## Ideal Stabilization

Mikhail Nesterenko Kent State University

#### Sébastien Tixeuil

**UPMC Sorbonne Universités & IUF** 

AINA 2011, Singapore, 24 March 2011

#### Motivation



# Distributed System



## Legitimate State



#### **Transient Faults**







## Legitimate State





## Self-stabilization

![](_page_10_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Ideal Stabilization

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Questions

- Existence ?
- Construction ?
- Composition ?
- Implementation vs. Specification ?
- Proof techniques ?

## Model

# Distributed System

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_0.jpeg)

# Merge Symmetry

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Merge Symmetry

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_0.jpeg)

# Ideal Stabilization to Non-ideal Specifications

# State Displacement

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

# A Necessary Condition

 Ideal stabilization may be possible only if the specification contains an inputcomplete subset of sequences such that every disallowed specification state contains at least one process whose projection does not occur in the subset.

# A Necessary Condition

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Conflict Managers

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_8.jpeg)

# Conflict Managers

Program

![](_page_28_Picture_1.jpeg)

Т

F

![](_page_28_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### Mappings

### Leader Election

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Leader Election

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Stabilization to Ideal Specifications

# Ideal Specifications

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Alternating Bit Protocol

 $\begin{array}{ll} \textit{next:} & \mathbf{receive} \; ack(nm) \longrightarrow \\ & \mathbf{if} \; nm = ns \; \mathbf{then} \\ & ns := \neg ns \\ & \mathbf{send} \; data(ns) \\ \textit{timeout:} \; \; \mathbf{timeout}() \longrightarrow \mathbf{send} \; data(ns) \\ \textit{reply:} \; \; \; \mathbf{receive} \; data(nm) \longrightarrow \\ & \mathbf{if} \; nm \neq nr \; \mathbf{then} \\ & nr := nm \\ & \mathbf{send} \; ack(nm) \end{array}$ 

# Alternating Bit Protocol

 $\begin{array}{ll} \textit{next:} & \textbf{receive} \ ack(nm) \longrightarrow \\ & \textbf{if} \ nm = ns \ \textbf{then} \\ & ns := \neg ns \\ & \textbf{send} \ data(ns) \\ \textit{timeout:} \ \textbf{timeout}() \longrightarrow \textbf{send} \ data(ns) \\ \textit{reply:} & \textbf{receive} \ data(nm) \longrightarrow \\ & \textbf{if} \ nm \neq nr \ \textbf{then} \\ & nr := nm \\ & \textbf{send} \ ack(nm) \end{array}$ 

![](_page_35_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Alternating Bit Protocol

 $\begin{array}{ll} \textit{next:} & \textbf{receive} \ ack(nm) \longrightarrow \\ & \textbf{if} \ nm = ns \ \textbf{then} \\ & ns := \neg ns \\ & \textbf{send} \ data(ns) \\ \textit{timeout:} \ \textbf{timeout}() \longrightarrow \textbf{send} \ data(ns) \\ \textit{reply:} & \textbf{receive} \ data(nm) \longrightarrow \\ & \textbf{if} \ nm \neq nr \ \textbf{then} \\ & nr := nm \\ & \textbf{send} \ ack(nm) \end{array}$ 

![](_page_36_Figure_2.jpeg)

## Conclusion

![](_page_37_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_0.jpeg)

## Ideal Stabilization

- New way of **reasoning** about distributed fault-tolerance
- Abitrary degree of precision when specifying the system behavior after transient faults occur
- **Composition** is easy
- Assertional vs. operational proofs

### Thank You