Formalization of a Generalized Protocol for Clock Synchronization in Isabelle/HOL

Alwen Tiu LORIA - http://qsl.loria.fr

March 17, 2025

Abstract

We formalize the generalized Byzantine fault-tolerant clock synchronization protocol of Schneider. This protocol abstracts from particular algorithms or implementations for clock synchronization. This abstraction includes several assumptions on the behaviors of physical clocks and on general properties of concrete algorithms/implementations. Based on these assumptions the correctness of the protocol is proved by Schneider. His proof was later verified by Shankar using the theorem prover EHDM (precursor to PVS). Our formalization in Isabelle/HOL is based on Shankar's formalization.

Contents

1	Intr	roduction	1
2	Isar	r proof scripts	2
	2.1	Types and constants definitions	2
	2.2	Clock conditions	3
		2.2.1 Some derived properties of clocks	5
		2.2.2 Bounded-drift for logical clocks (IC)	5
	2.3	Agreement property	

1 Introduction

In certain distributed systems, e.g., real-time process-control systems, the existence of a reliable global time source is critical in ensuring the correct functioning of the systems. This reliable global time source can be implemented using several physical clocks distributed on different nodes in the distributed system. Since physical clocks are by nature constantly drifting away from the "real time" and different clocks can have different drift rates, in such a scheme, it is important that these clocks are regularly adjusted so that they are closely synchronized within a certain application-specific safe bound. The design and verification of clock synchronization protocols are often complicated by the additional requirement that the protocols should work correctly under certain types of errors, e.g., failure of some clocks, error in communication network or corrupted messages, etc.

There has been a number of fault-tolerant clock synchronization algorithms studied in the literature, e.g., the *Interactive Convergence Algorithm* (ICA) by Lamport and Melliar-Smith [1], the Lundelius-Lynch algorithm [2], etc., each with its own degree of fault tolerance. One important property that

must be satisfied by a clock synchronization algorithm is the agreement property, i.e., at any time t, the difference of the clock readings of any two non-faulty processes must be bounded by a constant (which is fixed according to the domain of applications). At the core of these algorithms is the convergence function that calculates the adjustment to a clock of a process, based on the clock readings of all other processes. Schneider [3] gives an abstract characterization of a wide range of clock synchronization algorithms (based on the convergence functions used) and proves the agreement property in this abstract framework. Schneider's proof was later verified by Shankar [4] in the theorem prover EHDM (precursor to PVS), where eleven axioms about clocks are explicitly stated.

We formalize Schneider's proof in Isabelle/HOL, making use of Shankar's formulation of the clock axioms. The particular formulation of axioms on clock conditions and the statements of the main theorems here are essentially those of Shankar's [4], with some minor changes in syntax. For the full description of the protocol, the general structure of the proof and the meaning of the constants and function symbols used in this formalization, we refer readers to [4].

Acknowledgment I would like to thank Stephan Merz and Pascal Fontaine for useful tips on using Isabelle and particularly the Isar proof language.

2 Isar proof scripts

theory GenClock imports Complex-Main begin

2.1 Types and constants definitions

Process is represented by natural numbers. The type 'event' corresponds to synchronization rounds.

```
type-synonym process = nat
type-synonym event = nat
type-synonym time = real
type-synonym Clocktime = real
axiomatization
  \delta :: real \text{ and }
  \mu :: real \text{ and }
  \rho :: real \text{ and }
  rmin :: real and
  rmax :: real and
  \beta :: real \text{ and }
  \Lambda :: real \text{ and }
  np :: process and
  maxfaults :: process and
  PC :: [process, time] \Rightarrow Clocktime  and
  VC :: [process, time] \Rightarrow Clocktime  and
  te :: [process, event] \Rightarrow time  and
```

```
\vartheta::[process,\ event]\Rightarrow(process\Rightarrow\ Clocktime) and IC::[process,\ event,\ time]\Rightarrow\ Clocktime and correct::[process,\ time]\Rightarrow\ bool and cfn::[process,\ (process\Rightarrow\ Clocktime)]\Rightarrow\ Clocktime and \pi::[Clocktime,\ Clocktime]\Rightarrow\ Clocktime and
```

definition

 $\alpha :: Clocktime \Rightarrow Clocktime$

```
count :: [process \Rightarrow bool, process] \Rightarrow nat  where count f n = card \{p. \ p < n \land f p\}
```

