Alberto Sonnino

## **BFT Consensus** From Academic Paper to Mainnet



## **Alberto Sonnino** Research Scientist

- PhD from UCL (George Danezis & Jens Groth)
- Co-founded Chainspace
- At Libra / Diem from day 1
- Now building the Sui blockchain



# Slibra











### **HotStuff**



**Bullshark, Mysticeti**



# Sibra











- Lessons learned
- Open research challenges







## **Research Gifts**

### **(please keep it short)**



## **Byzantine Fault Tolerance**



## **Byzantine Fault Tolerance**







## Partial Synchrony





1. Network model?

## **Research Questions**

## **Lessons Learned**

## **Typical Blockchain**

Mempool / Initial

Overlay flooding slow and with significant redundancy

> Seconds latency, traditionally low throughput



### P2P flood & Selection on fee

Sequence all transactions in blocks



## **Typical Blockchain**

**Mempool / Initial Checks Ordering** (Sequencial)

**Overlay flooding slow and with significant redundancy**

> **Seconds latency, traditionally low throughput**

### **P2P flood & Selection on fee**

**Sequence all transactions in blocks**

## Libra, 2019

### **HotStuff**

### HotStuff: BFT Consensus in the Lens of Blockchain

Maofan Yin<sup>1,2</sup>, Dahlia Malkhi<sup>2</sup>, Michael K. Reiter<sup>2,3</sup>, Guy Golan Gueta<sup>2</sup>, and Ittai Abraham<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup>Cornell University, <sup>2</sup>VMware Research, <sup>3</sup>UNC-Chapel Hill

### Abstract

We present HotStuff, a leader-based Byzantine fault-tolerant replication protocol for the partially synchronous model. Once network communication becomes synchronous, HotStuff enables a correct leader to drive the protocol to consensus at the pace of actual (vs. maximum) network delay—a property called responsiveness—and with communication complexity that is linear in the number of replicas. To our knowledge, HotStuff is the first partially synchronous BFT replication protocol exhibiting these combined properties. HotStuff is built around a novel framework that forms a bridge between classical BFT foundations and blockchains. It allows the expression of other known protocols (DLS, PBFT, Tendermint, Casper), and ours, in a common framework.

Our deployment of HotStuff over a network with over 100 replicas achieves throughput and latency comparable to that of BFT-SMaRt, while enjoying linear communication footprint during leader failover (vs. cubic with BFT-

### 1 Introduction

Byzantine fault tolerance (BFT) refers to the ability of a computing system to endure arbitrary (i.e., Byzantine) failures of its components while taking actions critical to the system's operation. In the context of state machine replication (SMR)  $[35]$   $[47]$ , the system as a whole provides a replicated service whose state is mirrored across n deterministic replicas. A BFT SMR protocol is used to ensure that non-faulty replicas agree on an order of execution for clientinitiated service commands, despite the efforts of f Byzantine replicas. This, in turn, ensures that the  $n-f$  non-faulty replicas will run commands identically and so produce the same response for each command. As is common, we are concerned here with the partially synchronous communication model [25], whereby a known bound  $\Delta$  on message transmission holds after some unknown global stabilization time (GST). In this model,  $n \geq 3f + 1$  is required for non-faulty replicas to agree on the same commands in the same order (e.g.,  $[12]$ ) and progress can be ensured deterministically only after GST [27].

When BFT SMR protocols were originally conceived, a typical target system size was  $n = 4$  or  $n = 7$ , deployed on a local-area network. However, the renewed interest in Byzantine fault-tolerance brought about by its application to blockchains now demands solutions that can scale to much larger n. In contrast to permissionless blockchains such as the one that supports Bitcoin, for example, so-called *permissioned* blockchains involve a fixed set of replicas that collectively maintain an ordered ledger of commands or, in other words, that support SMR. Despite their permissioned nature, numbers of replicas in the hundreds or even thousands are envisioned (e.g., [42, 30]). Additionally, their deployment to wide-area networks requires setting  $\Delta$  to accommodate higher variability in communication

The scaling challenge. Since the introduction of PBFT [20], the first practical BFT replication solution in the partial synchrony model, numerous BFT solutions were built around its core two-phase paradigm. The practical aspect is that a stable leader can drive a consensus decision in just two rounds of message exchanges. The first phase guarantees proposal uniqueness through the formation of a quorum certificate (QC) consisting of  $(n-f)$  votes. The second phase guarantees that the next leader can convince replicas to vote for a safe proposal

The algorithm for a new leader to collect information and propose it to replicas-called a view-change-is the epicenter of replication. Unfortunately, view-change based on the two-phase paradigm is far from simple [38], is bug-prone [4], and incurs a significant communication penalty for even moderate system sizes. It requires the new leader to relay information from  $(n - f)$  replicas, each reporting its own highest known QC. Even counting just

2019  $_{\rm{Jul}}$ 23  $\begin{array}{c} \multicolumn{3}{c} {\begin{tabular}{c} \includegraphics[width=0.45\textwidth]{figs/fig_1001}} \end{tabular} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{tabular}{c} \includegraphics[width=0.45\textwidth]{figs/fig_1001}} \end{tabular} \end{array} \begin{tabular}{c} \includegraphics[width=0.45\textwidth]{figs/fig_1001}} \end{tabular} \caption{The 3DCCJ model with the 3DCCJ model.} \label{fig:1DCCJ}$  $\overline{\text{CS}}$  $\circ$ .05069 803 **Xi** 

点

### **HashGraph**

Verifying the Hashgraph Consensus Algorithm

Karl Crary Carnegie Mellon University

2021 Abstrac

<u>්ති</u>

 $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\sum$ 

 $\circ$ 

 $\sim$ 

K

The Hashgraph consensus algorithm is an algorithm for asynchronous Byzantine fault tolerance intended for disributed shared ledgers. Its main distinguishing characteristic is it achieves consensus without exchanging any extra messages; each participant's votes can be determined from public information, so votes need not be transmitted.

In this paper, we discuss our experience formalizing the Hasheraph algorithm and its correctness proof using the Coq proof assistant. The paper is self-contained; it includes a omplete discussion of the algorithm and its correctness argument in English.

### Introductio

Byzantine fault-tolerance is the problem of coordinating a distributed system while some participants may maliciously break the rules. Often other challenges are also present, 57 such as unreliable communications. The problem is at the center of a variety of new applications such as cryptocurencies. Such applications rely on distributed shared ledgers,<br>a form of Byzantine fault-tolerance in which a set of transactions are assigned a place in a globally-agreed total order that is *immutable*. The latter means that once a transaction enters the order, no new transaction can enter at an earlier  $\sim$ position

A distributed shared ledger makes it possible for all participants to agree, at any point in the order, on the current owner of a digital commodity such as a unit of cryptocurrency. A transaction transferring ownership is valid if the commodity's current owner authorizes the transac-(The authorization mechanism—presumably using a digital signature-is beyond the scope of the ledger itself.) Because the order is total, one transaction out of any pair has priority. Thus we can show that a commodity's chain of ownership is uniquely determined. Finally, because the order is immutable, the chain of ownership cannot change except by adding new transactions at the end.

Algorithms for Byzantine consensus (under various assumptions) have existed for some time, indeed longer than the problem has been named [12, 9]. Practical algorithms are more recent: in 1999. Castro and Liskov [6] gave an algorithm that when installed into the NFS file system slowed it only 3%. As Byzantine consensus algorithms have become more practical, they have been tailored to specific applications. Castro and Liskov's algorithm was designed for faulttolerant state machine replication [13] and probably would

not perform well under the workload of a distributed shared

However, in the last few years there have arisen Byzantine fault-tolerance algorithms suitable for distributed shared ledgers, notably HoneyBadgerBFT [10], BEAT [7], and-the subject of this paper-Hashgraph [2]. Moreover, the former two each claim to be the first practical asynchronous BFT algorithm (with different standards of practicality). Hashgraph does not claim to be first, but is also practical and asynchro

In parallel with that line of work has been the development of distributed shared ledgers based on proof of work, beginning with Bitcoin [11]. The idea behind proof of work is to maintain agreement on the ledger by maintaining a list of blocks of transactions, and to ensure that the list does not  $% \mathcal{N}$ become a tree. To ensure this, the rules state that (1) the longest branch defines the list, and (2) to create a new block, one must first solve a mathematical problem that takes the list's old head as one of its inputs. The problem's solution is much easier to verify than to obtain, so when one learns of a new block, one's incentive is to restart work from the new head rather than continue work from the old head.

