguration request but r takes any steps after r 's invocation. Then no configuration with $\text{epoch} > e$ is ever introduced. Thus: (*) any process in M has $\text{epoch} = e$ at any moment after delivering $\text{conf_changed}(C)$. We now use this fact to prove Properties 5b and 5c of Liveness.

5b. Let $k_1 = \max\{k \mid \text{msg}[k] \neq \perp\}$ at the leader of e when it invokes $\text{conf_changed}(C)$.

The leader of e sends a $\text{COMMIT}(e, k)$ to all members such that $k \leq k_1$ after it receives a $\text{NEW_STATE_ACK}(e)$ message from every follower. Now assume that a process from M broadcasts an application message m while in epoch e . This happens after the process invokes $\text{conf_changed}(C)$ and thus after it sets $\text{leader} = p_i$. Hence, the leader p_i of e receives a $\text{FORWARD}(m)$ message. Let k' be the value of $_$ at p_i at the moment when it receives this message. Then p_i sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k', m)$. When processes in M receive this message, they have already invoked $\text{conf_changed}(C)$. Then by (*) and the fact that all processes in M are correct, they reply with ACCEPT_ACKs and thus the leader eventually sends $\text{COMMIT}(e, k')$. Furthermore, by lines 15, 17 and 59, the leader p_i sends also $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k'', _)$ such that $k_1 < k'' < k'$ before sending $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k', m)$. By (*) and the fact that all processes in M are correct, the leader p_i eventually sends a $\text{COMMIT}(e, k'', _)$ message for all k'' such that $k_1 < k'' < k'$. Thus, we have established that the leader sends a COMMIT messages for all positions between 0 and k' . Fix an arbitrary process $p_j \in M$.

After receiving the above COMMIT messages, by (*), p_j handles $\text{COMMIT}(e, k')$ and delivers the message stored at $\text{msg}[k']$. If the leader p_i sends $\text{COMMIT}(e, k')$, then all followers handle $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k', m)$ before. Thus, p_j sets $\text{msg}[k'] = m$ before handling $\text{COMMIT}(e, k')$ either because it is the leader of e and sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k', m)$, or because it handles $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k', m)$. The process p_j does not overwrite $\text{msg}[k']$ while $\text{epoch} = e$, so that p_j has $\text{msg}[k'] = m$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e, k')$. Therefore, it delivers m . Since p_j was picked arbitrarily, all members of M deliver m as required.

5c. Assume that a process p_k delivers m at an epoch $e' \leq e$. Then p_k handles $\text{COMMIT}(e', k)$ while having $\text{msg}[k] = m$. This implies that the leader of e' has $\text{msg}[k] = m$ when it sends $\text{COMMIT}(e', k)$.

Consider an arbitrary process $p_j \in M$. Let $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}, _)$ be the NEW_STATE message sent by the leader p_i of e and let $k_1 = \text{length}(\text{msg})$. If $e' < e$, then by Invariant 1, p_j has $\text{msg}[k] = m$ while in e . Then $\text{msg}[k] = m$ and $k_1 \geq k$. Assume now that $e' = e$. Since p_k delivers m at an epoch e' , this process has $\text{msg}[k] = m$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e, k)$. The case when p_k sets $\text{msg}[k]$ to m due to sending or receiving $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$ is handled as in Property 5b. Hence, we can assume that p_k sends or receives $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}, _)$ such that $\text{msg}[k] = m$. In this case we have $k_1 \geq k$. Thus, from now on we can assume that $\text{msg}[k] = m$ and $k_1 \geq k$.

The leader of e sends a COMMIT message to all members of M for all positions $k_1 \geq k$.

Thus, by (*), p_j eventually delivers the message at position k in its log. If this message m' is different from m , then p_j handles $\text{COMMIT}(e^*, k)$ for some e^* while having $\text{msg}[k] = m'$. Then the leader of e^* must have had $\text{msg}[k] = m'$ when it sent the COMMIT message. But then by Lemma 7, $m = m'$. Thus, p_j eventually delivers m , as required. \blacktriangleleft

B Proof of Correctness for the Passive Replication Implementation (Theorem 5)

A state S' is *derived* from a state S using a command c , denoted $S \xrightarrow{c} S'$, iff $\exists \delta. S' = \text{apply}(S, \delta) \wedge S \xrightarrow{c} \langle _, \delta \rangle$. Given a sequence of commands $\sigma = \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_l$, a state S' is derived from a state S using σ , denoted $S \xrightarrow{\sigma} S'$, iff $S = S_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_1} S_1 \xrightarrow{\sigma_2} \dots \xrightarrow{\sigma_l} S_l = S'$ for some states $S_1 \dots S_{l-1}$. A state S' is derived from a state S , denoted $S \rightsquigarrow S'$, iff $S \xrightarrow{\sigma} S'$ for some sequence of commands σ . For two sequences σ and σ' , we write $\sigma \preceq \sigma'$ if σ is a prefix of σ' .

In the following, we will use the term *time* to refer to the index at which a particular event occurs in a history. The lemma below asserts the key invariants satisfied by the passive replication protocol in Figure 6:

► **Lemma 10.** *Let h be a finite history of the algorithm in Figure 6. Then, there exists a sequence of commands σ_h over the set $\{c \mid \text{execute}(c) \in h\}$ and a non-decreasing function $f_h^j : \{0..|h|\} \rightarrow \{0..|h|\}$ for each processes p_j such that $|\sigma_h| = \max_j \{f_j(|h|)\}$, and the following holds for all times $t \in \{0..|h|\}$:*

1. *For all processes p_i , $\Sigma_i(t)$ is derived from Σ_0 using the prefix of σ_h of size $f_i(t)$:
 $\forall p_i. \Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_h^{\downarrow k}} \Sigma_i(t)$ where $k = f_i^i(t)$.*
2. *For all processes p_i , the total number of messages delivered by p_i at or before t is equal $f_i(t)$, and if $t > 0$, then $f_i(t-1) \leq f_i(t) \leq f_i(t-1) + 1$.*
3. *For all processes p_i , if p_i delivers a message m at t , then at the time when m was broadcast, the value of the speculative state Θ at the sender of m is the same as the value of the committed state Σ at p_i at t :
 $\forall p_i, m. h_t = \text{deliver}_i(m) \implies \exists p_j, t'. t' < t \wedge h_{t'} = \text{broadcast}_j(m) \wedge \Sigma_i(t) = \Theta_j(t')$.*
4. *Consider a message m that was originally broadcast by a process p_j in an epoch e_j . Suppose that a process p_k joins an epoch $e_k > e_j$ at t , and p_k is the leader of e_k . Suppose further that p_k does not speculatively deliver any messages when joining e_k and m is the last message delivered by p_k before joining e_k . Then $\Theta_k(t) = \Theta_j(t_j)$.*
5. *Consider a message m that was originally broadcast by a process p_j in an epoch e_j , and assume that some process delivers m . Suppose that a process p_k joins an epoch $e_k > e_j$ at t , and p_k is the leader of e_k . Suppose further that m is the last message speculatively delivered by p_k when joining e_k . Then $\Theta_k(t) = \Theta_j(t_j)$.*

The following proposition is immediate from the passive replication code:

- **Proposition 11. 1.** *For all processes p_i , times $t > 0$, and messages $m = \langle _, _, \delta \rangle$, if p_i delivers m at time t , then $\Sigma_i(t) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_i(t-1), \delta)$.*
2. *For all processes p_i and times $t > 0$, if $\Sigma_i(t) \neq \Sigma_i(t-1)$, then p_i delivers a message at t .*

► **Lemma 12.** *Consider a process p_i that delivers m before m' and does not deliver any message in between the two. Suppose that m is broadcast in an epoch e and m' is broadcast in an epoch $e' > e$. Let p_k be the process that broadcast m' and assume that p_k delivers m before joining e' . Then*

1. p_k does not deliver any messages after delivering m and before broadcasting m' ; and

2. p_k does not speculatively deliver any messages when joining e' .

Proof. Let t_k be the time at which p_k broadcasts m' , and $s_k < t_k$ be the time at which p_k delivers m .

Assume by contradiction that either (1) or (2) is violated. Suppose first that (1) does not hold: i.e., there exists a time $s_k < t_k'' < t_k$ such that p_k delivers a message m'' at time t_k'' . Since p_k broadcasts m' and p_i delivers m' , by Prefix Consistency ((a)/if), p_i must deliver m'' before delivering m' . Since $s_k < t_k''$, by Total Order, p_i must also deliver m'' after delivering m . However, since p_i does not deliver any messages after delivering m and before delivering m' , this is a contradiction.