definition

```
Adj :: [process, event] \Rightarrow Clocktime  where Adj = (\lambda \ p \ i. \ if \ 0 < i \ then \ cfn \ p \ (\vartheta \ p \ i) - PC \ p \ (te \ p \ i)  else 0)
```

definition

```
okRead1 :: [process \Rightarrow Clocktime, Clocktime, process \Rightarrow bool] \Rightarrow bool  where okRead1 \ f \ x \ ppred \longleftrightarrow (\forall \ l \ m. \ ppred \ l \land ppred \ m \longrightarrow |f \ l - f \ m| \le x)
```

definition

```
okRead2 :: [process \Rightarrow Clocktime, process \Rightarrow Clocktime, Clocktime, process \Rightarrow bool] \Rightarrow bool where 
 <math>okRead2 \ f \ g \ x \ ppred \longleftrightarrow (\forall \ p. \ ppred \ p \longrightarrow |f \ p - g \ p| \le x)
```

definition

```
rho-bound1 :: [[process, time] \Rightarrow Clocktime] \Rightarrow bool where rho-bound1 C \longleftrightarrow (\forall p \ s \ t. \ correct \ p \ t \land s \le t \longrightarrow C \ p \ t - C \ p \ s \le (t - s)*(1 + \varrho)) lefinition
```

```
rho-bound2 :: [[process, time] \Rightarrow Clocktime] \Rightarrow bool where rho-bound2 C \longleftrightarrow (\forall p \ s \ t. \ correct \ p \ t \land s \leq t \longrightarrow (t-s)*(1-\varrho) \leq C \ p \ t-C \ p \ s)
```

2.2 Clock conditions

Some general assumptions

axiomatization where

```
constants-ax: 0 < \beta \land 0 < \mu \land 0 < rmin
 \land rmin \leq rmax \land 0 < \varrho \land 0 < np \land maxfaults \leq np
```

axiomatization where

```
PC-monotone: \forall p \ s \ t. \ correct \ p \ t \land s \leq t \longrightarrow PC \ p \ s \leq PC \ p \ t
```

axiomatization where

$$VClock: \forall p \ t \ i. \ correct \ p \ t \land te \ p \ i \leq t \land t < te \ p \ (i+1) \longrightarrow VC \ p \ t = IC \ p \ i \ t$$

axiomatization where

 $IClock: \forall p \ t \ i. \ correct \ p \ t \longrightarrow IC \ p \ i \ t = PC \ p \ t + Adj \ p \ i$

Condition 1: initial skew

axiomatization where

init: $\forall p. \ correct \ p \ 0 \longrightarrow 0 \le PC \ p \ 0 \land PC \ p \ 0 \le \mu$

Condition 2: bounded drift

axiomatization where

rate-1:
$$\forall p \ s \ t$$
. correct $p \ t \land s \le t \longrightarrow PC \ p \ t - PC \ p \ s \le (t - s)*(1 + \varrho)$ and rate-2: $\forall p \ s \ t$. correct $p \ t \land s \le t \longrightarrow (t - s)*(1 - \varrho) \le PC \ p \ t - PC \ p \ s$

Condition 3: bounded interval

axiomatization where

```
rts0: \forall p \ t \ i. \ correct \ p \ t \land t \le te \ p \ (i+1) \longrightarrow t - te \ p \ i \le rmax \ {\bf and} \ rts1: \forall p \ t \ i. \ correct \ p \ t \land te \ p \ (i+1) \le t \longrightarrow rmin \le t - te \ p \ i
```

Condition 4: bounded delay

axiomatization where

```
rts2a: \forall p \ q \ t \ i. correct p \ t \land correct \ q \ t \land te \ q \ i + \beta \leq t \longrightarrow te \ p \ i \leq t and rts2b: \forall p \ q \ i. correct p \ (te \ p \ i) \land correct \ q \ (te \ q \ i) \longrightarrow abs(te \ p \ i - te \ q \ i) \leq \beta
```

Condition 5: initial synchronization

axiomatization where

 $synch\theta$: $\forall p. te p \theta = \theta$

Condition 6: nonoverlap

axiomatization where

nonoverlap: $\beta \leq rmin$

Condition 7: reading errors

axiomatization where

```
readerror: \forall p \ q \ i. \ correct \ p \ (te \ p \ (i+1)) \land correct \ q \ (te \ p \ (i+1)) \longrightarrow abs(\vartheta \ p \ (i+1) \ q - IC \ q \ i \ (te \ p \ (i+1))) \le \Lambda
```