Bitcoin and some of its cousins are widely used, so in a certain sense they are indisputably practical. They are also truly permissionless, in a way that the BFT algorithms, including Hashgraph, cannot quite claim. Nevertheless, they offer severely limited throughput. Bitcoin is limited to seven transactions per second and has a latency of one hour, while its BFT competitors all do several orders of magnitude better. Proof-of-work systems are also criticized for being wasteful: an enormous amount of electricity is expended on plock-creation efforts that nearly always fail. Finally-more to the point of this paper—the theoretical properties of proof of work are not well understood

The Hashgraph consensus algorithm is designed to supn the massign constant and material and the performance applications of a distributed shared ledger. Like the other BFT systems, it is several orders of magnitude faster than proof of work. Actual performance depends very much on configuration choices  $(e.g., how many)$ peers, geographic distribution, tradeoff between latency and throughput, etc.), but in all configurations published in Miller, et. al [10] (for HoneyBadgerBFT) and Duan, et al. [7] (for BEAT), the Hashgraph algorithm equals or exceeds the published performance figures [4]. A frequently cited throughput goal is to equal the Visa credit-card network. According to Visa's published figures, Hashgraph can

## **Too much impact?**

- Patent your work
- Send the patent around
- Ask companies to cite your patented work (ideally in public)

## **Libra, 2019**

### HotStuff: BFT Consensus in the Lens of Blockchain

Maofan Yin<sup>1,2</sup>, Dahlia Malkhi<sup>2</sup>, Michael K. Reiter<sup>2,3</sup>, Guy Golan Gueta<sup>2</sup>, and Ittai Abraham<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cornell University, <sup>2</sup>VMware Research, <sup>3</sup>UNC-Chapel Hill

### Abstract

We present HotStuff, a leader-based Byzantine fault-tolerant replication protocol for the partially synchronous model. Once network communication becomes synchronous, HotStuff enables a correct leader to drive the protocol to consensus at the pace of actual (vs. maximum) network delay—a property called responsiveness—and with communication complexity that is linear in the number of replicas. To our knowledge, HotStuff is the first partially synchronous BFT replication protocol exhibiting these combined properties. HotStuff is built around a novel framework that forms a bridge between classical BFT foundations and blockchains. It allows the expression of other known protocols (DLS, PBFT, Tendermint, Casper), and ours, in a common framework.

Our deployment of HotStuff over a network with over 100 replicas achieves throughput and latency comparable to that of BFT-SMaRt, while enjoying linear communication footprint during leader failover (vs. cubic with BFT-SMaRt

### 1 Introduction

23 Jul 2019

 $[{\rm cs. DC}]$ 

05069v6

803

arXiv:1

Byzantine fault tolerance (BFT) refers to the ability of a computing system to endure arbitrary (i.e., Byzantine) failures of its components while taking actions critical to the system's operation. In the context of state machine replication (SMR)  $[35]$   $[47]$ , the system as a whole provides a replicated service whose state is mirrored across n deterministic replicas. A BFT SMR protocol is used to ensure that non-faulty replicas agree on an order of execution for clientinitiated service commands, despite the efforts of  $f$  Byzantine replicas. This, in turn, ensures that the  $n-f$  non-faulty replicas will run commands identically and so produce the same response for each command. As is common, we are concerned here with the partially synchronous communication model [25], whereby a known bound  $\Delta$  on message transmission holds after some unknown global stabilization time (GST). In this model,  $n \geq 3f + 1$  is required for non-faulty replicas to agree on the same commands in the same order (e.g.,  $[12]$ ) and progress can be ensured deterministically only after GST [27].

When BFT SMR protocols were originally conceived, a typical target system size was  $n = 4$  or  $n = 7$ , deployed on a local-area network. However, the renewed interest in Byzantine fault-tolerance brought about by its application to blockchains now demands solutions that can scale to much larger  $n$ . In contrast to *permissionless* blockchains such as the one that supports Bitcoin, for example, so-called *permissioned* blockchains involve a fixed set of replicas that collectively maintain an ordered ledger of commands or, in other words, that support SMR. Despite their permissioned nature, numbers of replicas in the hundreds or even thousands are envisioned (e.g.,  $[42, 30]$ ). Additionally, their deployment to wide-area networks requires setting  $\Delta$  to accommodate higher variability in communication delays

The scaling challenge. Since the introduction of PBFT [20], the first practical BFT replication solution in the partial synchrony model, numerous BFT solutions were built around its core two-phase paradigm. The practical aspect is that a stable leader can drive a consensus decision in just two rounds of message exchanges. The first phase guarantees proposal uniqueness through the formation of a quorum certificate (QC) consisting of  $(n-f)$  votes. The second phase guarantees that the next leader can convince replicas to vote for a safe proposal.

The algorithm for a new leader to collect information and propose it to replicas-called a view-change-is the epicenter of replication. Unfortunately, view-change based on the two-phase paradigm is far from simple [38], is bug-prone [4], and incurs a significant communication penalty for even moderate system sizes. It requires the new leader to relay information from  $(n - f)$  replicas, each reporting its own highest known QC. Even counting just

- **Linear**
- Clearly isolated components

### **HotStuff**

### **HashGraph**

- Impossible to garbage collect
- Unclear block synchroniser

## The first 6 months...

### State Machine Replication in the Libra **Blockchain**

Mathieu Baudet, Avery Ching, Andrey Chursin, George Danezis, François Garillot, Zekun Li, Dahlia Malkhi, Oded Naor, Dmitri Perelman, Alberto Sonnino\*

Abstract. This report presents LibraBFT, a robust and efficient state machine replication system designed for the Libra Blockchain. LibraBFT is based on HotStuff, a recent protocol that leverages several decades of scientific advances in Byzantine fault tolerance (BFT) and achieves the strong scalability and security properties required by internet settings. LibraBFT further refines the HotStuff protocol to introduce explicit liveness mechanisms and provides a concrete latency analysis. To drive the integration with the Libra Blockchain, this document provides specifications extracted from a fully-functional simulator. These specifications include state replication interfaces and a communication framework for data transfer and state synchronization among participants. Finally, this report provides a formal safety proof that induces criteria to detect misbehavior of BFT nodes, coupled with a simple reward and punishment mechanism.

### 1. Introduction

The advent of the internet and mobile broadband has connected billions of people globally, providing access to knowledge, free communications, and a wide range of lower-cost, more convenient services. This connectivity has also enabled more people to access the financial ecosystem. Yet, despite this progress, access to financial services is still limited for those who need it most.

Blockchains and cryptocurrencies have shown that the latest advances in computer science, cryptography, and economics have the potential to create innovation in financial infrastructure, but existing systems have not yet reached mainstream adoption. As the next step toward this goal, we have designed the Libra Blockchain [1], [2] with the mission to enable a simple global currency and financial infrastructure that empowers billions of people.

At the heart of this new blockchain is a consensus protocol called LibraBFT — the focus of this report  $-$  by which blockchain transactions are ordered and finalized. LibraBFT decentralizes trust among a set of validators that participate in the consensus protocol. LibraBFT guarantees consensus on the history of transactions among honest validators and remains safe even if a threshold of participants are Byzantine (i.e., faulty or corrupt [3]). By embracing the classical approach to Byzantine fault tolerance, LibraBFT builds on solid and rigorously proven foundations in distributed computing.

Initially, the participating validators will be permitted into the consensus network by an association consisting of a geographically distributed and diverse set of Founding Members, which are organizations chosen according to objective membership criteria with a vested interest in bootstrapping the

### **SMR in the Libra Blockchain**

- The LibraBFT/DiemBFT pacemaker
- Codesign the pacemaker with the rest

<sup>\*</sup> The authors work at Calibra, a subsidiary of Facebook, Inc., and contribute this paper to the Libra Association under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. For more information on the Libra ecosystem, please refe to the Libra white paper [1].

