Language Tools for Distributed Computing (II)

J-Orchestra: Automatic Java Application Partitioning

> Yannis Smaragdakis University of Oregon

Ο

These Lectures



- NRMI: middleware offering a natural programming model for distributed computing
 - solves a long standing, well known open problem!
- <u>J-Orchestra: execute unsuspecting programs</u> over a network, using program rewriting
 - Ied to key enhancements of a major open source software project (JBoss)
- Morphing: a high-level language facility for safe program transformation

• "bringing discipline to meta pogramming"

Partitioning: Start with a Centralized Application





Automatic Program Partitioning

- How can we do this with tools instead of manually?
 - write a centralized program
 - select elements (at some granularity) and assign them to network locations
 - let an automatic tool (compiler) transform the program so that it runs over a network, using a general purpose run-time system
 - correctness and efficiency concerns addressed by compiler—though not always possible

J-Orchestra

- For the past 5 years, J-Orchestra has been one of my major research projects
 - an automatic partitioning system for Java
 - works as a bytecode compiler
 - think of result as "applets on steroids"
 - "code near resource"





J-Orchestra

- For the past 5 years, J-Orchestra has been one of my major research projects
 - an automatic partitioning system for Java
 - works as a bytecode compiler
 - think of result as "applets on steroids"
 - "code near resource"



J-Orchestra Executive Summary



- Partitioned program is *equivalent* to the original centralized program for a very large subset of Java.
 - we handle synchronization, all OO language features, object construction, ...
 - nice analysis and compilation technique for dealing with native code
 - result: most scalable automatic partitioning system in existence
 - have partitioned many unsuspecting applications
 - including 8MB third prty bytecode only (JBits)

Example Partitioning









Example Partitioning



Yannis Smaragdakis

UOregon



Example Partitioning

| | | | | - | - · | |
|--|---|--|--------------|--|--|---------|
| State View Core | View Power | Jew Routin | g Density Vi | ew | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | 1919 | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Jumber of wires us | sed for CLB(0,11 | | Slice | | s | lice 0 |
| Jumber of wires us | sed for CLB(0,1) | ************************************** | Slice : | | s | Lice 0 |
| Number of wires us Number of wires us | sed for CLB(0,11 sed for CLB(4,11 sed for CLB(2,5) | #0 (15, | slice : | | 51-0020 | ilice 0 |
| Aumber of wires us Jumber of wires us Jumber of wires us | sed for CLB(0,1) sed for CLB(4,1) sed for CLB(2,5) sed for CLB(2,5) sed for CLB(0,2) | #0 (15, G1 - 0 G2 - 1 G3 - 0 | | | 51-0130 62-0130 63-0130 | Lice 0 |
| Aumber of wires us Aumber of wires us Aumber of wires us Aumber of wires us | sed for CLB(0,1) sed for CLB(4,1) sed for CLB(4,2) sed for CLB(0,2) sed for CLB(0,2) | *0 (15, G1 © G2 = 0 G3 = 0 G3 = 0 G4 = 0 | | | 61 - 01 = 0 62 - 03 = 0 63 - 03 = 0 64 - 0 = 1 | ilice 0 |
| Aumber of wires us Aumber of wires us Aumber of wires us Aumber of wires us Aumber of wires us | sed for CLB(0,11 sed for CLB(4,11 sed for CLB(2,5) sed for CLB(0,1) sed for CLB(0,1) sed for CLB(0,1) | *0 (15, C1 - 0 C3 - 0 C4 - 0 C3 - 0 C | | Porte Ab | S 01-035 02-035 03-035 04-035 BY | ilice 0 |
| Aumber of wires us Aumber of wires us | sed for CLB(0,11 sed for CLB(4,11 sed for CLB(4,25) sed for CLB(0,2) sed for CLB(0,21) sed for CLB(0,21) sed for CLB(1,21) sed for CLB(1,21) | *** (15, C1 - 0 C2 - 0 C3 - 0 C4 - 1 BY - 0 BY - 0 | | | 61 - 013 (62 - 013 (63 - 013 (64 - 013 (84 - 013 (| |
| Aumber of wires us Aumber of wires us | and for CLB(0,11 sed for CLB(0,21 sed for CLB(2,5) sed for CLB(2,5) sed for CLB(0,2) sed for CLB(0,3) sed for CLB(1,3) sed for CLB(1,3) sed for CLB(0,3) | #0 (15, G1 - 0 G2 - 10 G4 - 1 BY - 0 F1 - 0 F2 - 0 | | | S 61 - 00 - 0 62 - 00 - 0 63 - 00 - 0 64 - 00 - 0 FY FY P1 - 05 - 00 FY P1 - 05 - 00 FY FY FY FY FY FY FY FY FY FY | |
| Aumber of wires us Number of wires us | sed for CLB(0,1) sed for CLB(4,1) sed for CLB(2,5) sed for CLB(0,2) sed for CLB(0,1) sed for CLB(1,3) sed for CLB(1,3) sed for CLB(15, sed for CLB(15,1) sed for CLB(15,1) | *0 (15, G1 - © G3 - © G4 - © F1 - © F2 - © F2 - © F2 - © | | L Dute YB XB XB XB XB XB | S G1 0 1 0 G2 0 1 0 G3 0 1 0 G4 0 1 0 F1 0 F1 0 1 0 F1 0 | Alice 0 |
| Number of wires us Number of wires us | sed for CLB(0,11 sed for CLB(4,11 sed for CLB(4,25) sed for CLB(0,2) sed for CLB(0,3) sed for CLB(1,3) sed for CLB(1,5) sed for CLB(15,5) sed for CLB(15,5) | 40 (15, C1 0 C2 0 C3 0 C4 0 F2 0 F2 0 F2 0 F2 0 F2 0 F2 0 F2 0 F2 | | | 61 - 0 5 5 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 | |

