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Abstract—Function as a Service (FaaS) paradigm is getting widespread and is envisioned to be the next generation of cloud computing systems that mitigates the burden for programmers and cloud solution architects. However, FaaS does not explicitly deal with the data, and developers have to intervene and undergo the burden of managing the application data, often, via separate cloud services (e.g., AWS RDS). We overcome this problem of FaaS by borrowing the notion of object from the object-oriented programming into the serverless systems. We propose a new paradigm on top of the function abstraction, known as Object as a Service (OaaS), that offers encapsulation and abstraction benefits. The OaaS incorporates the application data into the object abstraction and relieves the developers from dealing with separate cloud services for the data management. It also unlocks opportunities for built-in optimization features, such as software reusability, data locality, and caching. Moreover, OaaS enables dataflow programming such that the developers define a workflow of functions transparently without getting involved into the synchronization and parallelism aspects. We implemented a prototype of the OaaS platform that is low-overhead and scalable. We evaluated it under real-world settings in terms of the ease-of-use, imposed overhead, and scalability. The results demonstrate that OaaS streamlines cloud programming and offers scalability with a minor overhead to the underlying cloud system.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. FaaS and Its Problems

Function-as-a-Service (FaaS) paradigm is getting widespread and is envisioned to be the next generation of cloud computing systems [22] that mitigates the burden for programmers and cloud solution architects. Major public cloud providers offer FaaS services and several open-source platforms for on-premise FaaS deployments are emerging too. FaaS offers the function abstraction that allows users to develop their business logic and invoke it with a predefined trigger. In the back-end, the serverless platform hides the complexity of resource management details and deploys the function in a seamless and scalable manner. In particular, the platform enables FaaS to be truly pay-as-you-go via scale-to-zero and charging the user only upon a function invocation. FaaS is proven to reduce the development and operation costs, thus, is in alignment with modern software development paradigms, such as CICD and DevOps [7].

As the FaaS paradigm is primarily centered around the notion of stateless functions, it naturally does not deal with the data. Thus, the developers have to intervene and undergo the burden of managing the application data using separate cloud services (e.g., AWS DynamoDB [6] or AWS S3 [5]). That is, although FaaS makes the resource management details (e.g., load balancing and scaling) transparent from the developer’s perspective, it does not do so for the data. Even though stateless functions make the system scalable and manageable, the state still exists in the external data store and the developer must intervene to connect the running service to the data store. For instance, in a video streaming application, in addition to developing the functions, the developer has to maintain the video files, their metadata, and manage the access to them.

Apart from the data aspect, current FaaS systems do not offer any built-in semantic to limit the access to the internal (a.k.a. private) mechanics of the functions. However, providing unrestricted access to the developer team has known side-effects, such as function invocation in an unintended context, and data corruption via direct data manipulation. To overcome such side-effects, developers again need to intervene and undergo the burden of configuring external services (e.g., AWS IAM [2] and API gateway [1]) to enable access control.

B. Our Motivation and Proposed Solution

To overcome these inherent problems of FaaS, we propose a new paradigm on top of the function abstraction that not only mitigates the burden of resource management, but also mitigates the burden of data management from the developer’s perspective. We borrow the notion of “object” from the object-oriented programming, and develop a new abstraction level in serverless computing, known as Object as a Service (OaaS).

Incorporating the application data into the object abstraction unlocks opportunities for built-in optimization features, such as data locality, data reliability, caching, software reusability, and data access control. Similar to OOP, objects in OaaS offer encapsulation and abstraction benefits on top of the function abstraction. Moreover, objects in OaaS enable developers to transparently define workflows of functions (a.k.a. dataflow programming [35]) in the cloud.

Our motivation in this study is a cloud-based video streaming system [14] that needs developers to rapidly implement new streaming services for the available video contents. A few examples of such services are as follows: Generating multilingual subtitles for the safety-related videos; Removing harmful and illicit contents from the child-safe video contents; Developing a face detection service on the videos. In these examples, the services have to deal with the video files, and
developing them using FaaS entails the developers manage the data by their own. In this context, the OaaS paradigm can mitigate the developer’s job by offering the built-in encapsulation semantic. The video files are defined as objects that persist their state and are bound to a set of functions that can be invoked by the viewer’s application and potentially change the object (video) state. For instance, the request to generate Chinese subtitles for a given video object invokes the `subtitle(chinese)` function of that particular object.