### 1. Network model?

## **Research Questions**

### 1. Modularisation is a design strategy



## **Lessons Learned**

## **HotStuf** Typical leader-based protocols



## **Naive Implementation** Uneven resource utilisation





### 1. Network model?

## **Research Questions**

- 1. Modularisation is a design strategy
- 2. Tasks-threads allocation



## **Lessons Learned**

## **Leader-Driven Consensus** Fragility to faults and asynchrony



## Fragility to faults and asynchrony **Leader-Driven Consensus**



## **Performance**





### Naive-HS



### 1. Network model?

## **Research Questions**

- 1. Modularisation is a design strategy
- 2. Tasks-threads allocation
- 3. Benchmark early



## **Lessons Learned**

## **Libra, 2019**

### HotStuff: BFT Consensus in the Lens of Blockchain

Maofan Yin<sup>1,2</sup>, Dahlia Malkhi<sup>2</sup>, Michael K. Reiter<sup>2,3</sup>, Guy Golan Gueta<sup>2</sup>, and Ittai Abraham<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cornell University, <sup>2</sup>VMware Research, <sup>3</sup>UNC-Chapel Hill

### Abstract

We present HotStuff, a leader-based Byzantine fault-tolerant replication protocol for the partially synchronous model. Once network communication becomes synchronous. HotStuff enables a correct leader to drive the protocol to consensus at the pace of actual (vs. maximum) network delay—a property called responsiveness—and with communication complexity that is linear in the number of replicas. To our knowledge, HotStuff is the first partially synchronous BFT replication protocol exhibiting these combined properties. HotStuff is built around a novel framework that forms a bridge between classical BFT foundations and blockchains. It allows the expression of other known protocols (DLS, PBFT, Tendermint, Casper), and ours, in a common framework.

Our deployment of HotStuff over a network with over 100 replicas achieves throughput and latency comparable to that of BFT-SMaRt, while enjoying linear communication footprint during leader failover (vs. cubic with BFT-SMaRt

### 1 Introduction

Byzantine fault tolerance (BFT) refers to the ability of a computing system to endure arbitrary (i.e., Byzantine) failures of its components while taking actions critical to the system's operation. In the context of state machine replication (SMR)  $[35, 47]$ , the system as a whole provides a replicated service whose state is mirrored across n deterministic replicas. A BFT SMR protocol is used to ensure that non-faulty replicas agree on an order of execution for clientinitiated service commands, despite the efforts of  $f$  Byzantine replicas. This, in turn, ensures that the  $n-f$  non-faulty replicas will run commands identically and so produce the same response for each command. As is common, we are concerned here with the partially synchronous communication model [25], whereby a known bound  $\Delta$  on message transmission holds after some unknown global stabilization time (GST). In this model,  $n \geq 3f + 1$  is required for non-faulty replicas to agree on the same commands in the same order (e.g.,  $[12]$ ) and progress can be ensured deterministically only after GST [27].

When BFT SMR protocols were originally conceived, a typical target system size was  $n = 4$  or  $n = 7$ , deployed on a local-area network. However, the renewed interest in Byzantine fault-tolerance brought about by its application to blockchains now demands solutions that can scale to much larger  $n$ . In contrast to *permissionless* blockchains such as the one that supports Bitcoin, for example, so-called *permissioned* blockchains involve a fixed set of replicas that collectively maintain an ordered ledger of commands or, in other words, that support SMR. Despite their permissioned nature, numbers of replicas in the hundreds or even thousands are envisioned (e.g.,  $[42, 30]$ ). Additionally, their deployment to wide-area networks requires setting  $\Delta$  to accommodate higher variability in communication delays

The scaling challenge. Since the introduction of PBFT [20], the first practical BFT replication solution in the partial synchrony model, numerous BFT solutions were built around its core two-phase paradigm. The practical aspect is that a stable leader can drive a consensus decision in just two rounds of message exchanges. The first phase guarantees proposal uniqueness through the formation of a quorum certificate (QC) consisting of  $(n-f)$  votes. The second phase guarantees that the next leader can convince replicas to vote for a safe proposal.

The algorithm for a new leader to collect information and propose it to replicas-called a view-change-is the epicenter of replication. Unfortunately, view-change based on the two-phase paradigm is far from simple [38], is bug-prone [4], and incurs a significant communication penalty for even moderate system sizes. It requires the new leader to relay information from  $(n - f)$  replicas, each reporting its own highest known QC. Even counting just



- **HotStuff (naive mempool)**
- Linear
- Clearly isolated components
- Uneven resource utilisation
- Fragile to faults and asynchrony
- Unspecified components (pacemaker)

## **Libra, 2021**

### Narwhal and Tusk: A DAG-based Mempool and **Efficient BFT Consensus**

George Danezis Mysten Labs & UCL

Alberto Sonnino Mysten Labs

### Abstract

We propose separating the task of reliable transaction dissemination from transaction ordering, to enable high-performance Byzantine fault-tolerant quorum-based consensus. We design and evaluate a mempool protocol, Narwhal, specializing in high-throughput reliable dissemination and storage of causal histories of transactions. Narwhal tolerates an asynchronous network and maintains high performance despite failures. Narwhal is designed to easily scale-out using multiple workers at each validator, and we demonstrate that there is no foreseeable limit to the throughput we can achieve.

Composing Narwhal with a partially synchronous consensus protocol (Narwhal-HotStuff) yields significantly better throughput even in the presence of faults or intermittent loss of liveness due to asynchrony. However, loss of liveness can result in higher latency. To achieve overall good performance when faults occur we design Tusk, a zero-message overhead asynchronous consensus protocol, to work with Narwhal. We demonstrate its high performance under a variety of configurations and faults.

As a summary of results, on a WAN, Narwhal-Hotstuff achieves over 130,000 tx/sec at less than 2-sec latency compared with 1,800 tx/sec at 1-sec latency for Hotstuff. Additional workers increase throughput linearly to 600,000 tx/sec without any latency increase. Tusk achieves 160,000 tx/sec with about 3 seconds latency. Under faults, both protocols maintain high throughput, but Narwhal-HotStuff suffers from increased latency

CCS Concepts:  $\cdot$  Security and privacy  $\rightarrow$  Distributed systems security.

Keywords: Consensus protocol, Byzantine Fault Tolerant

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. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific ermission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permiss EuroSys '22, April 5-8, 2022, RENNES, France © 2022 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed

to ACM. ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9162-7/22/04...\$15.00

https://doi.org/10.1145/3492321.351959

Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias **IST Austria** 

Alexander Spiegelman Aptos

### **ACM Reference Format:**

George Danezis, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Alberto Sonnino, and Alexan der Spiegelman. 2022. Narwhal and Tusk: A DAG-based Mempool and Efficient BFT Consensus . In Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys '22), April 5-8, 2022, RENNES, France. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 17 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3492321.

### Introduction

Byzantine consensus protocols [15, 19, 21] and the state machine replication paradigm [13] for building reliable distributed systems have been studied for over 40 years. However, with the rise in popularity of blockchains there has been a renewed interest in engineering high-performance consensus protocols. Specifically, to improve on Bitcoin's [33] throughput of only 4 tx/sec early works [29] suggested committee based consensus protocols. For higher throughput and lower latency committee-based protocols are required, and are now becoming the norm in proof-of-stake designs.

Existing approaches to increasing the performance of distributed ledgers focus on creating lower-cost consensus algorithms culminating with Hotstuff [38], which achieves linear message complexity in the partially synchronous setting. To achieve this, Hotstuff leverages a leader who collects, aggregates, and broadcasts the messages of other validators. However, theoretical message complexity should not be the only optimization target. More specifically:

- Any (partially-synchronous) protocol that minimizes overall message number, but relies on a leader to produce proposals and coordinate consensus, fails to capture the high load this imposes on the leader who inevitably becomes a bottleneck.
- Message complexity counts the number of metadata messages (e.g., votes, signatures, hashes) which take minimal bandwidth compared to the dissemination of bulk transaction data (blocks). Since blocks are orders of magnitude larger (10MB) than a typical consensus message (100B), the asymptotic message complexity is practically amortized for fixed mid-size committees (up to  $\sim$  50 nodes).