Benefit: 3.4MB + 1.8MB + 3.5MB transfers eliminated for view updates!



Network

Yannis Smaragdakis

UOregon

Benefit: 1.28MB vs, 1.68MB per simulation step!

11

J-Orchestra Techniques Summary



- Program generation and program transformation at the bytecode level
 - "virtualizing" execution through bytecode transformation
 - creating a "virtual" virtual machine
 - existing classes get transformed into RMI remote objects
 - client code is redirected through proxies
 - for each class, about 8 different proxy types (for mobility, access to native code, etc.) may need to be generated
 - user input is at class level, but how objects are passed around determines where code executes

J-Orchestra Program Transformation Techniques





The Problem Technically

- Emulate a shared memory abstraction for unsuspecting applications without changing the runtime system.
 - Complicating assumption: a pointer-based language.
 - Resembles DSM but different in objectives.
 - DSM distribution for parallelism.
 - Auto Partitioning functional distribution.

The Approach: User Level Indirection



- We cannot change the VM to change the notion of "pointer"/"reference"
- Can we do it by careful rewriting of the entire program?
 - any reference, method call, etc. is through a proxy
 - where an original program reference would be to an object of type A, the same reference will now be to a proxy for As
 - For example:
 - "new A()" creates proxy for A instead of instance of original class A
 - a.field becomes a.getField() or a.putField()

User Indirection (Proxy) Approach



- All clients (aliases) should view the same object regardless of location
- Change all references from direct to indirect



The Proxy Approach

- Changing all references from direct to indirect
 ensures correct behavior in the presence of aliases
- A remote object can have several proxies on different network sites



UOregon





The Proxy Approach

• Proxies hide the location of the actual object: objects can move at will to exploit locality





J-Orchestra Sample Transformations

For each original class A

class A becomes a proxy

Remote class A__remote

Local class A_local

Interface A___iface

class A__static_delegator

Interface A__static_iface



Generated Code

For each original class A:

class A { java.io.File _file;

public void foo(A p) { _file.read(); p._file.read(); A___interface is generated:

interface A__iface extends java.rmi.Remote

public void foo(A p)
throws Remote Exception;

public proxy.io.File get_file()
throws RemoteException;

Yannis Smaragdakis UOregon

Generated Code

For each original class A:

```
class A {
   java.io.File _file;
```

```
public void foo(A p) {
    __file.read();
    p.__file.read();
```

proxy is generated:

```
class A {
    A__iface _ref;
```

public void foo(A p) {
 _ref.foo(p);