Suppose next that (2) does not hold. Let $\text{conf_changed}_k(\langle e', -, - \rangle, \sigma)$ be the configuration change event that causes p_k to join e' and $s_k < t_k'' < t_k$ be the time at which p_k joins e' . Then, there exists a message m'' such that $m'' \in \sigma$. Since p_i delivers m' , p_k broadcasts m' , and $m'' \in \sigma$, by Prefix Consistency ((a)/if), p_i must deliver m'' before delivering m' . Thus, we get that p_i delivers m'' , p_k speculatively delivers m'' when joining e_k , and p_k delivers m before joining e_k . By Prefix Consistency ((b)/if), this implies that p_i delivers m before delivering m'' . However, since p_i does not deliver any messages after delivering m and before delivering m' , this is a contradiction. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 13.** Consider a process p_i that delivers m before m' and does not deliver any message in between the two. Suppose that m is broadcast in an epoch e and m' is broadcast in an epoch $e' > e$. Let p_k be the process that broadcasts m' and assume that p_k speculatively delivers m when joining e' . Then m is the last message speculatively delivered by p_k when joining e' .

Proof. Let t' be the time at which p_k joins e' , and $\text{conf_changed}_k(\langle e', -, - \rangle, m_1..m_l)$ be the configuration change event occurring at t' . Since p_k speculatively delivers m when joining e' , there exists $1 \leq r \leq l$ such that $m_r = m$. Assume by contradiction that $1 \leq r < l$. Then, there exists a message m'' such that p_k speculatively delivers m before m'' when joining e_k . By Prefix Consistency ((a)/if), p_i delivers m'' before m' , which by Prefix Consistency ((b)/if), implies that p_i delivers m before delivering m'' . Thus, p_i delivers m followed by m'' followed by m' , which is a contradiction to the assumption that p_i does not deliver any messages after delivering m and before delivering m' . \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 14.** Consider a process p_i that delivers m before m' and does not deliver any message in between the two. Suppose that m is broadcast in an epoch e and m' is broadcast in an epoch $e' > e$. Let p_k be the process that broadcasts m' . Then p_k does not broadcast any messages after joining e' and before broadcasting m' .

Proof. Assume by contradiction that there exists a message m'' such that p_k broadcasts m'' after joining e' and before broadcasting m' . By Local Order, p_i must deliver m'' before delivering m' . Since p_i does not deliver any messages after delivering m and before delivering m' , p_i must deliver m'' before delivering m . By Prefix Consistency ((b)/only if), this implies that p_k delivers m'' before joining e' or speculatively delivers m'' before m when joining e' . However, this means that m'' is delivered or speculatively delivered by p_k before it is broadcast by p_k , which is a contradiction. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Lemma 10. By induction on the length of an execution. Consider first an execution h such that $|h| = 0$. Then, all processes are in their initial states. Let σ_h be the empty sequence, and $f_h^j : \{0\} \rightarrow \{0\}$ for each process p_j . Then, $|\sigma_h| = \max_j \{f_j(|h|)\} = 0$, and for all processes p_i , $\Sigma_i = \Sigma_0$. Since Σ_0 is derived from itself using the empty sequence of

commands, and the empty sequence is the prefix of σ_h of size $f_h^i(0) = 0$, Lemma 10.1 holds. Furthermore, since no process delivers a message in h and $t = 0$, Lemma 10.2 is vacuously true. Finally, since no process broadcasts a message or joins an epoch in the history of size 0, the claims asserted by Lemmas 10.3-10.5 are vacuously true as well.

For the inductive step, assume that the lemma holds for all histories h of length k , and consider a history h' of length $k + 1$. If the last event in h' is the delivery of a message $m = \langle _, _, \delta \rangle$ and the process p_i that delivers m has the longest prefix of messages delivered in h , then we let

$$\sigma_{h'} \triangleq \sigma_h \cdot c \quad \text{such that } \exists S. \exists c. \text{execute}(c) \in h \wedge S \xrightarrow{c} \langle _, \delta \rangle \wedge \Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_h} S, \text{ and} \quad (2)$$

$$f_{h'}^i \triangleq f_h^i \cup \{|h| + 1, |\sigma_h| + 1\} \wedge \forall p_j \neq p_i. f_{h'}^j \triangleq f_h^j \cup \{|h| + 1, f_h^j(|h|)\}. \quad (3)$$

If the last event in h' is the delivery of a message $m = \langle _, _, \delta \rangle$ by a process p_i , and the length of the message prefix delivered by p_i in h is not the longest, then we let:

$$\sigma_{h'} \triangleq \sigma_h, \text{ and} \quad (4)$$

$$f_{h'}^i \triangleq f_h^i \cup \{|h| + 1, f_h^i(|h|) + 1\} \wedge \forall p_j \neq p_i. f_{h'}^j \triangleq f_h^j \cup \{|h| + 1, f_h^j(|h|)\}. \quad (5)$$

In all the remaining cases, we let:

$$\sigma_{h'} \triangleq \sigma_h, \text{ and} \quad (6)$$

$$\forall p_j. f_{h'}^j \triangleq f_h^j \cup \{|h| + 1, f_h^j(|h|)\}. \quad (7)$$

We first show that

$$|\sigma_{h'}| = \max_j \{f_{h'}^j(|h'|)\}. \quad (8)$$

If the last event in h' is not the delivery of a message, then by (6), (7), and the induction hypothesis:

$$|\sigma_{h'}| = |\sigma_h| = \max_j \{f_h^j(|h|)\} = \max_j \{f_{h'}^j(|h'|)\},$$

as needed. Next, assume that the last event in h' is the delivery of a message by process p_i , which has the longest prefix of messages delivered in h . Then by (3) and the induction hypothesis

$$f_{h'}^i(|h'|) = |\sigma_h| + 1 = \max_j \{f_h^j(|h|)\} + 1 \wedge \forall p_j \neq p_i. f_{h'}^j(|h'|) = f_h^j(|h|) \leq \max_j \{f_h^j(|h|)\},$$

which implies that

$$f_{h'}^i(|h'|) = \max_j \{f_{h'}^j(|h'|)\}.$$

Thus, by (2), we have

$$|\sigma_{h'}| = |\sigma_h| + 1 = f_{h'}^i(|h'|) = \max_j \{f_{h'}^j(|h'|)\},$$

as needed. Last, assume that the last event in h' is the delivery of a message by process p_i which does not have the longest prefix of messages delivered in h . Let l_h^k be the length of the message prefix delivered by process p_k in h . By the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.2,

$$\forall p_j. f_h^j(|h|) = l_h^j,$$

and therefore,

$$f_h^i(|h|) = l_h^i < \max_j \{l_h^j\}.$$

By (4), and the induction hypothesis,

$$|\sigma_{h'}| = |\sigma_h| = \max_j \{l_h^j\} = \max_j \{f_h^j(|h|)\} > l_h^i = f_h^i(|h|).$$

Thus by (5), we have

$$f_{h'}^i(|h'|) = f_h^i(|h|) + 1 \leq \max_{j \neq i} \{f_h^j(|h|)\} = \max_{j \neq i} \{f_{h'}^j(|h'|)\}.$$

The above implies that

$$\max_j \{f_{h'}^j(|h'|)\} = \max_j \{f_h^j(|h|)\} = |\sigma_h| = |\sigma_{h'}|,$$

as needed. We next prove the individual statements of the lemma assuming $t = k + 1$ (i.e., t is the time of the last event in h').

Proof of Lemma 10.4. Suppose that at t , a process p_k joins an epoch $e_k > e_j$, and p_k is the leader of e_k . Let m be a message that was originally broadcast by a process p_j in an epoch e_j at time t_j . Suppose further that p_k does not speculatively deliver any messages when joining e_k and m is the last message delivered by p_k before joining e_k . We prove that $\Theta_k(t) = \Theta_j(t_j)$.

Let s_k be the time at which p_k delivers m . Since m is the last message delivered by p_k before joining e_k , Σ_k does not change after it was updated by the code in line 16 and before p_k joins e_k . By the `conf_changed` handler code, $\Theta_k(t)$ is computed by first assigning it the value of $\Sigma_k(t)$ (line 23), and then applying the state updates speculatively delivered in the `conf_changed` upcall. Since by assumption, no state updates are speculatively delivered at t , $\Sigma_k(t) = \Sigma_k(s_k)$, and so we have $\Theta_k(t) = \Sigma_k(s_k)$. By the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.3, $\Sigma_k(s_k) = \Theta_j(t_j)$, and therefore, $\Theta_k(t) = \Theta_j(t_j)$, as needed. ◀

Proof of Lemma 10.5. Consider a message m that was originally broadcast by a process p_j at time t_j in an epoch e_j . We consider two cases:

- (a). Suppose first that at t , there exists a process p_k that joins an epoch $e_k > e_j$, and p_k is the leader of e_k . Suppose further that m is the last message speculatively delivered by p_k when joining e_k . If no process delivers m before t , then the required holds by the induction hypothesis. Suppose that there exists a process p_i that delivers m at time $t_i < t$. We prove that $\Theta_k(t) = \Theta_j(t_j)$.