Additionally, consensus protocols have grouped a lot of functions into a monolithic protocol. In a typical distributed

- Quadratic but even resource utilisation
- · Separation between consensus and data dissemination













**Round1** 

**Byzantine 'Reliable' Broadcast** 





### 1. Network model?

## **Research Questions**

- 1. Modularisation is a design strategy
- 2. Tasks-threads allocation
- 3. Benchmark early
- 4. Codesign with mem. and storage



## **Lessons Learned**

## **HotStuff on Narwhal** Enhanced commit rule



## **HotStuff on Narwhal** Enhanced commit rule



## **HotStuff on Narwhal** Enhanced commit rule



**Faulty HotStuff Leader!** 

**Blocks may still be 'saved'**
### **HotStuff on Narwhal** Enhanced commit rule



### **HotStuff on Narwhal** Enhanced commit rule







## **Performance**



### **Performance visa+mastercard**



## **Libra, 2021**

### Narwhal and Tusk: A DAG-based Mempool and **Efficient BFT Consensus**

George Danezis Mysten Labs & UCL

Alberto Sonnino Mysten Labs

### Abstract

We propose separating the task of reliable transaction dissemination from transaction ordering, to enable high-performance Byzantine fault-tolerant quorum-based consensus. We design and evaluate a mempool protocol, Narwhal, specializing in high-throughput reliable dissemination and storage of causal histories of transactions. Narwhal tolerates an asynchronous network and maintains high performance despite failures. Narwhal is designed to easily scale-out using multiple workers at each validator, and we demonstrate that there is no foreseeable limit to the throughput we can achieve.

Composing Narwhal with a partially synchronous consensus protocol (Narwhal-HotStuff) yields significantly better throughput even in the presence of faults or intermittent loss of liveness due to asynchrony. However, loss of liveness can result in higher latency. To achieve overall good performance when faults occur we design Tusk, a zero-message overhead asynchronous consensus protocol, to work with Narwhal. We demonstrate its high performance under a variety of configurations and faults.

As a summary of results, on a WAN, Narwhal-Hotstuff achieves over 130,000 tx/sec at less than 2-sec latency compared with 1,800 tx/sec at 1-sec latency for Hotstuff. Additional workers increase throughput linearly to 600,000 tx/sec without any latency increase. Tusk achieves 160,000 tx/sec with about 3 seconds latency. Under faults, both protocols maintain high throughput, but Narwhal-HotStuff suffers from increased latency

CCS Concepts:  $\cdot$  Security and privacy  $\rightarrow$  Distributed systems security.

Keywords: Consensus protocol, Byzantine Fault Tolerant

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. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific ermission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permis EuroSys '22, April 5-8, 2022, RENNES, France © 2022 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed

to ACM. ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9162-7/22/04...\$15.00

https://doi.org/10.1145/3492321.351959

Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias **IST Austria** 

Alexander Spiegelman Aptos

### **ACM Reference Format:**

George Danezis, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Alberto Sonnino, and Alexan der Spiegelman. 2022. Narwhal and Tusk: A DAG-based Mempool and Efficient BFT Consensus. In Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys '22), April 5-8, 2022, RENNES, France. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 17 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3492321.

### Introduction

Byzantine consensus protocols [15, 19, 21] and the state machine replication paradigm [13] for building reliable distributed systems have been studied for over 40 years. However, with the rise in popularity of blockchains there has been a renewed interest in engineering high-performance consensus protocols. Specifically, to improve on Bitcoin's [33] throughput of only 4 tx/sec early works [29] suggested committee based consensus protocols. For higher throughput and lower latency committee-based protocols are required, and are now becoming the norm in proof-of-stake designs.

Existing approaches to increasing the performance of distributed ledgers focus on creating lower-cost consensus algorithms culminating with Hotstuff [38], which achieves linear message complexity in the partially synchronous setting. To achieve this, Hotstuff leverages a leader who collects, aggregates, and broadcasts the messages of other validators. However, theoretical message complexity should not be the only optimization target. More specifically:

- Any (partially-synchronous) protocol that minimizes overall message number, but relies on a leader to produce proposals and coordinate consensus, fails to capture the high load this imposes on the leader who inevitably becomes a bottleneck.
- Message complexity counts the number of metadata messages (e.g., votes, signatures, hashes) which take minimal bandwidth compared to the dissemination of bulk transaction data (blocks). Since blocks are orders of magnitude larger (10MB) than a typical consensus message (100B), the asymptotic message complexity is practically amortized for fixed mid-size committees (up to  $\sim$  50 nodes).

Additionally, consensus protocols have grouped a lot of functions into a monolithic protocol. In a typical distributed

### **Narwhal**

• Quadratic but even resource utilisation

• Separation between consensus and data dissemination

• High engineering complexity



- 1. Network model?
- 2. BFT testing?

## **Research Questions**

- 1. Modularisation is a design strategy
- 2. Tasks-threads allocation
- 3. Benchmark early
- 4. Codesign with mem. and storage



## **Lessons Learned**



### DagRider

### All You Need is DAG

### Idit Keidar Oded Naor

### **ABSTRACT**

We present *DAG-Rider*, the first asynchronous Byzantine Atomic Broadcast protocol that achieves optimal resilience, optimal amor- $\begin{minipage}{0.9\textwidth} \begin{tabular}{p{0.8cm}p{0.$ (DAG) of the communication among them. In the second layer, processes locally observe their DAGs and totally order all proposals with no extra communication.

Technion

ACM Reference Format:  $\label{eq:1}$  ACM Reference Format: Soloris-Kogias, Oded Naor, and Alexander Spiegel-Idit Keidar, Eleftherios Kokoris-Kogias, Oded Naor, and AZM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PDic-202

years [2.6, 2.4 a.91 to capture the needs or loos<br>crains systems. I o accuracy density charges the fairness issues that naturally arise in interorganizational deployments, we focus on the classic long-lived By<br>candes at (

Up unit recently, asynchronous protocols for the byzantine con-<br>sensus problem [12, 16, 26] have been considered too costly or<br>complicated to be used in practical SMR solutions. However, two<br>recent single-shot Byzantine c complexity (for the latter). In this paper, we follow this recent line Oded Naor is grateful to the Technion Hiroshi Fujiwara Cyber-Security Research<br>Jenter for providing a research grant. Part of Oded's work was done while at Novi

ciassroom use is granted without lee provided Inat 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. Copyrights for components o

 $\!$  Alexander Spiegelman Novi Research of work and present DAG-Rider: the first asynchronous BAB prote  $% \left\langle \left\langle \cdot \right\rangle \right\rangle$  control optimal resilience, optimal round complexity, and optimal amortized communication complexity. In addition, given a perfect shared coin abstraction, our protocol does not use signatures and do

Eleftherios Kokoris-Kogias<br>IST Austria and Novi Research

with an information theoretical agreement guarantee  $\left[13,34\right]$  , the safety properties of our BAB protocol are post-quantum secure  $\label{cor:convex} Overview \ \textsf{We construct \textit{DAG-Rider} in two layers: a communication layer and a zero-overhead ordering layer. In the communication layer, process reliable broadants their proposal with the number of data that help them is more than the object of the graph (DAG) of the data that help them form a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) of the$ messages they deliver. That is, the DAG consists of rounds s.t. every process broadcasts at most one message in every round and every ma. 2021. All You Need is DAG. In Proceding of the 2021 AC May poison is one procedures to the mass age in every total and wery the mass and the state of the content in the state of the state of the state of the state of

A nuce teamined by a simple behave the mass of the section of the reliable broadcast ensures that all correct processes eventually see the same DAG. Moreover, the valid represent of the same DAG. Moreover, the valid broad cast guarantees that all broadcast messages by correct processes are<br>eventually included in the DAG. As a result, in contrast to the VABA<br>and Dumbo protocols that retroactively ignore half the protocol messages and commit one value out of  $O(n)$  proposals, DAG-Rider does not waste any of the messages and all proposed values by<br>correct processes are eventually ordered (i.e., there is no need to<br>re-propose).

