

Review of aspect oriented approaches and their use in RE-TRUST for mobile module implementation Vasily Desnitsky and Igor Kotenko

> **Computer Security Research Group**, St. Petersburg Institute for Informatics and Automation of Russian Academy of Sciences



Goal



- Replacement mechanism objectives
 - Interpenetrate module to the program
 - Hiding module to prevent from its extraction by an adversary

Introduction to AOP (1)

- Crosscutting concern
 - Scattered and tangled code of some behavior feature can't be expressed in generalized function presentation
- Separation of concerns
- Aspect-oriented programming
- Aspect
- AOP Frameworks
- Visual means



Main AOP notions

- Aspect
- Advice
 - before, after, instead
- Joinpoint
- Pointcut
- Aspect weaving
- Inter-type declaration

Pointcut definition

- Joinpoint types
 - Metod calls
 - Loop's beginning
 - Field access and assignments
 - Exception handlers including exception catch and throw
- Pointcut specification means
 - Name-based way
 - Direct definition of joinpoints by full class name, specific parameter types, modifiers, ect.
 - Wildcard matching / regular expressions
 - Attribute / annotation based way



- 1. Dynamic aspect loading into application
- 2. Representation of code of monitor and tag generator in the form of aspect collection

Kinds of AOP Approaches

- Three types of AOP Frameworks are different by the aspect weaving mechanism
 - Compile-time AOP
 - Load-time AOP
 - Runtime AOP



Load-time approach (1)

- Advice code is loaded as classes, libraries, assemblies, etc. during runtime
- Each new module's version is a new class collection
- Pointcuts are specified **no later than** application load
- Two possible strategies
 - Total 'hook' (joinpoint stubs) weaving it leads to the 'empty hook problem'
 - Minimal (Actual) hook weaving

Load-time approach (2)

- Drawbacks of load-time approach
 - Inalterability of joinpoint location
 - Aspects are located in the memory as single units which can be tampered with by a malicious user
 - Old module version classes unload problem

Runtime AOP approaches (1)

- Aspect weaving and unweaving at runtime without having to stop application
- To specify pointcuts at runtime

Runtime AOP approaches (2)

- An approach using **Debugger** Interface
- Joinpoints implementation by debug events and breakpoints
- Externally advice execution to the application
- Drawbacks:
 - Need to suspend and resume executing application
 - Necessity to run application in *debug mode*
 - It's easy to detach Debugger by a malicious user

Runtime AOP approaches (3)

- JIT (Just-in-time) approach
- The alterations take place when the JIT compiler compiles the byte-code into a native code
- To apply the Minimal Hook Strategy for a native code
- Advantage
 - Aspects are tightly integrated with the application

Representation of the code of monitor and tag generator in the form of aspect collection

- What program entities could we verify?
 - Methods
 - Objects
- Possible techniques
 - To check method's input parameters and return value using before/after advices
 - To check method's body by means of access/assignation/modification advices to the objects
 - Inter-type-declaration

AOP Frameworks

Opportunities

- Load-time approach + Total Hook Weaving strategy
 - .NET: JAsCO.NET
 - Java: JAsCO, JAC
 - C++: DAO C++
 - meta-object data (about classes and methods of application)
 - aspect matching expression
- Runtime JIT approach
 - Java: Prose

Conclusion (1)

 The aim is to construct a criteria which allow to determine if given AOP Framework can be used to implement Re-Trust replacement mechanism

Conclusion (2)

- List of requirements
 - Runtime pointcut specification
 - Runtime advice code weaving/unweaving
 - Aspects should be executed within the main application process
 - Aspects should be hidden in the application
 - AOP engine should be embedded into runtime environment
 - Atomic weaving