![Diagram of FaaS and OaaS](image)

**Fig. 1:** A bird-eye view of a FaaS-based and OaaS-based systems. In FaaS, the developer has to implement both the application logic and the state management and deploy them in form of function(s) that interact with the developer-provisioned cloud storage service. In contrast, in OaaS, the developer only has to implement the application logic and deploy it as an object with built-in state management service.

As we can see in Figure 1, unlike FaaS, OaaS segregates the state management from the developer’s source code and incorporates it into the serverless platform to make it transparent from the developer’s perspective. In this case, the object’s function only includes the business logic and upon invocation, the OaaS platform executes the function that is authorized to persist the object state (via internal API calls). In addition to enabling encapsulation of the function and state to form the object abstraction, the OaaS platform offers templates (analogous to the notion of class in OOP) to developers that can simplify defining properties and functions of the object(s). We note that the object abstraction is not a replacement for FaaS, instead, it is a complement for it. There are use cases that are naturally stateless (e.g., mathematical functions) and the function is the appropriate abstraction to develop them.

**C. Challenges and Contributions**

Although the OaaS paradigm is advantageous, it is not free of charge. First and foremost, developing the OaaS platform on top of FaaS entails unavoidable overheads. In fact, the challenge is how to design the OaaS platform such that the overhead is minimal and tractable? The second challenge is the scalability of the object access. Specifically, concurrent accesses to an object can lead to the race condition on the object state that has to be controlled to avoid the state inconsistency. Synchronization mechanisms to order the invocations can protect the state, however, they cause a bottleneck and unscalability of the OaaS platform.

In our initial experiments, we realized that the overhead challenge of the OaaS platform is mainly due to the latency of accessing the object state. To reduce the overhead, we develop a data tiering mechanism within the OaaS platform that diminishes the latency of accessing the object. The tiering mechanism makes use of a key-value database to store the object specifications (a.k.a. metadata) that are accessed frequently, in addition to an in-memory caching to accelerate accessing the infrequently-updated but frequently-accessed metadata (e.g., class and function specifications). OaaS also reduces unnecessary data movements within the platform via employing a redirection mechanism, instead of relaying (transferring) the object state.

To address the second challenge and keep the object scalability in check, we design the OaaS based on the microservices architecture and with the minimum contention between the self-contained services. OaaS also minimizes the object state synchronization by implementing the immutable data processing model. That is, upon invoking a function of an object the OaaS platform outputs a new/updated object state, instead of updating the existing one. Implementing this semantic makes the function perform a stateless operation and keep the state consistent without synchronization, thereby, appearing stateful at the high level.

In sum, this research proposes the OaaS paradigm that extends FaaS to offer the object abstraction to the cloud developers. The OaaS platform provides stateful objects with the minimal overhead, while maintaining the serverless characteristics. The key contributions of this research are as follows:

1) Developing the OaaS paradigm that hides the complexity of both state data and cloud resource management from the user’s perspective.
2) Implementing a working prototype of the OaaS platform.
3) Devising mechanisms based on data tiering and caching to minimize the imposed overhead of the OaaS platform.
4) Devising mechanisms to exploit object immutability in favor of the object scalability in OaaS.
5) Evaluating and analyzing the scalability and overhead of the OaaS platform.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews state of the art in the serverless paradigm. Section III discusses the conceptual design and the architecture of OaaS. Next, Section IV presents the performance evaluation of OaaS by considering the overhead, scalability, and development efficiency. Finally, we conclude this paper in Section V.

**II. BACKGROUND AND PRIOR STUDIES**

**A. Background**

The FaaS paradigm allows the developer to implement the application as a set of independent functions that are transparently provisioned in isolation on the cloud infrastructure. FaaS is offered by the public cloud providers (e.g., AWS Lambda [3], Azure Function [32], Google Function [11]). FaaS can...

1The source code and example use cases are available in our Github page and will be made available upon the paper acceptance.
be also self-hosted via open-source platforms (e.g., OpenFaaS [16] and OpenWhisk [18]). FaaS invokes the function upon receiving the event that matches its predefined trigger(s).

Functions can be pipelined and form a workflow. A function in the workflow generates an event that triggers another function. However, for larger workflows, configuring and managing the chain of events become complex and adds a burden to the developer. Function orchestrator services, e.g., AWS Step Function [4] and Azure Durable Function [10], are to mitigate this burden for the developers.