 $\label{thm:complexity} Complexity \times \text{We measure time complexity as the asynchronous time [16] required to commit } O(n) \text{ values proposed by different correct processes, and we measure communication complexity by the following property.}$ the number of bits processes send to commit a single value. To compare DAG-Rider to the state-of-the-art asynchronous Byza time agreement protocols, we consider SMR implementations that run an unbounded sequence of the VABA or Dumbo protocols to independently agree on every slot. To compare apples to apples in respect to our time complexity d Dumbo based SMRs to run up to  $n$  slots concurrently. Note, however, that for execution processes must output the slot decisions in a sequential order (no gaps). Therefore, based on the proof in [6], The lime time templex

or example, if we use the classic Bracha broadcast [11] to propose

### **Tusk**

### Narwhal and Tusk: A DAG-based Mempool and **Efficient BFT Consensus**

### George Danezis<br>Mysten Labs & UCL Alberto Sonnino Mysten Labs

Abstract

We propose separating the task of reliable transaction dissem- $\,$  ination from transaction ordering, to enable high-performance Byzantine fault-tolerant quorum-based consensus. We design and evaluate a mempool protocol, Narwhal, specializing<br>in high-throughput reliable dissemination and storage of<br>causal histories of transactions. Narwhal tolerates an asynchronous network and maintains high performance despit failures. Narwhal is designed to easily scale-out using multi-<br>ple workers at each validator, and we demonstrate that there

is no foreseeable limit to the throughput we can achieve.<br>Composing Narwhal with a partially synchronous consensus protocol (Narwhal-HotStuff) vields significantly better sus protocol (Narwani-Hotbstul') yields signincantly better<br>troughput even in the presence of faults or intermittent loss<br>of liveness due to asynchrony. However, loss of liveness can<br>result in higher latency. To achieve ev We demonstrate its high performance under a variety of

configurations and faults.<br>- As a summary of results, on a WAN, Narwhal-Hotstuff<br>achieves over 130.000 tx/sec at less than 2-sec latency com-As a summary of results, on a WAN, Narwhal-Hotst<br>tuff accelerate achieves over 130,000 tx/sec at less than 2-sec latency compared with 1,800 tx/sec at 1-sec latency for Hotstuff. Additional workers increase throughout lin

### $\mathit{CCS}$  Concepts:  $\bm{\cdot}$  Security and privacy  $\bm{\rightarrow}$  Distributed systems security.

Keywords: Consensus protocol, Byzantine Fault Tolerant **EXECUTE ASSES AND MONOR CONSERVANCE CONSERVANCE PERIMBOL PRESSION OF DEFINISION CONSERVANCE PERIMBOL OF PERIMBOL OF THE AND CONSERVANCE AND SERVED AND SERVED SOFTS AND SOFTS AND SOFTS AND SOFTS AND SOFTS AND SOFTS AND SO** 

### on Computer Systems (EuroSys '22), April 5–8, 2022, RENNES, France.<br>ACM, New York, NY, USA, 17 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3492321.

Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias

**IST Austria** 

Alexander Spiegelman

 $\label{eq:1}$  der Spiegelman. 2022. Narwhal and Tusk: A DAG-based Mempool<br>and Efficient BFT Consensus . In Seventeenth European Conference

Aptos

### 1 Introduction

**ACM Reference Format** 

**1 Introduction**<br>
Byzantine consensus protocols [15, 19, 21] and the state<br>
Byzantine consensus protocols [15, 19, 21] and the state<br>
tributed systems have been studed for over 40 years. However, with the rise in populari  $\label{thm:main} \begin{minipage}[t]{.45\textwidth} \begin{minipage}[t]{.45\textwidth} \begin{itemize} \begin{itemize} \begin{itemize} \begin{itemize} \end{itemize} \end{itemize} \end{minipage} \end{minipage} \begin{minipage}[t]{.45\textwidth} \begin{itemize} \end{itemize} \end{minipage} \end{minipage} \begin{minipage}[t]{.45\textwidth} \begin{itemize} \begin{itemize} \end{itemize} \end{itemize} \end{minipage} \end{minipage} \begin{minipage}[t]{.45\textwidth} \begin{itemize} \begin{itemize} \end{itemize}$ message complexity in the partially synchronous setting. To<br>achieve this, Hotstuff leverages a leader who collects, aggregates, and broadcasts the messages of other validators.<br>However, theoretical message complexity should not be the only optimization target. More specifically:

• Any (partially-synch) s) protocol that minimizes overall message number, but relies on a leader to pro duce proposals and coordinate consensus, fails to capture the high load this imposes on the leader who inevitably becomes a bottleneck.

merviancy becomes a occurrence.<br> **Nessage complexity counts the number of** *metadata*<br>
messages (e.g., votes, signatures, hashes) which take<br>
minimal bandwidth compared to the dissemination of bulk transaction data (blocks). Since blocks are order bulk transaction data (blocks). Since blocks are orders<br>of magnitude larger (100K) than a typical consensus<br>message (100B), the asymptotic message complexity<br>is practically amortized for fixed mid-size committees<br>(up to ~

functions into a monolithic protocol. In a typical distri-

### **Data Dissemination**

- Hard to make efficient
- · 99% of the code

### **Bullshark**

### Dumbo-NG

### **Bullshark: DAG BFT Protocols Made Practical** Neil Giridharan

### Alexander Spiegelman and .<br>sasha@aptos .<br>Aptos Alberto Sonnino

alberto@mysternlabs.com<br>Mysten Labs

**ABSTRACT** 

We present BullShark, the first directed acyclic graph (DAG) based We present BullShark, the first directed acyclic graph (DAO) based asyson<br>tronous Byzantine Atomic Broadcast protocol that is optimized for the common synchromous case. Like previous DAG-based BF<br>IF protocols [19, 25], Bu

.<br>eed even under a quantum adversary. In order to show the practicality and simplicity of our approach, In order to show the practical<br>my and simplicity or our approach, we also introduce a standalone partially synchronous version of<br>BullShark which we evaluate against the state of the art. The impediance<br>plemented protocol setting the state of the art pays a steep 50% latency increase as it optimizes for asynchrony. **ACM Reference Format:** 

Activitation Intimated The Alexander Spiegelman, Alexander Spiegelman, Nell Giridharan, Alberto Sonnino, and Lefteris Kokotis Scognis. 2022. ISLIshark: DAG BFT Protocols Made Practical. In Forence 222, 17 pages.<br> *Proceedi* https://doi.org/10.1145/nnn

1 INTRODUCTION rdering transactions in a distributed Byzantine er nechanism has become one of the most timely research areas in recent years due to the blooming Blockchain use-case. A recent line of work [8, 19, 21, 25, 33, 40] proposed an elegar way to separate between the distribution of transactions and th Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted with<br>usua tee pows was described by profile or profile of profile of commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation<br>on the first page. Copyrights for components of thi

to post on servers or to redistri<br>fee. Request permissions from

giridhn@berkeley.edu<br>UC Berkeley Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias ekokoris@ist.ac.at<br>IST Austria logic required to safely order them. The idea is simple. To propos<br>transactions, parties send them in a way that forms a casual orde ransactions, parties send them in a way that forms a ca<br>among them. That is, messages contain blocks of tran: sly received messages, which togeth form a directed acyclic graph (DAG). Interestingly, the structure o he DAG encodes information that allow parties to totally orde the DAG by locally interpreting their view of it without sending<br>the DAG by locally interpreting their view of it without sending<br>any extra messages. That is, once we build the DAG, implementing<br>consensus on top of it requ tured DAG, where each message refers to two previous ones, are

Nucleudes and the mass control of the step of the step and the DAG used hashes of messages as local coin flips to totally order the DAG round-based DAG and encoded a shared randomness in each round parameter of the result expectation. The state of the art is DAG-<br>previous ideas. Every round in its DAG<br>for each party), each of which contains well as references (edges) to at least  $2f+1$  vertices in the previous round. Blocks are disseminated via reliable broadcast [11] to avoid -can<br>not anotation and an honest party advances to the next round once<br>it reliably delivers  $2f + 1$  vertices in the current round. Note that<br>building the DAG requires honest parties to broadcast vertices ten<br>if they have st parties to broadcast vertices ever<br>propose. However, the edges of the DAG encodes the "voting" information that is sufficient to totally<br>order all the DAG's vertices. So in this sense it is not different from order all the DAOs svertees. So in this sense it is not all<br>recent in tom the BTT protocols in which parties send explicit vote messages, which contain no transactions as well. Remarkably, by using the DAOs based<br>interpre

which achieves optimal amort per transaction), post quantum safety, and some notion of fairne  $\ell$  called Validity) that guarantees that every transaction proposed by an honest party is eventually delivered (ordered). To achieve optimal amortized communication DAG-R(der combines batching techniques with an efficie  $\,$  protocol is post quantum safe because it does not rely on primitives that a quantum computer can brake for the safety properties. That is, a quantum adversary can prevent the protocol progress, but it cannot violate safety guarantees. However, although DAG-based protocols have a solid theoretical foundation, they have multiple gaps before being realistic