Let `conf_changedk`($\langle e_k, _, _ \rangle, m_1..m_l$) be the configuration change action executed by p_k at t . Since m is the last message speculatively delivered by p_k when joining e_k (i.e., $m_l = m$), by Prefix Consistency ((b)/if),

$$\begin{aligned} \forall r. 1 \leq r \leq l &\implies p_i \text{ delivers } m_r \wedge \\ 1 < r \leq l &\implies p_i \text{ delivers } m_{r-1} \text{ before } m_r \wedge \\ &\forall m'. p_i \text{ does not deliver } m' \text{ after } m_{r-1} \text{ and before } m_r. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Let t_1 be the time at which p_i delivers $m_1 = \langle _, _, \delta_1 \rangle$, and $\Sigma_i(t_1)^-$ be the value of Σ_i to which δ_1 is applied in line 16. We show that

$$\Sigma_i(t_1)^- = \Sigma_k(t). \quad (10)$$

Assume by contradiction that $\Sigma_i(t_1)^- \neq \Sigma_k(t)$. Then, by the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.1, there exists a message m' such that either (i) p_i delivers m' before delivering

m_1 and p_k does not deliver m' before joining e_k , or (ii) p_k delivers m' before joining e_k and p_i does not deliver m' before delivering m_1 . Suppose that (i) holds. Since p_k does not deliver m' before joining e_k , by Prefix Consistency ((b)/only if), p_k speculatively delivers m' before m_1 when joining e_k . However, since m_1 is the first message speculatively delivered by p_k when joining e_k , this is a contradiction. Suppose that (ii) holds. Then, by Prefix Consistency ((b)/if), p_i must deliver m' before delivering m_1 contradicting the assumption that p_i does not deliver m' before delivering m_1 . Thus, (10) holds, and from (10) and (9), and the code in line 13, we get $\Theta_k(t) = \Sigma_i(t_i)$. By the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.3, $\Sigma_i(t_i) = \Theta_j(t_j)$, and therefore, $\Theta_k(t) = \Theta_j(t_j)$, as needed.

- (b). Suppose next that at t , there exists a process p_i which delivers a message m that was originally broadcast by a process p_j in epoch e_j . If m is not the last message speculatively delivered by any process when joining an epoch $> e_j$ before t , then the required holds by the induction hypothesis. Otherwise, let p_k be a process that speculatively delivers m when joining an epoch $e_k > e_j$ at a time $t_k < t$, and assume that m is the last message delivered by p_k when joining e_k . Then instantiating the argument in (a) with $t = t_k$, we obtain $\Theta_k(t_k) = \Theta_j(t_j)$, as needed. ◀

Proof of Lemma 10.3. Let m' be the message delivered by p_i at t . Consider the latest time $s \leq T$ at which p_i delivers a message, and let m be the message delivered by p_i at s . Thus,

$$\Sigma_i(t) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_i(s), \delta) \wedge m' = \langle _, _, \delta \rangle. \quad (11)$$

Let p_k be the processes that broadcast m' at time $t_k < t$. We prove that

$$\Sigma_i(t) = \Theta_k(t_k).$$

By the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.3, there exists a process p_j which broadcast m at time $t_j < s$ and

$$\Sigma_i(s) = \Theta_j(t_j). \quad (12)$$

Let $e_j = \text{epochOf}(\text{broadcast}_j(m))$ and $e_k = \text{epochOf}(\text{broadcast}_k(m'))$. By definition of epochOf , $\text{conf_changed}_j(\langle e_j, _, _ \rangle, _)$ (respectively, $\text{conf_changed}_k(\langle e_k, _, _ \rangle, _)$) is the latest configuration change event preceding $\text{broadcast}_j(m)$ (respectively, $\text{broadcast}_k(m')$) at p_j (respectively, p_k). By line 21, $\text{cur_leader}_j(t_j) = \text{leader}(e_j)$ and $\text{cur_leader}_k(t_k) = \text{leader}(e_k)$. Since a process can only broadcast a message if the precondition in line 11 holds, we have $\text{cur_leader}_j(t_j) = p_j$ and $\text{cur_leader}_k(t_k) = p_k$. Hence,

$$p_j = \text{leader}(e_j) \wedge p_k = \text{leader}(e_k).$$

We consider two cases. Suppose first that $e_j = e_k$. Then

$$p_j = p_k = \text{leader}(e_j) = \text{leader}(e_k).$$

By Local Order, $t_j < t_k$ and for all times $t_j < t'_j < t_k$, p_j does not broadcast any messages at t'_j . Thus, by the code in lines 12–14, we have

$$\exists c. \Theta_k(t_k) = \text{apply}(\Theta_j(t_j), \delta) \wedge \Theta_j(t_j) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _, \delta \rangle \wedge m' = \langle _, _, \delta \rangle.$$

By (12), the above implies

$$\Theta_k(t_k) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_i(s), \delta) \wedge m' = \langle _, _, \delta \rangle.$$

Thus, by (11), we have

$$\Sigma_i(t) = \Theta_k(t_k),$$

as needed.

Suppose next that $e_j \neq e_k$. Since p_i delivers m before m' , by Prefix Consistency ((a)/only if), either p_k delivers m before joining e_k , or p_k speculatively delivers m when joining e_k . Let t'_k be the time at which p_k joins e_k . Suppose first that $\text{deliver}_k(m)$ occurs at time $s_k < t'_k$. Since by Global Order, $e_j < e_k$, by Lemma 12, p_k does not deliver any messages after delivering m and before joining e_k and does not speculatively deliver any messages when joining e_k . Thus, by the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.4,

$$\Theta_k(t'_k) = \Theta_j(t_j). \quad (13)$$

Since p_i does not deliver any messages after delivering m and before delivering m' , by Local Order, p_k does not broadcast any messages in-between t'_k and t_k . Together with (13), this implies

$$\exists c. \Theta_k(t_k) = \text{apply}(\Theta_j(t_j), \delta) \wedge \Theta_j(t_j) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _, \delta \rangle \wedge m' = \langle _, _, \delta \rangle.$$

By (12), the above implies

$$\Theta_k(t_k) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_i(s), \delta) \wedge m' = \langle _, _, \delta \rangle.$$

Thus, by (11), we obtain,

$$\Sigma_i(t) = \Theta_k(t_k),$$

as needed.

Suppose that p_k speculatively delivers m when joining e_k . Then, by Lemma 13, m is the last message speculatively delivered by p_k when joining e_k . Hence, by the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.5,

$$\Theta_k(t'_k) = \Theta_j(t_j).$$

Since by Lemma 14, p_k does not broadcast any messages after joining e_k and before broadcasting m' , the above implies

$$\exists c. \Theta_k(t_k) = \text{apply}(\Theta_j(t_j), \delta) \wedge \Theta_j(t_j) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _, \delta \rangle \wedge m' = \langle _, _, \delta \rangle.$$

By (12), the above implies

$$\Theta_k(t_k) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_i(s), \delta) \wedge m' = \langle _, _, \delta \rangle.$$

Thus, by (11), we obtain,

$$\Sigma_i(t) = \Theta_k(t_k),$$

as needed. ◀

Proof of Lemma 10.2 Let l_j denote the length of the message prefix delivered by the process p_j . By (3), (5), and (7), for all processes p_j and times $t' < t$, $f_{h'}^j(t') = f_h^j(t')$. Since by the induction hypothesis,

$$\forall t' < t. l_j(t') = f_h^j(t') \wedge \forall 0 < t' < t. f_h^j(t' - 1) \leq f_h^j(t') \leq f_h^j(t' - 1) + 1,$$

we have

$$\forall t' < t. \forall p_j. f_{h'}^j(t') = l_j(t').$$

Thus, it remains to show that

$$\forall p_j. f_{h'}^j(t) = l_j(t) \wedge f_{h'}^j(t-1) \leq f_{h'}^j(t) \leq f_{h'}^j(t-1) + 1. \quad (14)$$