A variant of FaaS, called Container as a Service (CaaS) [24], does not offer the function development framework, and the user has to provide the platform with the already containerized functions. Kubernetes [12] is a widely used infrastructure management platform that automates container provisioning (via a configuration language, called YAML) and manages the life cycle of containerized services. Knative [20] complements Kubernetes by adding serverless features (particularly, scale to zero). It is composed of two main components, namely Knative Serving and Knative Eventing. The former enables auto-scaling, scale to zero, and minimizes the configuration of the containerized services. The latter enables pipelining and routing events, thereby, mitigating the burden of developing event-driven containers. In fact, the synergy of Kubernetes and Knative offers FaaS features at the container level.

B. Prior Works

A few notable research studies have been undertaken to address the shortages of FaaS systems [8], [30], [31], [37], [40]. Similar to OaaS, that provides a way to deal with the object state, Cloudburst [36] proposes a new serverless design to offer stateful functions using a shared distributed key-value database to keep track of the state. In addition, Durable Functions, provided by the Azure Cloud, supports stateful functions, known as Entity Function [9]. In contrast to these works, OaaS provides the notion of object that is beyond only stateful functions. It also establishes abstraction and encapsulation into the serverless paradigm. Moreover, OaaS implements the immutable data processing model to avoid state inconsistency without the synchronization, whereas, Azure Entity Functions use locking mechanisms to synchronize the state data.

eiger [15] is a runtime system that implements an indirect approach to manage the function state. It considers the state as an input argument, and the modified state as the function output. In this way, the function is still stateless, however, it exhibits the features of a stateful function. Although OaaS manages the state in a similar manner, it only includes the state metadata as the function input argument, not the entire state data. Similar to OaaS, Pheromone [38] enhances the serverless workflows by implementing the flow of data (i.e., dataflow), rather than the invocation dependency. While Pheromone focuses on the flow control and optimizing complex workflows, OaaS implements the dataflow to make the function invocation more transparent, hence, the function can be invoked without any concern of concurrency and synchronization.

Incorporating the state management into the serverless implies the overhead of state management through storage. OaaS implements the dataflow to make the function invocation transparent, hence, the function can be invoked without any concern of concurrency and synchronization.

III. OBJECT AS A SERVICE (OAA) PARADIGM

A. Design Goals

OaaS aims at providing a high-level abstraction for developers to rapidly implement a new service without getting involved in low-level details. To this end, we have to accomplish the following two objectives:

First, developing the concept of object in OaaS that can provide abstraction and encapsulation across data and functions in the cloud. Moreover, developing the notion of class is desired to provide a framework for defining a group of objects with the same characteristics. For instance, consider a video stream provider who is developing a streaming application for disabled viewers [14]. Using the notion of class, he/she can define the accessible_videos class and assign all the accessibility functions to it (e.g., subtitle_generator() for deaf viewers; scene_descriptor() for blind viewers; and increase_contrast() for color-blind users). Without the notion of class in place, the developer has to assign functions to each individual video file, which is tedious and error-prone, whereas using the class, he/she declares the class once, and defines several video files as the object instances of that class. In this manner, the notion of class provides a “type” for a set of objects that are otherwise untyped. Furthermore, the notion of class enables the developer to assign an access modifier to each function, thereby, realizing encapsulation and control the access to functions in different contexts.

Second, OaaS needs to provide transparency in the application data (object state) management, and in defining a workflow of functions. Fulfilling this objective realizes the notion of Dataflow Programming [35] that allows developer to define a workflow without getting involved in the concurrency and synchronization complexities. To allow the developer accessing an object in the workflow without the knowledge of its status (i.e., whether or not the object is instantiated in the workflow), the OaaS platform exposes the object access interface (a.k.a. OAI) that enables the developer to invoke a function, request the object state, or both in a single request. For instance, while the first user is invoking the increase_contrast() function for video1 and the new object (video2) is being created in the output, the second user can invoke the scene_descriptor() function on video2 and the OaaS platform handles the ordering of the invocations transparently.

B. Conceptual Modeling of OaaS

In OaaS, an object is defined as an immutable entity with a state (i.e., data) associated with one or more functions. The state is, in fact, the application data that can be a file or a group of files on the cloud. Each function corresponds to a
task upon invocation that can take action on the state. Note that, the function can have one or more objects as its input, however, it cannot modify them. Each object is instantiated from a class and is bound to the set of functions and state(s) declared in that class.