### Dumbo-NG: Fast Asynchronous BFT Consensus with



(over up to 64 AWS EC2 nodes across 16 AWS regions) reveal: Dumbo -NG realizes a peak throughput 4-8x over Dumbo, and 2-3x over specifical specific specific specific specific specific specific specific specific specific s tested protocols, can almost remain stable when throughput grows. **CCS CONCEPTS** 

Authors are listed alphabetically. Yingxi, Yuan & Zhenliang made equal contributions. strated the first asynchronous BFT consensuses that is performant in the wide-area network [60]. As shown in Figure 1, HBBFT was

odes [11], and<br>re and efficient timess. The con-<br>
ivive in a highly<br>
poplications atop<br>
dodes can be well<br>
if a several worse, the<br>
inface due to net-<br>
frace due to net-<br>
it asynchronous<br>
3, 3, 47, 58, 60<br>
a safety) despite<br>
ay messages. In<br>
safety despi

Unfortunately, it is fundamentally challenging to realize practical asynchronous BFT consensus, and none of such protocols was widely adopted due to serious efficiency concerns. The seminal FLP "impossibility" [36] proves  $[1, 12, 13, 21, 25, 65, 67]$  aimed at to circu venting the "impossib  ${\begin{tabular}{l} \bf CCSC CONCEPTS \\ \bf \textcolor{red}{\bf \textcolor{black}S} \end{tabular}} \begin{tabular}{l} \bf \textcolor{red}{\bf \textcolor{black}S} \end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{l} \bf \textcolor{black}S} \end{tabular} \begin{tab$ 

### $\bigodot$

### **Consensus**

- Error prone
- · Isolated, easy to maintain



### Narwhal and Tusk: A DAG-based Mempool and **Efficient BFT Consensus**

George Danezis<br>ivsten Labs & HCL

### Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias<br>IST Austria

### Alexander Spiegelman

Abstract Mileto Somino Alexandre Spiegelman<br>
Abstract Myster Labs (Somina Mc Spiegelman<br>
Nythern Labs (Somina Mc Somina Mc Spiegelman<br>
We propose separating the task of relability performance in the simulation of the syst

### **Bullshark**

### **Bullshark: DAG BFT Protocols Made Practical**

### Alexander Spiegelman sasha@aptoslabs.com<br>Aptos

Alberto Sonnino alberto@mysternlabs.com<br>Mysten Labs

 $\label{eq:10} \textbf{ABSTRACTI} \textbf{XAYI} \text$ 

Neil Giridharan

giridhn@berkeley.edu<br>UC Berkeley

Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias

ekokoris@ist.ac.at<br>IST Austria

### Dumbo-NG: Fast Asynchronous BFT Consensus with



## **Performance**



- 1. Network model?
- 2. BFT testing?
- 3. Consensus-exec interface?

## **Research Questions**

- 1. Modularisation is a design strategy
- 2. Tasks-threads allocation
- 3. Benchmark early
- 4. Codesign with mem. and storage
- 5. Core is hard, consensus is easy



## **Lessons Learned**

## By that time...





How Libra Was Killed.

I never shared this publicly before, but since @pmarca opened the floodgates on @joerogan's pod, it feels appropriate to shed more light on this.

As a reminder, Libra (then Diem) was an advanced, high-performance, payments-centric blockchain paired with a stablecoin that we built with my team at @Meta. It would've solved global payments at scale. Prior to announcing the project, we spent months briefing key regulators in DC and abroad. We then announced the project in June 2019 alongside 28 companies. Two weeks later, I was called to testify in front of both the Senate Banking Committee and the House Financial Services Committee, which was the starting point of two years of nonstop work and changes to appease lawmakers and regulators.

By spring of 2021 (yes they slow played us at every step), we had addressed every last possible regulatory concern across financial crime, money laundering, consumer protection, reserve management, buffers,

Reply

## By that time...





### Aptos

### Linera

 $\bullet\bullet\bullet$ 

# **Fundraising with papers seems to work**



- Lack of checkpoints
- Lack of epoch-change
- Lack of crash-recovery

### **Over a year for mainnet**

- 1. Network model?
- 2. BFT testing?
- 3. Consensus-exec interface?
- 4. Storage architecture?

## **Research Questions**

- 1. Modularisation is a design strategy
- 2. Tasks-threads allocation
- 3. Benchmark early
- 4. Codesign with mem. and storage
- 5. Core is hard, consensus is easy
- 6. Epoch change is not an add-on



## **Lessons Learned**



- Latency was too high
- Crash faults were the predominant faults
- Building Bullshark was still too complex

### **Shoal**

### Shoal: Improving DAG-BFT Latency And Robustness

### Alexander Spiegelman Rati Gelashvili

### Abstract

The Narwhal system is a state-of-the-art Byzantine faultnt scalable architecture that involves constructing a<br>ed acyclic graph (DAG) of messages among a set of val-<br>s in a Blockchain network. Bullshark is a zero-overhead idators in a Blockchain network. Bullshark is a zero-overhead consensus protocol on top of the Narwhal's DAG that can order over 100k transactions per second. Unfortunately, the high throughput of Bullshark comes with a l

out extremely uncommon scenarios in practice, a property<br>we name "prevalent responsiveness" (it strictly subsumes  $\label{thm:main}$  the established and often desired "optimistic responsiveness" property for BFT protocols). We integrated Shoal instantiated with Bullshark, the fastest

We untergrated onoin assumes with our<br>sums, we have serving Narwhal-based consensus protocol, in an open-source<br>of 160,000 TPS with 10 machine per validator, which further<br>Blockchain project and provide experimental evalu

Keywords: Consensus Protocol, Byzantine Fault Tolerance **ACM Reference Format:** 

ישטאר, או נאפ**רופופן (Alexander Spiegelman, Balaji Arun, Rati Gelashvili, and Zekun Li.<br>2023. Shoal: Improving DAG-BFT Latency And Robustness .** 

1 Introduction Byzantine fault tolerant (BFT) systems, including consensus Byzantine fault tolerant (BFT) systems, including consensus<br>protocols [13, 23, 24, 29] and state machine replication [7, 10, 26, 42, 46], have been a topic of research for over four<br>decades as a means of constructing reli

Historically, the prevailing belief has been that reducing communication complexity was the key to unlocking high performance, leading to the pursuit of protocols with lin ear communication. However, this did not result in drastic enough improvements in the throughput, falling significantly short of the current blockchain network targets. For example the state-of-the-art Hotstuff [46] protocol in this line of work only achieves a throughput of 3500 TPS [3]. A recent breakthrough, however, stemmed from the real-

Balaji Arun<br>Aptos

Zekun Li

ization that data dissemination is the primary bottleneck for leader-based protocols, and it can benefit from parallelization [4, 17, 37, 45]. The Narwhal system [17] separated data dissemination from the core consensus logic and proposed an architecture where all validators simultaneously dissem significantly reduces latency. Moreover, the combination of an architecture where all validators simultaneously disseming properties of the DAG construction and the leader reputation and the leader reputation mechanism ena nate data, while the consensus component orders a smaller ture is that not only it delivers impressive throughput on ture is that not only it delivers impressive throughput on<br>a single machine, but also naturally supports scaling out<br>each blockchain validator by adding more machines. The<br>Narwihl paper [17] evaluated the system in a geo-

Developing a production-ready reliable distributed system is challenging, and integrating intricate consensus protocols only adds to the difficulty. Narwhal addresses this issue by abstracting away networking from the con

 $\label{lem:main} \begin{minipage}[t]{0.9\linewidth} \emph{implementation, ensuring that malicious validators cannot distribute different vertices to different validators within the same round. With networking abstraction separated from the same round.} \emph{[The two-dimensional linear equations are used in the same result, and the two-dimensional linear equations are used.} \emph{[In this case, the two-dimensional linear equations are used in the same result, and the two-dimensional linear equations are used.} \emph{[In this case, the two-dimensional linear equations are used in the same result, and the two-dimensional linear equations are used.} \emph{[In this case, the two-dimensional linear equations are used in the same result, and the two-dimensional linear equations are used.} \emph{[In this case, the two-dimensional linear equations are used in the same result, and the two-dimensional linear equations are used.} \emph{[In this case, the$ the details of consensus, the DAG can be constructed without contending with complex mechanisms like view-change or view-synchronization.<br>During periods of network asynchrony, each validator

may observe a slightly different portion of the DAG at any

### **Sailfish**

### Sailfish: Towards Improving the Latency of DAG-based BFT



Abdurate-Interceteur Aftyric virtual UDAO Justed par is protocolos agree out use proposed. Vantance consensus efforts across different parties and maintain leceps making progress. From an efficiency standpoint, this high t ommit decisions, primarily because they have a leader every 2 or more "rounds". Recent works, such as Shoal (FC'23) and and their network are not used, leading to uneven resourc

submitted by the leader (leader vertex) and additional latency<br>to commit other proposals (non-leader vertices).<br>In this work, we present Sailfish, the first DAG-based BFT<br>that supports a leader vertex in each round. Under cols introduce significantly lower latency overhead compare to existing DAG-based protocols, with similar throughput.