}

Generated Code

For each original class A:

```
class A {
   java.io.File _file;
```

public void foo(A p) { _file.read(); p._file.read(); class A is binary-modified:

```
class A__remote
extends UnicastRemoteObject
implements A__iface
```

proxy.java.io.File _file;

```
public void foo(A p) {
    __file.read();
    p.get_file().read();
}
```

public proxy.java.io.File
get_file() { return _file; }

Complexities

Overheads, Grouping Objects, System Code





- Micro benchmark
- A function of average work per method call
- 1 billion calls total

Optimizing Proxy Indirection













How is This Implemented?

- Two kinds of references: direct and indirect
- Direct: for code statically guaranteed to refer to the object itself
 - i.e., object on the same site
- Indirect: maybe we are calling a method on the object, maybe on a proxy



System Code



- The same idea applies to dealing with system classes
 - system classes are split in groups
 - we assume that groups are consistent with what native code does (more later)
 - code accesses objects in the same group directly
 - other objects accessed indirectly

Wrapping / Unwrapping



- For this approach to work, we need to inject code in many places to convert direct references to indirect and vice-versa
 - dynamic "wrapping/unwrapping"
 - code injected at compile time, wrapping/unwrapping takes place at run time

Example: Pass a Reference to System Code

 What if a system object is passed from user code to system code?



Wrapping/Unwrapping at the Proxy

- The easy case: callee can tell wrapping is needed
 - applies to system code



Wrapping/Unwrapping at Call Site

- The harder case: sometimes we need to wrap/unwrap at call site
 - either to keep proxy simple, or because we'd end up with overloaded methods only differing in return type
 - a problem since our proxies are generated in source, although the rest of the transforms are in bytecode
 - need to reconstruct call stack, inject code

Example: "this"

```
//original code
class A { void foo (B b) { b.baz (this); } }
class B { void baz (A a) {...} }
//generated remote object for A
class A__remote {
   void foo (B b) { b.baz (this); } //"this" is of type A__remote!
}
```

```
//rewritten bytecode for foo
aload_0 //pass "this" to locateProxy method
invokestatic Runtime.locateProxy
checkcast "A" //locateProxy returns Object, need a cast to "A"
astore_2 //store the located proxy object for future use
aload_1 //load b
aload_2 //load proxy (of type A)
invokevirtual B.baz
```

"How Do You Handle...?"

Native code, Synchronization

Ο

Handling Java Language Features



- Many language features need explicit handling, but most complexities are just engineering
 - static methods and fields
 - inheritance hierarchies
 - remote object creation
 - inner classes
 - System.in, System.out, System.exit, System.properties
- Some require more thought
 - native code
 - synchronization

Native Code

- Recall how we split system classes into groups
- These groups have to respect native code behavior
- But we don't know what native code does!
- The problem: we may let a proxy escape into native code, and the native code will try to access it directly
 - e.g., read fields from the original object



Heuristic Type-Based Analysis: Group Based on Types

- class C extends S {
 F f;
 public native R meth (A a);
 }
- Conservative, but still not safe
 - nothing can be!
 - type information can be disguised at the native code interface level
 - i.e., native code can do type casts

How Safe?

- Studied native code in JDK 1.4.2 for Solaris
- Two analyses:
 - 13 applications, dynamic analysis of execution
 - code inspection of native code for Object, IsInstanceOf
- Overall, fairly safe—few violations
 - PlainSocketImp.socketGetOption casts Object to InetAddress
 - GlyphVector assumed to be StandardGlyphVector, Composite assumed to be AlphaComposite
 - native code respects types more than library code!
 - JNI IsInstanceOf : 69 occurrences Java instanceof : 5900 occurrences
- In practice, J-Orchestra works without (much) intervention



Synchronization



- We only handle monitor-style synchronization: synchronized blocks and methods, wait/notify/notifyAll
 - not volatile variables, concurrent data structures, atomic operations, etc.
- Two problems:
 - thread identity is not maintained over the network
 - synchronization operations (synchronized, wait, notify, etc.) do not get propagated by RMI