We consider the following three cases. First, if the last even in h' is not a delivery of a message, then $\forall p_j. l_j(t-1) = l_j(t)$. Thus, by (5) and the induction hypothesis

$$\forall p_j. f_{h'}^j(t) = f_h^j(t-1) = l_j(t-1) = l_j(t),$$

and therefore, (14) holds. Second, suppose that the last event in h' is the delivery of a message m by process p_i such that the following holds:

$$l_i(t-1) = \max_j \{l_j(t-1)\}.$$

Then,

$$l_i(t) = l_i(t-1) + 1 \wedge \forall p_j \neq p_i. l_j(t-1) = l_j(t).$$

By (3),

$$\forall p_j \neq p_i. f_{h'}^j(t) = f_h^j(t-1) = l_j(t-1) = l_j(t).$$

Hence, (14) holds for all $p_j \neq p_i$. Otherwise, by (3),

$$f_{h'}^i(t) = |\sigma_h| + 1,$$

which by the induction hypothesis for (8) implies that

$$f_{h'}^i(t) = \max_j \{f_h^j(|h|)\} + 1 = \max_j \{l_j(t-1)\} + 1 = l_i(t-1) + 1 = l_i(t).$$

In addition, the above and the induction hypothesis also yield

$$f_{h'}^i(t) = l_i(t-1) + 1 = f_h^i(t-1) + 1,$$

and so (14) follows. Finally, suppose that the last event in h' is the delivery of a message m by process p_i such that the following holds:

$$l_i(t-1) < \max_j \{l_j(t-1)\}.$$

By (5),

$$\forall p_j \neq p_i. f_{h'}^j(t) = f_h^j(t-1) = l_j(t-1) = l_j(t).$$

Otherwise,

$$f_{h'}^i(t) = f_h^i(t-1) + 1 = l_i(t-1) + 1 = l_i(t),$$

as needed.

Proof of Lemma 10.1. Let m' be the message delivered by p_i at t . Assume that m' is the l th message delivered by p_i . Let $m_1..m_l = m'$ be the sequence of the first l messages delivered by p_i , and t_j^k denote the time at which the k th message is delivered by p_j . (Note that $t = t_i^l$.) Let

$$m_l = \langle _, _, \delta_l \rangle.$$

Suppose first that for all processes $p_j \neq p_i$, the number of messages delivered by p_j before t is $< l$. Then, we have to show that the following holds provided $\sigma_{h'}$ and the functions $f_{h'}^j$ for each process p_j are chosen as shown in (2) and (3):

$$\forall t' \leq t. \forall p_j. \exists k. \Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_{h'}^{\downarrow k}} \Sigma_j(t') \wedge k = f_{h'}^j(t'). \quad (15)$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\forall t' < t. \forall p_j. \exists k. \Sigma_0 \overset{\sigma_{h'} \downarrow k}{\rightsquigarrow} \Sigma_j(t') \wedge k = f_h^j(t'). \quad (16)$$

Since

$$\forall c. \forall k. k \leq |\sigma_h| \implies \sigma_h \downarrow k = (\sigma_h \cdot c) \downarrow k = \sigma_{h'} \downarrow k,$$

and from (3),

$$\forall t' < t. f_{h'}(t') = f_h(t') \wedge f_{h'}(t') \leq |\sigma_h|,$$

we get

$$\forall t' < t. \forall c. \exists k. (\sigma_h \downarrow k = (\sigma_h \cdot c) \downarrow k \wedge k = f_{h'}(t')).$$

Thus, (16) implies

$$\forall t' < t. \exists k. \Sigma_0 \overset{\sigma_{h'} \downarrow k}{\rightsquigarrow} \Sigma_j(t') \wedge k = f_{h'}^j(t').$$

Furthermore, since

$$\forall p_j. p_j \neq p_i \implies \Sigma_j(t-1) = \Sigma_j(t),$$

we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t' \leq t. \forall p_j. (p_j \neq p_i \implies \exists k. \Sigma_0 \overset{\sigma_{h'} \downarrow k}{\rightsquigarrow} \Sigma_j(t') \wedge k = f_{h'}^j(t')) \wedge \\ \forall t' < t. \exists k. \Sigma_0 \overset{\sigma_{h'} \downarrow k}{\rightsquigarrow} \Sigma_i(t') \wedge k = f_{h'}^j(t'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it remains to show that

$$\Sigma_i(t) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_i(t-1), \delta) \wedge \exists c. \Sigma_i(t-1) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta_l \rangle,$$

which by Proposition 11 can be rewritten as

$$\Sigma_i(t_i^l) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_i(t_i^{l-1}), \delta_l) \wedge \exists c. \Sigma_i(t_i^{l-1}) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta_l \rangle. \quad (17)$$

Since $\Sigma_i(t_i^l) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_i(t_i^{l-1}), \delta)$, we only need to show that

$$\exists c. \Sigma_i(t_i^{l-1}) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta_l \rangle. \quad (18)$$

Let p_k be the process that broadcast m_{l-1} , and s_k and e_k be the time and the epoch at which this happened, respectively. By the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.3,

$$\Sigma_i(t_i^{l-1}) = \Theta_k(s_k). \quad (19)$$

Let s'_k and e'_k be respectively the time and the epoch when m_l is broadcast. Suppose first that $e_k = e'_k$. Since the leader of e_k is the only process that can broadcast messages in e_k , it also broadcasts m_{l-1} . Since m_{l-1} is delivered by p_i before m_l and no messages are delivered by p_i in-between m_{l-1} and m_l , by Local Order, $s_k < s'_k$ and p_k does not broadcast any messages between s_k and s'_k . Thus, by the code of the EXECUTE handler, we have

$$\exists c. \Theta_k(s_k) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta_l \rangle,$$

which by (19) implies

$$\Sigma_i(t_i^{l-1}) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta_l \rangle,$$

where c is the command used to compute δ by the sender p_k of m_l , as needed.

Suppose next that $e_k \neq e'_k$, let p_r be the leader of e'_k , and s_r be the time when p_r joins e'_k . Since p_i delivers m_{l-1} before m_l , by Prefix Consistency ((b/only if)), either p_r delivers m_{l-1} before joining e'_k , or p_r speculatively delivers m_{l-1} when joining e'_k . Suppose first that $\text{deliver}_k(m_{l-1})$ occurs before p_r joins e'_k . Since by Global Order, $e_k < e'_k$, by Lemma 12, p_r does not deliver any messages after delivering m_{l-1} and before joining e'_k and does not speculatively deliver any messages when joining e'_k . Thus, by the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.4,

$$\Theta_r(s_r) = \Theta_k(s_k).$$

Since p_i does not deliver any messages after delivering m_{l-1} and before delivering m_l , by Lemma 14, p_r does not broadcast any messages in-between s_r and s'_k . Thus, by the code of the EXECUTE handler,

$$\exists c. \Theta_r(s_r) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta_l \rangle \wedge m_l = \langle _ , _ , \delta_l \rangle,$$

which implies

$$\exists c. \Theta_k(s_k) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta_l \rangle \wedge m_l = \langle _ , _ , \delta_l \rangle.$$

Thus, by (19) we get (18), as needed. Next, suppose that p_r speculatively delivers m_{l-1} when joining e'_k . Then, by Lemma 13, m_{l-1} is the last message speculatively delivered by p_r when joining e'_k . Hence, by the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.5,

$$\Theta_r(s_r) = \Theta_k(s_k).$$

Thus, applying the same reasoning as above, we again get (18), as needed.

Finally, suppose that there exists a process $p_r \neq p_i$ such that p_r delivers $> l$ messages before t . Thus, we have to show that (15) holds given that $\sigma_{h'}$ and $f_{h'}^j$, for each process p_j are chosen as shown in (4) and (5). Then, (15) can be re-written as follows

$$\forall t' \leq t. \forall p_j. \exists k. \Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_{h'}^{\downarrow k}} \Sigma_j(t') \wedge k = f_{h'}^j(t'). \quad (20)$$

By the induction hypothesis and (5)

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t' \leq t. \forall p_j. p_j \neq p_i &\implies \exists k. \Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_{h'}^{\downarrow k}} \Sigma_j(t') \wedge k = f_{h'}^j(t') \wedge \\ \forall t' < t. \exists k. \Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_{h'}^{\downarrow k}} \Sigma_i(t') &\wedge k = f_{h'}^i(t'). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that

$$\exists k. \Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_{h'}^{\downarrow k}} \Sigma_i(t) \wedge k = f_{h'}^i(t-1) + 1. \quad (21)$$