### 1. Introduction

**1. Introduction**<br>
For such DAG-based protocols? Addressing this question is<br>
for such DAG-based protocols? Addressing this question is<br>
Byzantine fault-tolerant state machine replication (BFT<br>
All existing DAG-based prot

**hstract—Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) based BFT protocols** agree on the proposed values and ensure that the leader<br>alance consensus efforts across different parties and maintain keeps making progress. From an efficiency st uneven scheduling of work among the parties. While the leader is sending a proposal, the other parties' processors 2 or more "rounds". Recent Works, such as Shoal (FC-25) and and using earches particle, have deemed supporting a leader vertex in each using a cross parties. Second, in typical leader-based pro-<br>Mysticeli, have deemed sup efficiently

Electricity, a novel approach known as DAG-based BFT<br>has emerged  $[5]$ ,  $[18]$ ,  $[28]$ ,  $[33]$ ,  $[34]$ ,  $[46]$ ,  $[47]$ . These<br>protocols enable all participating parties to propose in paralprotocols enable all participating parties to propose in paral-<br>lel, maximizing bandwidth utilization and ensuring equitable<br>distribution of workload. Additionally, because each party<br>is responsible for disseminating its o to their leader-based counterparts under moderate network<br>sizes [19], [46]. However, existing DAG-based protocols meur a high latency compared to their "leader-heavy" counterparts  $[12]$ ,  $[22]$ ,  $[30]$ ,  $[37]$ ,  $[51]$ . Is high latency inherent for such DAG-based protocols? Addressing this question is

virtuality conditions (such as an honest leader). Writes, "Our attempts to solve the problem by delving into<br>Most of these protocol designs rely on a designated the inner workings of the protocol and exploring complex leader who is the party responsible for proposing transac-<br>
una intersection ordering rules have not been fruitful.<br>
tions and driving the protocol forward while other parties Intuitively, this is because ... ". Similarly,

### **Techniques**

- · Many leaders per round
- · Leaders every round
- · Uncertified DAG

### CM

### **Cordial Miners: Fast and Efficient Consensus for**

**Every Eventuality** 

Idit Keida

Oded Naor Technion and StarkWar

Ouri Poupko

Ehud Shapiro Weizmann Institute of Scienc

### - Abstract

Cordial Miners are a family of efficient Byzantine Atomic Broadcast protocols, with instance for a<br>synchrony and eventual synchrony. They improve the latency of state-of-the-art DAG-based<br>protocols by almost 2× and achieve optimal good-case complexity of<br> $O(n)$  by forgoing Reliable Broadcast as a building block. R counterpart of the totally-ordered blockchain data structure-to implement the three algorithmic components of consensus: Dissemination, equivocation-exclusion, and ordering.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Computing methodologies  $\rightarrow$  Distributed algoritl

Keywords and phrases Byzantine Fault Tolerance, State Machine Replication, DAG, Consensus,

Related Version Cordial Miners: Fast and Efficient Consensus for Every Eventuality Full Version: https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.09174

Acknowledgements Oded Naor is grateful to the Azrieli Foundation for the award of an Azrieli Fellowship, and to the Technion Hiroshi Fujiwara Cyber-Security Research Center for providin a research grant. Ehud Shapiro is the Incumbent of The Harry Weinrebe Professorial Chair of Computer Science and Biology at the Weizmann Institute.  $\,$ 

### 1 Introduction

The problem of ordering transactions in a permissioned Byzantine distributed system, also known as *Byzantine Atomic Broadcast (BAB)*, has been investigated for four decades [30], and in the last decade, has attracted renewed attention due to the emergence of cryptocur Recently, a line of works [4, 14, 20, 33, 21, 27] suggests ordering transactions using a distributed Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) structure, in which each vertex contains a block of transactions as well as references to previously sent vertices. The DAG is distributively of unascendes as well as futures running the consensus protocol. While building the constructed from messages of *miners* running the consensus protocol. While building the DAG structure, each miner also totally orders the as the DAG is being constructed, a consensus on its ordering emerges without additional ication among the miners.

The two state-of-the-art protocols in this context are DAG-Rider [21] and Bullshark [33]. DAG-Rider works in the asynchronous setting, in which the adversary controls the finite delay on message delivery between miners, and Bullshark works in the Eventual Synchrony (ES) model, in which eventually all messages between correct miners are delivered within a know

### Mysticeti

### MYSTICETI: Reaching the Latency Limits with **Uncertified DAGs**

### Kushal Babel\*<sup>†</sup>, Andrey Chursin<sup>‡</sup>, George Danezis<sup>‡§</sup>, Anastasios Kichidis<sup>‡</sup>, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias<sup>‡¶</sup>, Arun Koshy<sup>†</sup>, Alberto Sonnino<sup>†§</sup>, Mingwei Tian<sup>†</sup>

### \*Cornell Tech, <sup>†</sup>IC3, <sup>‡</sup>Mysten Labs, <sup>§</sup>University College London (UCL), <sup>¶</sup>IST Austria

Abstract-We introduce MYSTICETI-C, the first DAG-based **Anstract—We introduce MYSTICETI-C, the first DAG-based Byzantine consensus protocol to achieve the lower bounds latency of 3 message rounds. Since MYSTICETI-C is built over DAGs it also achieves high resource efficiency a** a novel commit rue such that very block can be committed<br>without eleays, resulting in optimal latency in the steady state<br>and under crash failures. We further extend MYSTICETI-C<br>for MYSTICETI-FPC, which incorporates a fast and liveness in a Byzantine context. We evaluate both MYSTICETI protocols and compare them with state-of-the-arr consensus and fast path protocols to demonstrate their low latery and resource efficiency, as well as their

Several recent blockchains, such as Sui [67], [12], have community and the common case of powers, protocols based on certified directed acyclic the common case of powering a State Machine Replication (SB), [44], By design

MYSTICETI-C: the power of uncertured LONOS Centure of resources and results in low untouguput. About the DAGs [34], [25], where each vertex is delivered through are fragile to faults and implementation mistakes due to thei reasons: (1) the certification process requires multiple round.<br>
templexity, especially the we-change sub-protocols.<br>
trips to broadcast each block between validators, get signa-<br>
templex and re-broadcast certificates. Thi



Fig. 1: P50 latency of a major blockchain switching from Bullshark (1900ms)<br>to MYSTICETI-C (390ms) consensus on 106 independently run validators

and verification consume a large amount of CPU on each validator, which provs with the number of validators [42], [16]. This burden is particularly heavy for a crash-recovered validator that typically needs to verify thous certification seems to have the benefit that in adversarial case nodes can advance the DAG without needing to synchro 1. INTRODUCTION<br>
the full-history, production experience of deploying Bullshark<br>
Several recent blockchains, such as Sui [67], [12], have summitted transactions. As a result, the certification benefits<br>
doned consensus pro

any so conducts exact oncident series and the brackets and the brackets are the state and the brackets at the state of the state of the state and the brackets in the conducts of the state of the state of the conduct of th

### **Shoal/shoal++ Sailfish/BBCA CM/Mysticeti**

- Low latency
- Easier synchroniser
- Leverage existing code
- Easy synchroniser
- Flexible
- Lowest latency
- Graceful crash faults
- Simpler, less CPU



• Lower latency

### **Certified DAG Uncertified DAG**

## **Discussion**

- 1. Network model?
- 2. BFT testing?
- 3. Consensus-exec interface?
- 4. Storage architecture?
- 5. Block synchroniser?