Condition 8: bounded faults

axiomatization where

```
correct-closed: \forall p \ s \ t. \ s \leq t \land correct \ p \ t \longrightarrow correct \ p \ s \ and
correct-count: \forall t. \ np - maxfaults \leq count \ (\lambda \ p. \ correct \ p \ t) \ np
```

Condition 9: Translation invariance

axiomatization where

```
trans-inv: \forall p \ f \ x. \ 0 \le x \longrightarrow cfn \ p \ (\lambda y. \ f \ y + x) = cfn \ p \ f + x
```

Condition 10: precision enhancement

axiomatization where

prec-enh:

$$\forall ppred \ p \ q \ f \ g \ x \ y.$$

$$np - maxfaults \leq count \ ppred \ np \ \land okRead1 \ f \ y \ ppred \ \land okRead1 \ g \ y \ ppred \ \land$$

```
okRead2 \ f \ g \ x \ ppred \land ppred \ p \land ppred \ q

\longrightarrow abs(cfn \ p \ f - cfn \ q \ g) \le \pi \ x \ y
```

Condition 11: accuracy preservation

```
axiomatization where
```

```
acc-prsv: \forall \ ppred \ p \ q \ f \ x. \ okRead1 \ f \ x \ ppred \ \land \ np - \ maxfaults \leq count \ ppred \ np \\ \land \ ppred \ p \ \land \ ppred \ q \longrightarrow abs(cfn \ p \ f - f \ q) \leq \alpha \ x
```

2.2.1 Some derived properties of clocks

```
lemma rts0d:
assumes cp: correct p (te p (i+1))
shows te p(i+1) - te p i \le rmax
\langle proof \rangle
lemma rts1d:
assumes cp: correct \ p \ (te \ p \ (i+1))
shows rmin \le te \ p \ (i+1) - te \ p \ i
\langle proof \rangle
lemma rte:
assumes cp: correct \ p \ (te \ p \ (i+1))
shows te p i \leq te p (i+1)
\langle proof \rangle
lemma beta-bound1:
assumes corr-p: correct p (te p (i+1))
and corr-q: correct q (te p (i+1))
shows 0 \le te \ p \ (i+1) - te \ q \ i
\langle proof \rangle
lemma beta-bound2:
assumes corr-p: correct p (te p (i+1))
and corr-q: correct q (te q i)
shows te p(i+1) - te \ q \ i \leq rmax + \beta
\langle proof \rangle
```