Let $\ell_k(s)$ denote the length of the message prefix delivered by process p_k at or before time s . By the induction hypotheses for Lemma 10.2, we get

$$f_h^r(t-1) = \ell_h^r(t-1) > \ell_h^i(t-1) = f_h^i(t-1).$$

Since by the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.2, f_h^r never skips a value, there exists a time $t'' \leq t-1$ such that

$$f_h^r(t'') = \ell_h^r(t'') = \ell_h^i(t-1) = f_h^i(t-1).$$

Let s_r and s_i be the earliest times for which the above holds, i.e.,

$$f_h^r(t'') = f_h^r(s_r) = \ell_h^r(s_r) = \ell_h^i(s_i) = f_h^i(s_i) = f_h^i(t-1).$$

Then, by the induction hypothesis, we get

$$\exists k. \Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{k \downarrow \sigma_{h'}} \Sigma_r(s_r) \wedge \Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{k \downarrow \sigma_{h'}} \Sigma_i(s_i) \wedge k = f_h^r(s_r).$$

Thus,

$$\Sigma_r(s_r) = \Sigma_i(s_i).$$

By the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.2, the value of f_h^r remains the same until the time $s'_r > s_r$ at which p_r delivers the next message. Hence,

$$\Sigma_r(s'_r - 1) = \Sigma_r(s_r) = \Sigma_i(s_i). \quad (22)$$

By the induction hypothesis

$$\exists c. \sigma_h[f_h^r(s_r) + 1] = c \wedge \exists \delta. \Sigma_r(s'_r) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_r(s'_r - 1), \delta) \wedge \Sigma_r(s'_r - 1) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta \rangle.$$

Since by the code, $\Sigma_r(s'_r - 1)$ can only transition to $\Sigma_r(s'_r)$ by applying the delta included in the payload of the message delivered at s'_r . By Agreement and Total Order, this message must be the same as the one p_i delivers at t , i.e., $m_l = \langle _ , _ , \delta_l \rangle$. Hence, we get $\delta = \delta_l$, and therefore,

$$\exists c. \sigma_h[f_h^r(s_r) + 1] = c \wedge \Sigma_r(s'_r) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_r(s'_r - 1), \delta_l) \wedge \Sigma_r(s'_r - 1) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta_l \rangle. \quad (23)$$

Since $f_h^i(s_i) = f_h^i(t - 1)$, by the induction hypothesis for Lemma 10.2, the value of f_h^i remains the same until the time $t > s_i$ at which p_r delivers m_l . Hence, by (22),

$$\Sigma_r(s'_r - 1) = \Sigma_r(s_r) = \Sigma_i(s_i) = \Sigma_i(t - 1). \quad (24)$$

Since at t , p_i delivers $m_l = \langle _ , _ , \delta_l \rangle$ and applies it to $\Sigma_i(t - 1)$, from (23) and (24), we get

$$\exists c. \sigma_h[f_h^r(s_r) + 1] = c \wedge \Sigma_i(t) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_r(t - 1), \delta) \wedge \Sigma_t(t - 1) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta_l \rangle.$$

Since $f_h^r(s_r) = f_h^i(t - 1)$, the above implies

$$\exists c. \sigma_h[f_h^i(t - 1) + 1] = c \wedge \Sigma_i(t) = \text{apply}(\Sigma_r(t - 1), \delta) \wedge \Sigma_t(t - 1) \xrightarrow{c} \langle _ , \delta_l \rangle.$$

which combined with the induction hypothesis yields (21), as needed. \blacktriangleleft

We are now ready to prove the main result:

Proof of Theorem 5. Consider a history of the passive replication algorithm in Figure 6. By Lemma 10, there exists a sequence of commands $\sigma = \sigma_1.. \sigma_l$ such that for all $1 \leq k \leq l$, $\text{execute}(\sigma_k)$ is an event in h , and the conditions given by Lemmas 1–5 hold for all times t in h . By Lemma 10.1, for all k , there exists a committed state Σ_k and a response r_k such that $\Sigma_k \xrightarrow{\sigma_k} \langle r_k, _ \rangle$. Let $\pi = \sigma_1, r_1, \dots, \sigma_l, r_l$. Then, by induction on the length of π , it follows that π is a history of the specification in Figure 5, which implies the required. \blacktriangleleft

C Proof of Correctness for the Primary-Order Broadcast Protocol (Theorem 6)

Figure 10 summarizes additional invariants that, together with the invariants listed in Figure 9, are used to prove the correctness of the protocol. The proof that the Primary-Order Broadcast protocol satisfies the invariants in Figure 9 and the properties in Figure 1 (except for Property 3, which is not required) is virtually identical to the one for the atomic broadcast protocol, and therefore omitted.

5. Assume the leader of an epoch e sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$ while having $\text{msg} = \text{msg}$. Whenever any process p_i has $\text{epoch} = e' > e$ and $\text{msg}[k] = m$, it also has $\text{msg}|_k = \text{msg}$.
6. If a process p_i receives $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$ and replies with ACCEPT_ACK , then after this and while $\text{epoch} = e$ at p_i we have $\text{msg}|_k = \text{msg}|_k$, where msg was the value of the msg array at the leader of e when it sent $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$.
7. For any messages $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m_1)$ and $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m_2)$, we have $m_1 = m_2$.
8. Assume the leader of an epoch e sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$. If a process p_i delivers m at an epoch $e' \geq e$ after handling $\text{COMMIT}(e', k')$, then $k = k'$.

■ **Figure 10** Remaining invariants.

Proof of Invariant 6. Assume that a process p_i at e receives $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$ and replies with the message ACCEPT_ACK . We prove that, after the transition and while $\text{epoch} = e$, p_i has $\text{msg}|_k = \text{msg}|_k$ where msg is the value of the array msg at the leader of e when it sent $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$.

By the protocol, since p_i handles $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$, by line 19, p_i has $\text{epoch} = e$. This implies that p_i is a follower in e and that p_i has handled the $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}')$ message sent by the leader p_j of e . After handling this message, p_i has $\text{msg} = \text{msg}'$ where msg' is the value of msg at p_j when it sent the $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}')$ message. Let $k_1 = \text{length}(\text{msg}')$. We know that p_j does not overwrite any position $\leq k_1$ from the moment it sends $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}')$ while in e . Then $\text{msg}|_{k_1} = \text{msg}'$. The same holds of p_i from the moment it handles $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}')$ and while it stays in e . Thus, (*) p_i has $\text{msg}|_{k_1} = \text{msg}|_{k_1}$ after handling $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}')$ and while in e . We now prove that p_i receives an ACCEPT message for every position k^* such that $k_1 < k^* < k$ before receiving $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, _)$. We prove it by induction on k . Assume that the invariant holds for k_2 such that $k_1 < k_2 < k$. We now show it for $k_2 = k$. Consider the case when $k_1 < k_2 - 1$; otherwise the required holds trivially. If p_i receives $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k_2, m)$, then the leader p_j has $\text{epoch} = k_2$ when it sent it. The leader p_j sets $\text{epoch} = k_1$ at line 59 before setting $\text{status} = \text{LEADER}$. After that, p_j only updates at line 17 by increasing it by one. Therefore, p_j has $\text{epoch} = k_2 - 1$ at some point before sending $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k_2, m)$. Since $k_1 < k_2 - 1$, the leader p_j sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k_2 - 1, _)$ before sending $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k_2, m)$. Since channels are FIFO, p_i receives $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k_2 - 1, _)$ before receiving $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k_2, m)$. Then, by this and the induction hypothesis, p_i receives an ACCEPT message for all positions $< k_2$ (and $> k_1$) before receiving $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k_2, _)$, as required. Hence, p_i receives an ACCEPT message for every position k^* such that $k_1 < k^* < k$ before receiving $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, _)$. When p_j sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k^*, m^*)$, it sets $\text{msg}[k^*] = m^*$. While $\text{epoch} = e$, p_j does not overwrite $\text{msg}[k^*]$, so that $\text{msg}[k^*] = m$. When p_i handles $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k^*, m^*)$, it sets $\text{msg}[k^*] = m^*$. Since p_i does not overwrite $\text{msg}[k^*]$ while $\text{epoch} = e$, after handling $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k^*, m^*)$, p_i has $\text{msg}[k^*] = \text{msg}[k^*]$ while in e . Then by (*), p_i has $\text{msg}|_k = \text{msg}|_k$ after handling $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$ and while in e , as required. ◀

► **Lemma 15.** *Assume that the leader of an epoch e sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$. Let $e' > e$ be an epoch and p_i its leader. If p_i sends $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}', _)$ such that $\text{msg}'[k] = m$, then p_i has $\text{epoch} \geq e$ right before it sends $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}', _)$.*

