ECE 473/573 Cloud Computing and Cloud Native Systems Lecture 24 Batch and Stream Processing II

Professor Jia Wang Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering Illinois Institute of Technology

November 13, 2024

1/19 ECE 473/573 – Cloud Computing and Cloud Native Systems, Dept. of ECE, IIT

[RDD Implementation Details](#page-3-0)

[Cryptography](#page-8-0)

- ▶ This lecture: Resilient Distributed Datasets: A Fault-Tolerant Abstraction for In-Memory Cluster Computing [http://people.csail.mit.edu/matei/papers/2012/](http://people.csail.mit.edu/matei/papers/2012/nsdi_spark.pdf) [nsdi_spark.pdf](http://people.csail.mit.edu/matei/papers/2012/nsdi_spark.pdf)
- ▶ This and next lecture: Cloud Security

[RDD Implementation Details](#page-3-0)

[Cryptography](#page-8-0)

RDD Representation

▶ Each RDD consists of

- ▶ Partitions as atomic piece of dataset.
- ▶ Dependencies to parent RDDs.
- ▶ A function to compute it from parent RDDs.
- Metadata of partitioning scheme and data placement.
- ▶ Dependencies define communication needs.
	- ▶ Narrow dependency: each partition of the parent RDD is used by at most one partition of the child RDD, e.g. map and filter.
	- ▶ Wide dependency: multiple child partitions may depend on a single partition of the parent RDD, e.g. join and groupByKey.
	- ▶ Narrow dependencies allow for pipelined execution on a single node, elimating communication and simplifying fault recovery.
	- ▶ Wide dependencies require communications like MapReduce, and need complete re-execution for lost partitions.

Job Scheduling

- ▶ Since transformations are lazy, scheduling is trigger by actions.
- ▶ The scheduler will build a plan to compute the RDDs.
	- ▶ From RDD's lineage graph, as a directed acyclic graph (DAG) where vertices are partitions and edges are transformations.
	- ▶ The DAG is optimized by grouping vertices into stages, where within each stage transformations are merged, and no intermediate partitions are stored or communicated.
- \blacktriangleright The scheduler then decides what partitions are available and schedules tasks to compute missing partitions.
	- ▶ Follow the order of DAG to only schedule a task when all its input partitions become available.
	- ▶ Consider locality of data either in-memory or on-disk.
- ▶ Rerun failed task, persist RDDs to local drives if they require expensive communications to compute.

Memory Management

▶ RDD persistence options

- ▶ In-memory storage as deserialized Java objects: fastest performance but large overhead in memory usage.
- ▶ In-memory storage as serialized data: efficient memory usage.
- ▶ On-disk storage: slowest, for RDDs too large to fit into memory, or too costly to recompute, usually due to expensive communication requirements from wide dependencies.

▶ Apply LRU policy to evict RDDs to make memory available.

Checkpointing

- ▶ While one can always recompute RDDs given their lineages, it is not efficient to do so for long lineage chains.
	- \triangleright Specifically for wide dependencies within that require expensive communications.
- ▶ Checkpointing: store RDDs as output from wide dependencies on long lineage chains into stable storage.
	- ▶ Replicated as needed so no need to recompute if nodes fail.
	- ▶ RDDs are read-only so they can be written out in the background without impacting computation.
- ▶ Should checkpointing be specified by users or automatically decided?

Outline

[RDD Implementation Details](#page-3-0)

[Cryptography](#page-8-0)

CIA: Basic Components of (Computer Cyber) Security

- ▶ A king need to send messages to a general fighting in a war.
- ▶ Confidentiality
	- ▶ Only the king and the general can read the messages.
- **Integrity**
	- \triangleright The general should only accept messages sent by the king.
- ▶ Availability
	- ▶ Some of the messages must be able to reach the general.

▶ Nonrepudiation: sender can not deny creation of message.

- \triangleright Can the general provide a proof to a third party that the command is from the King?
- \blacktriangleright But who is the King?
- ▶ Authentication: who are you?
	- \blacktriangleright A.k.a. entity/user authentication, or identification
	- ▶ Within the context of computer cyber security, shall be built on top of a nonrepudiation service (but usually is not!).
- \triangleright Access control/authorization: decide who can do what.