2.2.2 Bounded-drift for logical clocks (IC)

```
lemma bd:
   assumes ie: s \le t
   and rb1: rho-bound1 C
   and rb2: rho-bound2 D
   and PC-ie: D \neq t - D \neq s \le C \neq t - C \neq s
   and corr-p: correct \neq t
   and corr-q: correct \neq t
   shows |C \neq t - D \neq t| \le |C \neq s - D \neq s| + 2*\varrho*(t - s)
\langle proof \rangle
```

```
lemma bounded-drift:

assumes ie: s \le t

and rb1: rho-bound1 C
```

```
and rb2: rho-bound2 C
 and rb3: rho-bound1 D
 and rb4: rho-bound2 D
 and corr-p: correct p t
 and corr-q: correct q t
 shows |C p t - D q t| \le |C p s - D q s| + 2*\rho*(t - s)
\langle proof \rangle
Drift rate of logical clocks
lemma IC-rate1:
rho-bound1 (\lambda p t. IC p i t)
\langle proof \rangle
lemma IC-rate2:
rho-bound2 (\lambda p t. IC p i t)
\langle proof \rangle
Auxiliary function ICf: we introduce this to avoid some unification problem in some tactic of isabelle.
definition
  ICf :: nat \Rightarrow (process \Rightarrow time \Rightarrow Clocktime) where
 ICf i = (\lambda \ p \ t. \ IC \ p \ i \ t)
lemma IC-bd:
  assumes ie: s \leq t
 and corr-p: correct p t
 and corr-q: correct q t
 shows |IC \ p \ i \ t - IC \ q \ j \ t| \le |IC \ p \ i \ s - IC \ q \ j \ s| + 2*\varrho*(t - s)
\langle proof \rangle
lemma event-bound:
assumes ie1: 0 \leq (t::real)
and corr-p: correct p t
and corr-q: correct q t
shows \exists i. t < max (te \ p \ i) (te \ q \ i)
\langle proof \rangle
2.3
        Agreement property
definition \gamma 1 \ x = \pi \ (2*\varrho*\beta + 2*\Lambda) \ (2*\Lambda + x + 2*\varrho*(rmax + \beta))
definition \gamma 2 \ x = x + 2 * \varrho * rmax
definition \gamma \beta x = \alpha (2*\Lambda + x + 2*\rho*(rmax + \beta)) + \Lambda + 2*\rho*\beta
definition
  okmaxsync :: [nat, Clocktime] \Rightarrow bool where
  okmaxsync \ i \ x \longleftrightarrow (\forall \ p \ q. \ correct \ p \ (max \ (te \ p \ i) \ (te \ q \ i))
     \land correct q (max (te p i) (te q i)) \longrightarrow
       |IC\ p\ i\ (max\ (te\ p\ i)\ (te\ q\ i)) - IC\ q\ i\ (max\ (te\ p\ i)\ (te\ q\ i))| \le x)
definition
  okClocks :: [process, process, nat] \Rightarrow bool  where
  okClocks\ p\ q\ i \longleftrightarrow (\forall\ t.\ 0 \le t \land t < max\ (te\ p\ i)\ (te\ q\ i)
        \land correct p t \land correct q t
     \longrightarrow |VC \ p \ t - VC \ q \ t| \leq \delta
```

```
\mathbf{lemma}\ okClocks	ext{-}sym:
assumes ok-pq: okClocks p q i
shows okClocks \ q \ p \ i
\langle proof \rangle
lemma ICp	ext{-}Suc:
assumes corr-p: correct p (te p (i+1))
shows IC p (i+1) (te p (i+1)) = cfn p (\vartheta p (i+1))
\langle proof \rangle
lemma IC-trans-inv:
assumes ie1: te \ q \ (i+1) \le te \ p \ (i+1)
and corr-p: correct p (te p (i+1))
and corr-q: correct \ q \ (te \ p \ (i+1))
shows
IC \ q \ (i+1) \ (te \ p \ (i+1)) =
 cfn\ q\ (\lambda\ n.\ \vartheta\ q\ (i+1)\ n\ +\ (PC\ q\ (te\ p\ (i+1))\ -\ PC\ q\ (te\ q\ (i+1))))
(is ?T1 = ?T2)
\langle proof \rangle
lemma beta-rho:
assumes ie: te q(i+1) \le te p(i+1)
and corr-p: correct p (te p (i+1))
and corr-q: correct q (te p (i+1))
and corr-l: correct l (te p (i+1))
shows |(PC \ l \ (te \ p \ (i+1)) - PC \ l \ (te \ q \ (i+1))) - (te \ p \ (i+1) - te \ q \ (i+1))| \le \beta * \varrho
\langle proof \rangle
This lemma (and the next one pe-cond2) proves an assumption used in the precision enhancement.
lemma pe-cond1:
assumes ie: te q(i+1) \le te p(i+1)
and corr-p: correct p (te p (i+1))
and corr-q: correct q (te p (i + 1))
and corr-l: correct l (te p (i+1))
shows |\vartheta| q(i+1) l + (PC q(te p(i+1)) - PC q(te q(i+1))) -
          \vartheta p(i+1) |l| \leq 2 * \varrho * \beta + 2 * \Lambda
(is ?M \leq ?N)
\langle proof \rangle
lemma pe-cond2:
assumes ie: te m i \le te l i
and corr-k: correct k (te k (i+1))
and corr-l-tk: correct l (te k (i+1))
and corr-m-tk: correct m (te k (i+1))
and ind-hyp: |IC\ l\ i\ (te\ l\ i) - IC\ m\ i\ (te\ l\ i)| \le \delta S
shows |\vartheta| k (i+1) l - \vartheta| k (i+1) m| \le 2*\Lambda + \delta S + 2*\rho*(rmax + \beta)
\langle proof \rangle
lemma theta-bound:
assumes corr-l: correct l (te p (i+1))
and corr-m: correct m (te p (i+1))
and corr-p: correct p (te p (i+1))
```

```
and IC-bound:
    |IC\ l\ i\ (max\ (te\ l\ i)\ (te\ m\ i)) - IC\ m\ i\ (max\ (te\ l\ i)\ (te\ m\ i))|
shows |\vartheta| p(i+1) l - \vartheta| p(i+1) m|
      \leq 2*\Lambda + \delta S + 2*\varrho*(rmax + \beta)
\langle proof \rangle
lemma four-one-ind-half:
 assumes ie1: \beta \leq rmin
 and ie2: \mu \leq \delta S
 and ie3: \gamma 1 \ \delta S \leq \delta S
 and ind-hyp: okmaxsync \ i \ \delta S
 and ie4: te \ q \ (i+1) \le te \ p \ (i+1)
 and corr-p: correct p (te p (i+1))
 and corr-q: correct q (te p (i+1))
shows |IC \ p \ (i+1) \ (te \ p \ (i+1)) - IC \ q \ (i+1) \ (te \ p \ (i+1))| \le \delta S
\langle proof \rangle
Theorem 4.1 in Shankar's paper.
theorem four-one:
 assumes ie1: \beta \leq rmin
 and ie2: \mu \leq \delta S
 and ie3: \gamma 1 \delta S < \delta S
shows okmaxsync \ i \ \delta S
\langle proof \rangle
lemma VC-cfn:
 assumes corr-p: correct p (te p (i+1))
 and ie: te p (i+1) < te p (i+2)
shows VC \ p \ (te \ p \ (i+1)) = cfn \ p \ (\vartheta \ p \ (i+1))
\langle proof \rangle
Lemma for the inductive case in Theorem 4.2
lemma four-two-ind:
 assumes ie1: \beta \leq rmin
 and ie2: \mu \leq \delta S
 and ie3: \gamma 1 \ \delta S \leq \delta S
 and ie4: \gamma 2 \delta S \leq \delta
 and ie5: \gamma 3 \ \delta S \leq \delta
 and ie6: te \ q \ (i+1) \le te \ p \ (i+1)
 and ind-hyp: okClocks p q i
 and t-bound1: 0 < t
 and t-bound2: t < max (te \ p \ (i+1)) (te \ q \ (i+1))
 and t-bound3: max (te \ p \ i) (te \ q \ i) \leq t
  and tpq-bound: max (te p i) (te q i) < max (te p (i+1)) (te q (i+1))
 and corr-p: correct p t
  and corr-q: correct q t
shows |VC p t - VC q t| \le \delta
\langle proof \rangle
Theorem 4.2 in Shankar's paper.
theorem four-two:
 assumes ie1: \beta \leq rmin
```

```
and ie2: \mu \leq \delta S
and ie3: \gamma 1 \ \delta S \leq \delta S
and ie4: \gamma 2 \ \delta S \leq \delta
and ie5: \gamma 3 \ \delta S \leq \delta
shows okClocks \ p \ q \ i
\langle proof \rangle
```