Proof. Let e_0 be the value of epoch at p_i right before handling $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e', _)$. The process p_i has $\text{msg}[k] = m$ when it sends $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}', _)$. Then p_i sets $\text{msg}[k] = m$ after handling $\text{ACCEPT}(e^*, k, m)$ or $\text{NEW_STATE}(e^*, \text{msg}_0, _)$ such that $\text{msg}_0[k] = m$ in an epoch $e^* \leq e_0$. In the former case, by (1), $e = e^* \leq e_0$, which implies required. In the latter case, we prove by contradiction that $e^* \geq e$. Assume that $e^* < e$. By Invariant 4, there exists an

epoch $< e$ in which m is broadcast. But by (1), this is impossible. Thus, $e_0 \geq e^* \geq e$, as required. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Invariant 5. We prove the invariant by induction on e' . Assume the invariant holds for each $e' < e''$. We now show that it holds for $e' = e''$ by induction on the length of the protocol execution. We only consider the most interesting transition in line 64, where a process p_i receives $\text{NEW_STATE}(e'', \text{msg}'')$ from the leader of e'' and sets msg to msg'' (line 69). Assume that after the transition p_i has $\text{msg}[k] = m$; then $\text{msg}''[k] = m$. To show that after the transition p_i has $\text{msg}|_k = \text{msg}$, it is sufficient to prove that $\text{msg}'|_k = \text{msg}$. Let p_j be the leader of e'' , i.e., the process that sends $\text{NEW_STATE}(e'', \text{msg}'')$, and let $e_0 < e''$ be the value of epoch at p_j right before receiving the $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e'', _)$ message at line 53. By Lemma 15, $e \leq e_0$.

Consider first the case when $e < e_0$. We have that p_j has epoch = e_0 at some point. Therefore, p_j sends or handles $\text{NEW_STATE}(e_0, \text{msg}_0)$. Right after this p_j has $\text{msg}[k] = \text{msg}_0[k]$, and p_j does not overwrite $\text{msg}[k]$ while epoch = e_0 . Then, when p_j handles $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e'', _)$, it has $\text{msg}[k] = \text{msg}_0[k] = \text{msg}''[k] = m$. Since $e_0 < e''$, by the induction hypothesis, from the moment when p_j sends or handles $\text{NEW_STATE}(e_0, \text{msg}_0)$ and while p_j is in e_0 , it has $\text{msg}|_k = \text{msg}$. Then p_j has $\text{msg}|_k = \text{msg}$ right before handling $\text{NEW_CONFIG}(e'', _)$. Hence, $\text{msg}'|_k = \text{msg}$, as required.

Consider now the case when $e = e_0$. There are two possibilities: either p_j is the leader of e , or it is a follower in e . We only consider the latter case, since the former is analogous. We know that p_i receives $\text{NEW_STATE}(e'', \text{msg}'')$ with $\text{msg}''[k] = m$ from p_j . Therefore, p_j has $\text{msg}[k] = m$ before sending $\text{NEW_STATE}(e'', \text{msg}'')$. The process p_j sets $\text{msg}[k] = m$ when handling $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$ or $\text{NEW_STATE}(e, \text{msg}''')$ such that $\text{msg}'''[k] = m$. By Invariant 4 and (1), the latter is impossible. Thus, p_j handles $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$ and replies with ACCEPT_ACK . Hence, by Invariant 6, p_j has $\text{msg}|_k = \text{msg}$ right before sending $\text{NEW_STATE}(e'', \text{msg}'')$. Thus, $\text{msg}'|_k = \text{msg}$, as required. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Invariant 7. We have proved that the protocol satisfies Basic Configuration Change Properties and, in particular, Property 1a. Hence, for any epoch number there is at most one leader. Let p_i be the leader of e . Then, since $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m_1)$ and $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m_2)$ are sent in e , then p_i is the only process that can send these messages.

By contradiction, assume $m_1 \neq m_2$. Then, p_i must have received $\text{broadcast}(m_1)$ and $\text{broadcast}(m_2)$. Let us assume without loss of generality that it receives $\text{broadcast}(m_1)$ before $\text{broadcast}(m_2)$. When p_i handles $\text{broadcast}(m_1)$, it sends the $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m_1)$ message to the followers. We note that k is the value stored in the variable. Furthermore, p_i increases by one (line 17) for each application message to broadcast. Hence, when p_i has to handle $\text{broadcast}(m_2)$ while in e , it will use a slot number $> k$, which contradicts our assumption. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Invariant 8. Let $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}, _)$ be the NEW_STATE message sent by the leader of e' . The process p_i has $\text{msg}[k'] = m$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e', k')$. Then either it has received $\text{ACCEPT}(e', k', m)$ or $\text{msg}[k'] = m$. In the latter case, by Invariant 4, there exists an epoch $e'' < e'$ such that its leader sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e'', k', m)$. Thus, in both cases, there exists an epoch e^* in which its leader sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e^*, k', m)$. Furthermore, we have that the leader of e sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$. By (1), $e = e^*$ and $k = k'$, as required. \blacktriangleleft

Basic Speculative Delivery Properties. Let e be an epoch at which p_i is the leader. A process speculatively delivers an application message when it receives a NEW_CONFIG message.

Line 42 guarantees that `NEW_CONFIG` is only sent to the leader of e . Therefore, only p_i can speculatively deliver messages in e , as required.

A process speculatively delivers an application message in its `msg` array at a position $> \text{last_delivered}$ when it receives a `NEW_CONFIG` message. Assume that p_i speculatively delivers m in e . Then it receives `NEW_CONFIG`(e, M) and there is a k such that `msg`[k] = m and $k > \text{last_delivered}$ at p_i at that moment. The process p_i sets `msg`[k] = m either after handling `ACCEPT`(e', k, m) or `NEW_STATE`($e', msg, _$) such that `msg`[k] = m . In the latter case, by Invariant 4, there exists an epoch $e'' < e'$ such that the leader of e'' has previously sent `ACCEPT`(e'', k, m). Then, in either case, there exists an `ACCEPT`(e^*, k, m) message such that $e^* < e$. Thus, m has been previously broadcast, as required. We now prove that (i) p_i speculatively delivers m at most once in e , and (ii) p_i does not deliver m before handling `NEW_CONFIG`(e, M). We prove both by contradiction.

- (i) Assume that p_i has `msg`[k'] = m such that $k' \neq k$ when it receives `NEW_CONFIG`(e, M). Following the same reasoning as before, there exists an `ACCEPT`(e_1, k', m) message such that $e_1 < e$. By (1), an application message is only broadcast once, so that $e_1 = e^*$ and $k' = k$, which contradicts our assumption.
- (ii) Assume that p_i delivers m before handling `NEW_CONFIG`(e, M). Then p_i handles a `COMMIT`(e_1, k') message such that $e_1 < e$ while `msg`[k'] = m . When p_i handles `COMMIT`(e_1, k'), it sets `last_delivered` = k' . Thus, p_i has `last_delivered` $\geq k'$ when it handles `NEW_CONFIG`(e, M). Therefore, $k' < k$. If p_i has `msg`[k'] = m when it handles `COMMIT`(e_1, k'), then it has handled an `ACCEPT`(e_1, k', m) message or an `NEW_STATE`($e_1, msg_1, _$) message such that `msg_1`[k'] = m . In the latter case, by Invariant 4, there exists an epoch $e_2 < e_1$ such that the leader of e_2 has previously sent `ACCEPT`(e_2, k', m). Then, in either case, there exists an `ACCEPT`(e_3, k', m) message such that $e_3 \leq e_1$. By (1), an application message is only broadcast once, then $e_3 = e^*$ and $k' = k$, which contradicts our assumption.

◀

► **Lemma 16.** *If a process delivers an application message m while in an epoch e' , then m has been previously broadcast in some epoch $e \leq e'$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Integrity for atomic broadcast in §A. ◀

Proof of Local Order. Assume that the leader p_i of an epoch e receives `broadcast`(m_1) followed by `broadcast`(m_2) at e and that some process p_j delivers m_2 at e' . By Lemma 16 and (1), $e \leq e'$. We show that p_j delivers m_1 before delivering m_2 .

- Assume first that $e' = e$. Let:
 - $k = \text{length}(msg)$, where `msg` is the array of messages sent by the leader of e in `NEW_STATE`(e, msg);
 - `ACCEPT`(e, k', m_1) and `ACCEPT`(e, k'', m_2) be the `ACCEPT` messages sent by the leader of e to broadcast m_1 and m_2 .

Since the leader of e broadcast m_1 before m_2 , then $k' < k''$. Moreover, by lines 17 and 59, $k' > k$.