## **Research Questions**

- 1. Modularisation is a design strategy
- 2. Tasks-threads allocation
- 3. Benchmark early
- 4. Codesign with mem. and storage
- 5. Core is hard, consensus is easy
- 6. Epoch change is not an add-on



## **Lessons Learned**







ish throughest even when ame designated parties fail. How - appeach results in two key develocies. First, there is no the specific state, then is not the specific state, principle in the specific state of the specific lin

leader who is the party responsible for proposing transac- *quorum intersection ordering rules have not been fruujul.*<br>tions and driving the protocol forward while other parties *Intuitively, this is because ... ".* Simila

### **Cordial Miners: Fast and Efficient Consensus for Every Eventuality**

Idit Keidar $\,$ 

Oded Naor Ouri Poupko

Ehud Shapiro

### - Abstract

**PROSECUTE:**<br> **PROSECUTE ALTERATION** Alternative Momic Broadcast protocols, with instance<br>
synchrony and eventual synchrony. They improve the latency of state-of-the-art DAG-base<br>
synchrony and eventual synchrony. They im

eywords and phrases Byzantine Fault Tolerance, State Machine Replication, DAG, Consensu<br>ockchain, Blocklace, Cordial Dissemination

Related Version Cordial Miners: Fast and Efficient Consensus for Every Eventuality<br>Full Version: https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.09174

 ${\small \bf Acknowledgements\ Oded\ No}or$  is grateful to the Azrieli Foundation for the award of an Azrieli Fellowship, and to the Technion Hiroshi Fujiwara Cyber-Security Research Center for providing a research grant. El<br/>nd Shapiro is the I

### 1 Introduction

The problem of ordering transactions in a permissioned Byzantine distributed system, also known as *Byzantine Atomic Broadcast (BAB)*, has been investigated for four decades [30], and in the last decade, has attracted ren

The EFF is being constructed; a consensus on its ordering emerges without additional momentum<br>cation among the miners. The two state-of-the-art protocols in this context are DAG-Rider [21] and Bullshark [33].<br>DAG-Rider wo

### Mysticeti

### MYSTICETI: Reaching the Latency Limits with **Uncertified DAGs**

### Kushal Babel\*<sup>†</sup>, Andrey Chursin<sup>‡</sup>, George Danezis<sup>‡§</sup>, Anastasios Kichidis<sup>‡</sup>, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias<sup>‡¶</sup>, Arun Koshy<sup>†</sup>, Alberto Sonnino<sup>†§</sup>, Mingwei Tian<sup>†</sup>

### \*Cornell Tech, <sup>†</sup>IC3, <sup>‡</sup>Mysten Labs, <sup>§</sup>University College London (UCL), <sup>¶</sup>IST Austria

Concel Tech, 1C, 1 Myster Lab. University College Leaden (UCL), 1ST Austria<br>
Advanture-Weinstone concelled the state of the BAC-1 Myster Lab. Schwarz (College Leaden (UCL), 1ST Austria<br>
Deposite concelled the state of the



## **Uncertified DAG**

- Round number
- Author
- Payload (transactions)
- Signature



## **Uncertified DAG**



## **Uncertified DAG**



## Interpreting DAG Patterns



### **Certificate**



## **Direct Decision Rule**

- **Skip** if 2f+1 blames
- **Commit** if 2f+1 certificates
- **Undecided** otherwise

### On each leader starting from highest round:

## **Direct Decision Rule**

- **Skip** if 2f+1 blames
- **Commit** if 2f+1 certificates
- **Undecided** otherwise

### On each leader starting from highest round:



## **Direct Decision Rule**

- **Skip** if 2f+1 blames
- **Commit** if 2f+1 certificates
- **Undecided** otherwise

### On each leader starting from highest round:





## **Indirect Decision Rule**

## **Performance**

Throughput (tx/s)







### We ran it for 24h and it looks good

- 1. Network model?
- 2. BFT testing?
- 3. Consensus-exec interface?
- 4. Storage architecture?
- 5. Block synchroniser?
- 6. Realistic benchmarks?
- 7. Efficient reads?

## **Research Questions**

- 1. Modularisation is a design strategy
- 2. Tasks-threads allocation
- 3. Benchmark early
- 4. Codesign with mem. and storage
- 5. Core is hard, consensus is easy
- 6. Epoch change is not an add-on



## **Lessons Learned**

## **Testing Strategy**



- Compare performance & robustness
- 
- 

• Test mainnet change bullshark -> mysticeti • Prepare for the worst mysticeti -> bullshark

## The Sui Mainnet



## **Conclusion**

### **2019 naive consensus 2020-2021 mempool** ❤**consensus**










# **[alberto@mystenlabs.com](mailto:alberto@mystenlabs.com)**



## **EXTRA: Research in Industry**

### **Projects Roadmap**



**Dmitri Perelman** Oct 18th at 5:55 AM In tomorrow's Research <> Core Eng syncup, @Mark Logan is going to share top of mind of Core Eng pain points and current struggles. See you L  $\mathbb{G}^\dagger$ 

## **Projects Roadmap**



**Dmitri Perelman** Oct 18th at 5 In tomorrow's Research <> C going to share top of mind of struggles. See you  $\mathbf{\hat{S}}^{\dagger}$ 



2 replies





Thread <sub># sui-core-internal</sub>



**Dmitri Perelman** Oct 18th at 5:55 AM

In tomorrow's Research <> Core Eng syncup, @Mark Logan is going to share top of mind of Core Eng pain points and current struggles. See you





**John Martin** Oct 18th at 6:16 AM Can I get an invite to this  $\blacksquare$ 



**Dmitri Perelman** Oct 18th at 7:36 AM You're in the invite list!







> Can we solve it ourself?















### **Research Gifts**

### **(please keep it short)**





Research paper



Research paper implementation











Chainspace: A Sharded Smart Contracts Platform NDSS • Adopted by chainspace.io

Coconut: Threshold Issuance Selective Disclosure … NDSS • Adopted by chainspace.io, Ketl, Nym, …

Replay Attacks and Defenses against Cross-shard … EuroS&P • Adopted by chainspace.io

> Parakeet: Practical Key Transparency for End-to-End … NDSS • Adopted by WhatsApp **IETF Applied Networking Research Prize**

Bullshark: DAG BFT Protocols Made Practical CCS • Adopted by Sui, Aleo, Fleek

Be Aware of Your Leaders FC • Adopted by Diem, Aptos Zef: Low-latency, Scalable, Private Payments WPES • Adopted by Linera

Sui Lutris: A Blockchain Combining Broadcast and … CCS · Adopted by Sui Distinguished paper award



HammerHead: Leader Reputation for Dynamic Scheduling ICDCS • Adopted by Sui

Subset-optimized BLS Multi-signature with Key Aggregation FC • Adopted by Fastcrypto Mysticeti: Reaching the Limits of Latency with Uncertified … NDSS • Adopted by Sui

Fastcrypto: Pioneering Cryptography via Continuous … LTB • Adopted by Fastcrypto

FastPay: High-Performance Byzantine Fault Tolerant … AFT • Adopted by Sui, Linera

Twins: BFT Systems Made Robust OPODIS • Adopted by Diem, Aptos, Chainlink

Fraud Proofs: Maximising Light Client Security and … FC • Adoped by Ethereum, Celestia

Narwhal and Tusk: A DAG-based Mempool and Efficient … EuroSys • Adopted by Sui, Aptos, Fleek, Aleo Best paper award

Jolteon and Ditto: Network-Adaptive Efficient Consensus … FC • Adopted by Flow, Diem, Aptos, Monad

- 1. Network model?
- 2. BFT testing?
- 3. Consensus-exec interface?
- 4. Storage architecture?
- 5. Block synchroniser?
- 6. Realistic benchmarks?
- 7. Efficient reads?

### **Research Questions**

- 1. Modularisation is a design strategy
- 2. Tasks-threads relationship
- 3. Benchmark early
- 4. Codesign with mem. and storage
- 5. Core is hard, consensus is easy
- 6. Epoch change is not an add-on
- 7. Writing papers to explore designs





### **Lessons Learned**

**EXTRA: Benchmarks**

### **Implementation**

- Written in Rust
- Networking: Tokio (TCP)
- Storage: custom WAL
- Cryptography: ed25519-consensus

### **https://github.com/mystenlabs/mysticeti**

### **Implementation**

- Synchronous core
- One Tokio task per peer (limiting resource usage)
- DTE simulator

### **https://github.com/mystenlabs/mysticeti**

### **Evaluation** Experimental setup on AWS





