

Tight Bounds for k -Set Agreement with Limited-Scope Failure Detectors (Brief Announcement)

www.cs.brown.edu/people/mph/detector.pdf

Maurice Herlihy and Lucia Draque Penso
Computer Science Department
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912

In the k -set agreement problem [1], each process in a group starts with a private input value, communicates with the others, and then halts after choosing a private output value. Each process is required to choose some process's input, and at most k distinct values may be chosen.

We consider this problem in an asynchronous message-passing system of $n + 1$ processes, of which at most f may fail by halting. A *failure detector* [5] is an unreliable oracle that informs each process when it suspects other processes to have failed. In practice, however, a process can typically detect some failures more easily than others. For example, timeouts may reliably detect failures on the same local area network, but less reliably over a wide-area network. A *limited-scope* failure detector model, the set of processes encompasses sets X_0, \dots, X_{q-1} , such that some correct process in X_i is never suspected by any process in X_i . Failure detectors in class S_x satisfy this property all the time, while failure detectors in $\diamond S_x$ satisfy it eventually.

In a classic paper, Mostéfaoui and Raynal [4] give two algorithms for the k -set agreement task in asynchronous message-passing models augmented with failure detectors from the S_x or $\diamond S_x$ classes, subject to the restrictions that $q = 1$. They conjectured that their algorithms for each model are optimal.

This paper makes the following contributions. We give the first ever lower bounds for k -set agreement protocols employing failure detectors from classes S_x and $\diamond S_x$. For S_x , we show that any k -set agreement protocol must satisfy

$$f < k + x - q,$$

while for $\diamond S_x$,

$$f < \min\left(\left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \right\rfloor, k + x - q\right).$$

Our proof employs mechanisms from Combinatorial Topol-

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

PODC'03, July 13–16, 2003, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.
Copyright 2003 ACM 1-58113-708-7/03/0007...\$5.00.

ogy [2, 3]. These methods have been successful in other models, this is the first time such methods have been applied to failure detectors.

For the class S_x , our lower bound implies that the elegant TWA-based protocol of Mostéfaoui and Raynal [4] is optimal for the case where $q = 1$. For the class $\diamond S_x$, we give a novel protocol that matches our lower bound, and exceeds the fault-tolerance of the Mostéfaoui and Raynal algorithm for this model. Our protocol has an unexpectedly simple structure: it alternates the TWA-based protocol with a novel *convergence detection* protocol that halts when it detects that an earlier iteration of TWA has succeeded. Our protocol thus disproves the conjecture of Mostéfaoui and Raynal that their algorithm for the $\diamond S_x$ model is optimal.

1. REFERENCES

- [1] Soma Chaudhuri. Agreement is harder than consensus: set consensus problems in totally asynchronous systems. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 311–234, August 1990.
- [2] Maurice Herlihy, Sergio Rajsbaum, and Mark R. Tuttle. Unifying synchronous and asynchronous message-passing models. In *Proceedings of the seventeenth annual ACM symposium on Principles of distributed computing*, pages 133–142. ACM Press, 1998.
- [3] Maurice Herlihy and Nir Shavit. The topological structure of asynchronous computability. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 46(6):858–923, 1999.
- [4] Achour Mostéfaoui and Michel Raynal. k -set agreement with limited accuracy failure detectors. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual ACM symposium on Principles of distributed computing*, pages 143–152. ACM Press, 2000.
- [5] Tushar Deepak Chandra, Vassos Hadzilacos, and Sam Toueg. The weakest failure detector for solving consensus. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 43(4):685–722, 1996.