The main theorem: all correct clocks are synchronized within the bound delta.

```
theorem agreement: assumes ie1: \beta \leq rmin and ie2: \mu \leq \delta S and ie3: \gamma 1 \delta S \leq \delta S and ie4: \gamma 2 \delta S \leq \delta and ie5: \gamma 3 \delta S \leq \delta and ie6: 0 \leq t and cpq: correct\ p\ t \wedge correct\ q\ t shows |VC\ p\ t - VC\ q\ t| \leq \delta \langle proof \rangle
```

end

References

- [1] L. Lamport and P. M. Melliar-Smith. Synchronizing clocks in the presence of faults. *J. ACM*, 32(1):52–78, 1985.
- [2] J. Lundelius and N. Lynch. A new fault-tolerant algorithm for clock synchronization. In *Proceedings of PODC '84*, pages 75–88, New York, NY, USA, 1984. ACM Press.
- [3] F. B. Schneider. Understanding protocols for byzantine clock synchronization. Technical Report 87-859, Department of Computer Science, Cornell University, August 1987.
- [4] N. Shankar. Mechanical verification of a generalized protocol for byzantine fault tolerant clock synchronization. In J. Vytopil, editor, *Formal Techniques in Real-Time and Fault-Tolerant Systems*, volume 571 of *LNCS*. Springer Verlag, Jan. 1992.