By line 26, p_j has `last_delivered` = $k'' - 1$ right before handling `COMMIT`(e, k''). Hence, the messages stored at slot numbers between 1 and $k'' - 1$, must have been delivered. Consequently, since $k' < k''$, we know that p_j handles `COMMIT`(e^*, k') before handling `COMMIT`(e, k''). If $e^* < e$, then by Invariant 1, when p_i became the leader of e , it had `msg`[k'] $\neq \perp$, so that $k' < k$. But we have established that $k' > k$. Hence, we must have

$e^* = e$. Consider the case when the leader of e sends $\text{COMMIT}(e, k')$ because it receives a NEW_STATE_ACK message from every follower. This is impossible: in this case p_i sends COMMIT messages for the entries between 1 and k , but $k' > k$. Thus, the leader of e sends $\text{COMMIT}(e, k')$ because it receives an $\text{ACCEPT_ACK}(e, k')$ message from every follower. This implies that the leader has sent an $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k', m_3)$ message to its followers for some m_3 . Since we know that p_i also sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k', m_1)$, by Invariant 7 we have $m_3 = m_1$. When handling this message, p_j sets $\text{msg}[k] = m_1$. Since p_j does not overwrite $\text{msg}[k]$ while $\text{epoch} = e$, p_j has $\text{msg}[k] = m_1$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e, k')$. Hence, p_j delivers m_1 before m_2 , as required.

- Assume now that $e' > e$. Let $\text{COMMIT}(e', k)$ be the commit message that makes p_j deliver m_2 . By (1), it is easy to see that the leader of e' sends $\text{COMMIT}(e', k)$ at line 76 after receiving a NEW_STATE_ACK message from every follower. Let $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}')$ be the NEW_STATE message sent by the leader of e' . Then $\text{length}(\text{msg}') \geq k$. By Invariant 4, there exists an epoch $e'' < e'$ whose leader sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e'', k, m_2)$. We know that p_i broadcast m_2 in e , and thus sent $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m_2)$. Then, by (1), $e'' = e$. Let msg be the value of the array msg at p_i at the time when it sent $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m_2)$; then $\text{msg}[k] = m_2$. We know that p_i broadcast m_1 before m_2 in e . Then there exists a $k' < k$ such that $\text{msg}[k'] = m_1$.

We have that p_i sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m_2)$, $\text{msg}'[k] = m_2$ and $e' > e$. Therefore, by Invariant 5, p_j has $\text{msg}[k] = \text{msg}$ after handling $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}')$ and while in e' . In particular, $\text{msg}[k'] = m_1$. We know that p_j delivers m_2 after handling $\text{COMMIT}(e', k)$. Therefore, before this p_j delivers all values in positions 1 to $k - 1$. Let k_0 be the value of last_delivered at p_j after it handles $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}')$. Assume first that $k_0 < k'$. Then p_j delivers the value at position k' while in e' . We have established that p_j has $\text{msg}[k'] = m_1$ after handling $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}')$ and while in e' . Thus, p_j delivers m_1 , as required. Assume now that $k_0 \geq k'$. Then, p_j handled a COMMIT message for position k' in an epoch $< e'$ and delivered a message m' . By Invariant 1, p_j has $\text{msg}[k'] = m'$ at e' . We have already established that p_j has $\text{msg}[k'] = m_1$ after handling $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}')$ and while in e' . Thus, $m' = m_1$ and p_j delivers m_1 , as required. ◀

Proof of Global Order. We have that:

- the leader of e sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k_1, m_1)$ while in e ,
 - the leader of e' sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e', k_2, m_2)$ while in e' ,
- and $e < e'$. Then by (1), $m_1 \neq m_2$.

Let e_1 and e_2 be the epochs at which p_i delivers m_1 and m_2 respectively. By Lemma 16 and (1), $e \leq e_1$ and $e' \leq e_2$. The process p_i delivers m_1 when it receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e_1, k)$ from the leader of e_1 while having $\text{msg}[k] = m_1$, and m_2 when it receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e_2, k')$ from the leader of e_2 while having $\text{msg}[k'] = m_2$. By Invariant 8, $k = k_1$ and $k' = k_2$. Furthermore, since $m_1 \neq m_2$, by Lemma 7 we have $k_1 \neq k_2$.

Lines 26-27 and the fact that a process never decrements last_delivered guarantee that a process delivers each position of its msg array only once and in position order. Then, if $k_1 < k_2$, the process delivers m_1 before m_2 , as required. We now show that $k_1 > k_2$ is impossible. Assume the contrary, so that $k_1 > k_2$. As argued above, a process delivers each position of its msg array only once and in order. Since $k_1 > k_2$, then p_i has to deliver m_2 before m_1 , so that $e_2 \leq e_1$.

- Consider first the case when $e_1 > e_2$. We have $e < e' \leq e_2 < e_1$. The process p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e_1, k_1)$. Then p_i either handles an $\text{ACCEPT}(e_1, k_1, m_1)$ message or the process has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it enters e_1 , i.e.,

when it sets $\text{epoch} = e_1$. The application message m_1 is broadcast in e and $e < e_1$. Then by (1), m_1 cannot be broadcast in e_1 . Thus, p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it enters e_1 . Since $e_1 > e_2$, by Invariant 1, p_i has $\text{msg}[k_2] = m_2$ when it enters e_1 . By Invariant 5, p_i also has $\text{msg}_{k_1} = \text{msg}$ when it enters e_1 , where msg is the msg array that the leader of e had when it sent $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k_1, m_1)$. Since $k_2 < k_1$, $\text{msg}[k_2] = m_2$. But m_2 is broadcast at e' and $e' > e$. Thus, by (1) and Invariant 4, $\text{msg}[k_2] \neq m_2$, yielding a contradiction.

- Consider now the case when $e_2 = e_1$. We have $e < e' \leq e_2 = e_1$. The application message m_1 is broadcast in e . Then by (1), m_1 cannot be broadcast in e_1 . Thus, p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it enters e_1 , i.e., when it sets $\text{epoch} = e_1$. By Invariant 5, p_i also has $\text{msg}_{k_1} = \text{msg}$ when it enters e_1 , where msg is the msg array that the leader of e had when it sent $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k_1, m_1)$. After setting $\text{epoch} = e_1$ and while $\text{epoch} = e_1$, p_i does not overwrite $\text{msg}[k]$. Since $k_1 > k_2$ and p_i has $\text{msg}[k_2] = m_2$ when it receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e_1, k_2)$ from the leader of e_1 , we must have $\text{msg}[k_2] = m_2$. But m_2 is broadcast at e' and $e' > e$. Thus, by (1) and Invariant 4, $\text{msg}[k_2] \neq m_2$, yielding a contradiction. ◀

► **Lemma 17.** *Assume that the leader of an epoch e sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e, k, m)$. If a process p_i has $\text{msg}[k'] = m$, then $k' = k$.*

Proof. The process p_i sets $\text{msg}[k'] = m$ either after handling an $\text{ACCEPT}(e', k', m)$ message or a $\text{NEW_STATE}(e', \text{msg}', _)$ message such that $\text{msg}'[k'] = m$. In the latter case, by Invariant 4, there exists an epoch $e'' < e'$ such that the leader of e'' has previously sent $\text{ACCEPT}(e'', k', m)$. Thus, if p_j sets $\text{msg}[k'] = m$, then there exists an $\text{ACCEPT}(e^*, k', m)$ message. By (1), a message is only broadcast once. Hence, $k = k'$. ◀

► **Lemma 18.** *Assume that the leaders of epochs e_1 and e_2 such that $e_1 \neq e_2$ send messages $\text{ACCEPT}(e_1, k_1, m_1)$ and $\text{ACCEPT}(e_2, k_2, m_2)$ respectively. Let msg be the value of the msg array at the leader of e_2 when it sent $\text{ACCEPT}(e_2, k_2, m_2)$. Assume that a process p_i delivers both, delivering m_1 before m_2 , and that p_i has $\text{msg}_{k_2} = \text{msg}$ after delivering m_2 . Then $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ and $k_1 < k_2$.*

Proof. We have that:

- p_i receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e'_1, k'_1)$ sent by the leader of an epoch e'_1 , and p_i has $\text{msg}[k'_1] = m_1$ when receiving this message;
- p_i receives a message $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k'_2)$ sent by the leader of an epoch e'_2 , and p_i has $\text{msg}[k'_2] = m_2$ when receiving this message.

By Lemma 16 and (1), $e_2 \leq e'_2$ and $e_1 \leq e'_1$. Then by Invariant 8, $k_2 = k'_2$ and $k_1 = k'_1$. Furthermore, since p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 , then $e'_1 \leq e'_2$ and $k_1 < k_2$, as required.