Symmetric Cryptography

Fig. 1.5 Symmetric-key cryptosystem

(Paar and Pelzl)

- \blacktriangleright A mechanism for confidentiality
	- \blacktriangleright plaintext x, ciphertext y, and the key k
	- e(): encryption such that $y = e_k(x)$
	- \blacktriangleright d(): decryption such that $x = d_k(y)$
	- \blacktriangleright "Symmetric": both Alice and Bob know k .

 \triangleright No "security by obscurity": Oscar knows everything except k

Hash Functions

Fig. 11.3 Principal input-output behavior of hash functions

(Paar and Pelzl)

- Input x : messages of arbitrary lengths
- ▶ Output $z = h(x)$: message digest or hash, with fixed size.
- ▶ A strong hash function for use with cryptography prevents to find $x \neq x'$ such that $h(x) = h(x')$.

Authenticated Encryption with Associated Data (AEAD)

- ▶ Symmetric ciphers along cannot guarantee integrity.
- \triangleright With the secret, hash functions can be augmented into message authentication code to validate integrity.
- ▶ Authenticated encryption combines the two to achieve both confidentiality and integrity.
- \triangleright Very tricky to implement them together securely.
	- ▶ Use a well-defined AEAD algorithm like GCM, where software packages and hardware accelerations are widely available.
- ▶ AEAD cannot provide nonrepudiation service.
	- ▶ Neither Alice nor Bob can provide a proof that the message is encrypted by the other because they both know the secret.
- ▶ To establishing a shared secret between two or more parties. ▶ Which could be used later for AEAD.
- ▶ How can we solve this problem without a shared secret to begin with?

Public-Key Cryptography

Fig. 6.4 Basic protocol for public-key encryption

(Paar and Pelzl)

Key pair k: a public k_{pub} and a private (secret) k_{pr} .

 \blacktriangleright No one should be able to derive k_{pr} from k_{pub} .

- Alice only need to obtain Bob's k_{pub} before they could share the secret x
- ▶ Such algorithms exist, e.g. RSA
- ▶ But how could Alice be sure that k_{pub} is from Bob?

Digital Signatures

Fig. 10.1 Principle of digital signatures which involves signing and verifying a message

(Paar and Pelzl)

- ▶ Nonrepudiation: no shared secret
	- \blacktriangleright Bob signs with his private key k_{pr} .
	- \blacktriangleright Alice verifies with Bob's public key k_{pub} .
- ▶ Such algorithms exist, e.g. to run RSA reversely.
- ▶ Still, how could Alice be sure that k_{pub} is from Bob?

17/19 ECE 473/573 – Cloud Computing and Cloud Native Systems, Dept. of ECE, IIT

Public Key Infrastructure (PKI)

 \triangleright A service to connect public keys to physical identities.

- ▶ People, hosts, services, etc.
- ▶ Certificate Authority (CA): a trusted third-party.
	- \blacktriangleright Make use of public-key cryptography: $k_{pub,CA}$ and $k_{pr,CA}$.
	- \blacktriangleright For digital signatures only.
- \blacktriangleright Everyone knows $k_{pub,CA}$ to verify digital signatures from CA.
	- \blacktriangleright But how?
- \blacktriangleright How Bob proves to Alice $k_{pub,B}$ is from Bob?
	- ▶ Bob sends $k_{pub,B}$ to CA and ask CA to sign $(k_{pub,B}, ID_B)$.
	- ▶ CA returns Bob his certificate:
		- $Cert_B = ((k_{pub,B}, ID_B), sig_{k_{pr,CA}}(k_{pub,B}, ID_B)).$
	- \triangleright Bob presents Alice Cert_B that Alice can verify with $k_{pub,CA}$.
- ▶ Authentication: in other words, Bob proves to Alice that he is Bob, with the help from CA.
- ▶ RDDs improve performance of distributed algorithms by making better use of local memory and CPUs to save on expensive disk and network I/Os.
- ▶ Public-key infrastructures combine symmetric cryptography and public-key cryptography to establish secure communication over insecure networks and to provide authentication.