Synchronization Operations Don't Get Propagated Over the Network

- obj a remote object, implementing interface *RI* and remotely accessible through it
- *RI ri* points to a local RMI "stub" object
- ri.foo(); //will be invoked on obj on a remote machine
- The stub serves as an intermediary, propagating method calls to the *obj* object
- Only synchronized methods are propagated correctly
- Synchronized blocks might not work correctly



Synchronization Operations Don't Get Propagated Over the Network

- Monitor operations: Object.wait,
 Object.notify, Object.notifyAll don't work correctly
- They are declared *final* in class *Object* and cannot be overridden in subclasses
- Calling any of them on an RMI stub does not get propagated over the network

J-Orchestra Synchronization

- Maintain per-site "thread id equivalence classes"
- Replace all the standard synchronization constructs (monitorenter, Object.wait, Object.notify) with the corresponding calls to a per-site synchronization library





Maintaining Thread Id Equivalence Classes *Efficiently*



- Updating thread equivalence classes only when the execution of a program crosses the network boundary
- This happens only after it enters a method in an RMI stub
- Use bytecode instrumentation on standard RMI stubs
- Equivalence classes' representation is very compact (encoded into a *long int*). Imposes virtually no overhead on remote calls

A Specialized Application

"Appletizing"



- Execute on the client.
- Transfer all code to client.
- Provide "sandbox" secure execution environment.



- Execute on the server.
- Thin GUI through Web Forms.



- A hybrid between Applets and Servlets.
- Rich GUI client; full access to server resources.
- Safe and secure execution model.
- Ease of development and deployment.

Sanitizing GUI Code



- Some code inside GUI classes is rejected by the Applet Security Manager.
- E.g., *System.exit*, read/write graphical files from the local hard drive, closing a frame.
- Two approaches to replacing unsafe code:
 - 1. With different code.
 - 2. With semantically similar (identical) code.

Sanitizing: Reading Image From File

//Creates an ImageIcon from
//the specified file
//will cause a security exception when
//a file on disk is accessed

javax.swing.ImageIcon icon =
 new javax.swing.ImageIcon ("AnIconFile.gif");

Sanitizing: Reading Image From File

//Sanitize by replacing with the
//following safe code

javax.swing.ImageIcon icon =
 new jorch.rt.ImageIcon("AnIconFile.gif");

//will safely read the image from
//the applets's jar file

Sanitizing: JFrame.setDefaultCloseOperation

- Method setDefaultCloseOperation in system class javax.swing.JFrame.
- Applet Security Manager prevents it from taking EXIT_ON_CLOSE parameter.

invokevirtual

JFrame.setDefaultCloseOperation



Sanitizing: JFrame.setDefaultCloseOperation

- **pop** //pop value on top of the stack
- push 0 //param 0 is DO_NOTHING_ON_CLOSE

invokevirtual

JFrame.setDefaultCloseOperation

Wrap up



J-Orchestra Impact

- Although the J-Orchestra work is well-cited, its greatest impact was unconventional
 - in late 2002, we gave a demo to Marc Fleury, head of the JBoss Group
 - JBoss: probably the world's most popular J2EE
 Application Server—millions of downloads (open source)
 - Application Server: OS for server sde computing
 - handles persistence, communication, authentication, ...
 - imagine a web store, bank, auction site, etc.
 - great excitement about using bytecode engineering to generate and transform code, to turn Java classes into EJBs
 - J2EE middleware has strict conventions (e.g., "each session bean needs to implement local and remote interfaces, such that...")



Program Transformation and Generation in JBoss

- JBoss engineers had little expertise
 - my M.Sc. student Austin Chau did the first implementation
 - we fixed the bytecode generation platform (Javassist)
 - JBoss contributors then took over
- Radical innovation in version 4: can use plain Java objects as Enterprise Java Beans
 - a general mechanism: "Aspect-Oriented Programming in JBoss"
 - JBoss can now produce automatically much of the tedious J2EE code
 - given plain Java code (together with user annotations)
 - annotation mechanism in Java 5 largely motivated by program generation tasks for J2EE code

Publications

- Main paper: ECOOP'02
- Synchronization: Middleware '04
- Appletizing: ICSM'05
- Dealing with native code: ECOOP'02 + GPCE'06