Assume that $e'_1 = e'_2$. Since p_i delivers both m_1 and m_2 in the same epoch and $k_1 < k_2$, p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k_2)$. Assume now that $e'_1 < e'_2$. By Invariant 1, p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k_2)$. Thus, in both cases p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k_2)$. Furthermore, we have that p_i has $\text{msg}_{k_2} = \text{msg}$ after handling $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k_2)$. Hence, $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$, as required. ◀

► **Lemma 19.** *Assume that the leader p_i of an epoch e_1 sends $\text{COMMIT}(e_1, k)$ while having $\text{msg}[k] = m_1$, and the leader p_j of an epoch e_2 sends $\text{COMMIT}(e_2, k)$ while having $\text{msg}[k] = m_2$. Then $m_1 = m_2$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Lemma 7 for atomic broadcast in §A. ◀

► **Lemma 20.** *Assume that a process p_i has $\text{msg}[k] = m$ when joining an epoch e for which it is the leader. Then p_i delivers m before joining e or speculatively delivers m at position k when joining e .*

Proof. Let k_0 be the value of the variable `last_delivered` at p_i when it joins e . Consider first the case when $k_0 < k$. Then p_i speculatively delivers m when joining e . Furthermore, by Property 9 [Basic Speculative Delivery Properties], p_i does not deliver m before joining e , as required. Consider now the case when $k_0 \geq k$. Then p_i has delivered position k before joining e . Thus, it has handled a `COMMIT` message for position k before joining e while having $\text{msg}[k] = m'$. By Lemma 19, $m' = m$. Hence, in this case, p_i delivers m before joining e . Furthermore, by Property 9 [Basic Speculative Delivery Properties], p_i does not speculatively deliver m when joining e , as required. ◀

► **Lemma 21.** *Assume that a process p_i delivers m_2 after handling `COMMIT`(e, k_2) while having $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ such that $k_1 < k_2$. Then p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 .*

Proof. Since $k_1 < k_2$, then p_i has already delivered position k_1 when it delivers m_2 at position k_2 . Assume that p_i delivers position k_1 after handling `COMMIT`(e', k_1) while having $\text{msg}[k_1] = m'$. We trivially have that $e' \leq e$. Consider the case when $e' = e$. After handling `COMMIT`(e, k_1), p_i does not overwrite position k_1 while in e . Since p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it handles `COMMIT`(e, k_2), then $m' = m_1$. Consider now the case when $e' < e$. By Invariant 1, p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m'$ when it handles `COMMIT`(e, k_2). But, p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it handles `COMMIT`(e, k_2). Thus, $m' = m_1$. Therefore, in both cases p_i delivers m_1 before delivering m_2 , as required. ◀

Proof of Prefix Consistency (a). We have that:

- the leader of e_1 sends `ACCEPT`(e_1, k_1, m_1) while in e_1 ;
- the leader of e_2 sends `ACCEPT`(e_2, k_2, m_2) while in e_2 . Let msg be the value of the `msg` array at the leader of e_2 when it sent `ACCEPT`(e_2, k_2, m_2);

The process p_i delivers m_2 after handling `COMMIT`(e'_2, k'_2) while having $\text{msg}[k'_2] = m_2$. By Lemma 17, $k_2 = k'_2$. Furthermore, by Lemma 16, $e_2 \leq e'_2$. Consider the case when $e_2 = e'_2$. Then p_i has handled `ACCEPT`(e_2, k_2, m_2). Thus, by Invariant 6, p_i has $\text{msg}|_{k_2} = msg$ after handling `COMMIT`(e'_2, k_2). Consider now the case when $e_2 < e'_2$. Then by Invariant 5, we get the same. Hence, (*) p_i has $\text{msg}|_{k_2} = msg$ after handling `COMMIT`(e'_2, k_2).

The process p_j broadcast m_2 in e' . By (1), p_j is the leader of e_2 and $e_2 = e'$. Therefore, msg is the value of the `msg` array at p_j when it sent `ACCEPT`(e', k_2, m_2).

- i) Consider first the case when p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 . We prove that p_j delivers m_1 before joining e' or speculatively delivers m_1 before m_2 when joining e' . By (*) and Lemma 18, $msg[k_1] = m_1$ and $k_1 < k_2$. Thus, p_j has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it sends `ACCEPT`(e', k_2, m_2). We have that $e_1 \neq e'$. Then by (1), m_1 cannot be broadcast in e' . Thus, p_j has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when joining e' . Furthermore, by Lemma 20, p_j delivers m_1 before joining e' or speculatively delivers m_1 at position k_1 when joining e' . Since $k_1 < k_2$, in the case that p_j speculatively delivers m_1 , it does it before m_2 , as required.
- ii) Consider now the case when p_j delivers m_1 before joining e' or speculatively delivers m_1 before m_2 when joining e' . We prove that p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 . Assume that p_j delivers m_1 before joining e' . Then p_i handles a `COMMIT` message for a position k' while having `epoch` < e' and $\text{msg}[k'] = m_1$. By Invariant 1, p_j has $\text{msg}[k'] = m_1$ when joining e' . Since p_j broadcast m_2 in e' , then $k' < k_2$. Furthermore, by Invariant 8, $k' = k_1$. Thus, p_j has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when joining e' and $k_1 < k_2$. Assume now that p_j

speculatively delivers m_1 when joining e' . Then p_j has $\text{msg}[k'] = m_1$ when joining e' . Since p_j broadcast m_2 in e' , then $k' < k_2$. Furthermore, by Lemma 17, $k' = k_1$. Thus, p_j has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when joining e' and $k_1 < k_2$ in both cases. This implies that p_j has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e', k_2, m_2)$. Therefore, $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$. Thus by (*), p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k_2)$. By Lemma 21, p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 as required. ◀

Proof of Prefix Consistency (b). We have that:

- the leader of e_1 sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e_1, k_1, m_1)$ while in e_1 ;
- the leader of e_2 sends $\text{ACCEPT}(e_2, k_2, m_2)$ while in e_2 . Let msg be the value of the msg array at the leader of e_2 when it sent $\text{ACCEPT}(e_2, k_2, m_2)$;

The process p_i delivers m_2 after handling $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k'_2)$ while having $\text{msg}[k'_2] = m_2$. By Lemma 17, $k_2 = k'_2$. Furthermore, by Lemma 16, $e_2 \leq e'_2$. Consider the case when $e_2 = e'_2$. Then p_i has handled $\text{ACCEPT}(e_2, k_2, m_2)$. Thus, by Invariant 6, p_i has $\text{msg}|_{k_2} = \text{msg}$ after handling $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k_2)$. Consider now the case when $e_2 < e'_2$. Then by Invariant 5, we get the same. Hence, (*) p_i has $\text{msg}|_{k_2} = \text{msg}$ after handling $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k_2)$.

The process p_j speculatively delivers m_2 when joining e' . Then p_j has $\text{msg}[k] = m_2$ when it sets $\text{epoch} = e'$. By Lemma 17, $k = k_2$. Then by Invariant 5, (**) p_j has $\text{msg}|_{k_2} = \text{msg}$ when joining e' .

- i) Consider first the case when p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 . We prove that p_j delivers m_1 before joining e' or speculatively delivers m_1 before m_2 when joining e' . By Lemma 18 and (*), $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ and $k_1 < k_2$. Then by (**) p_j has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when joining e' . Furthermore, by Lemma 20, p_j delivers m_1 before joining e' or speculatively delivers m_1 at position k_1 when joining e' . Since $k_1 < k_2$, in the case that p_j speculatively delivers m_1 , it does it before m_2 , as required.
- ii) Consider now the case when p_j delivers m_1 before joining e' or speculatively delivers m_1 before m_2 when joining e' . We prove that p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 . Assume that p_j delivers m_1 before joining e' . Then p_i handles a COMMIT message for a position k' while having $\text{epoch} < e'$ and $\text{msg}[k'] = m_1$. By Invariant 1, p_j has $\text{msg}[k'] = m_1$ when joining e' such that $k' < k_2$. Furthermore, by Invariant 8, $k' = k_1$. Thus, p_j has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when joining e' and $k_1 < k_2$. Assume now that p_j speculatively delivers m_1 before m_2 when joining e' . Then p_j has $\text{msg}[k'] = m_1$ when joining e' such that $k' < k_2$. By Lemma 17, $k' = k_1$. Thus, p_j has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when joining e' and $k_1 < k_2$ in both cases. By (**), this implies that $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$. Furthermore, by (*), p_i has $\text{msg}[k_1] = m_1$ when it handles $\text{COMMIT}(e'_2, k_2)$. By Lemma 21, p_i delivers m_1 before m_2 as required. ◀