To enable higher-level abstractions for the users or developers, the OaaS platform allows combining (nesting) multiple objects into one. The high-level object holds a reference to the lower-level object(s), and the invoked function can leverage the reference to fetch the lower-level object as the input. Moreover, it is possible that the high-level object implements a new function (called macro function) and invoke a chain of functions from the lower-level objects. This resembles to configuring a workflow in the conventional FaaS systems. The major difference of macro functions with other works (e.g., AWS Step Function [4]) is that, macro functions introduce the flow of execution via the flow of data (state), rather than the invocation order. Given this data-flow semantic and immutable nature of the objects, the execution flow in a macro function is determined by the flow of data and the developers only need to introduce the flow. Then, in the background, OaaS takes care of the concurrency and synchronization, and guarantees the state consistency, regardless of the execution order.

As shown in Figure 2, OaaS supports two user scenarios: (A) The service provider (developer) who declares the class and its functions and develops objects for its application. (B) The end-user who accesses the objects (e.g., via an application or a web front-end) and calls their functions via the object access interface. Declaring a new class and its functions in OaaS is achieved using the YAML (or JSON) format. Listing 1 represents a declaration example for a class called `test1` that has a state named `str` (Line 6) and a function named `concat` (Line 11). The state storage type is `s3`, which is the object storage of the state file. The class has a public function called `concat`. The specifications of the function are declared in Lines 10—16. The type of a function (Line 12) can be a task (or a macro as it is explained later). Because the objects in OaaS are immutable, Line 13 specifies that the output of the function is another object instance of type `test1`. Lines 14—16 specifies the deployment configuration of the function, and Line 16 specifically declares the function container image URI. Declaring the function input(s) makes this example long. Therefore, we just show the curtailed class declaration and the complete form will be available in the Artifact Description (AD) Appendix of the paper and in our Github project.

Listing 1: An example script that declares a class, named `test1`, and a function for it, named `concat`, in the YAML format.

```yaml
classes:
  - name: test1
    stateSpec:
      provider: s3
      keySpecs:
        - name: str
          functions:
            - access: PUBLIC
              function: concat
    functions:
      - name: concat
        type: TASK
        outputClass: test1
        provision:
          knative:
            image: concat:latest
            ...
```

C. OaaS Architecture

The OaaS platform is designed based on multiple self-contained microservices communicating over the network in a serverless cloud system. Figure 2 provides a bird-eye view to the OaaS architecture, and Figure 4 shows more details of the architecture by focusing on the interactions across the OaaS modules. At high-level, OaaS is composed of the following four modules:

1) **Object Control Module** provides the interface for the objects to be managed (i.e., instantiated and updated) and used
by the developer or the user. Upon invoking a function of an object, the module translates it to one (or more) task(s) in the system, and submits it (them) to the Function Execution Module. It also oversees the task(s) completion in the system. This module is elaborated in Section III-E.

2) Function Execution Module works with the serverless engine (e.g., Knative) to execute the task, and report the result back to the Object Control Module. It also deploys a developer-provided container in form of a function in the serverless system. This modules is described in Section III-F.

3) Data Management Module handles the state of objects and makes them available to the other modules of OaaS. Details of this module can be found in Section III-G.

4) Data Serving Module acts as the end-user’s interface and forwards his/her requests to the other modules. Details of this module are elaborated in Section III-H.

D. Object Data Modeling in OaaS

OaaS has to deal with four types of persisted data for an object that it handles. Accessing such data frequently, if not handled properly, can cause a major slowdown of the platform. As such, the purpose of this data modeling is to design a scheme that can efficiently organize these different types of object data in OaaS, such that the system slowdown is minimized. The four types of data that have to be maintained for an object are shown in the top part of Figure 3, and are described as follows:

(i) **Object State**, which is essentially the actual data the object represents.

(ii) **Object Specification (Metadata)** defines characteristics of the object, including the object state URL, execution state, and class name (which is linked to the class specification data).

(iii) **Class Specification** is the developer-provided information that serves as a template to introduce the attributes (state) and the functions for the objects of a specific class.

(iv) **Function Specification** is the developer-provided information describing the function signature (i.e., the type of inputs and output) and its deployment configuration (e.g., the function container URL that is accessible to OaaS).

As the Class and Function Specifications are common across objects, thus, are accessed more often than the object state that is the largest type of data in OaaS, and is only accessed upon the user demand or a function call to the associated object. Accordingly, we employ the object storage (e.g., S3 [5]), which offers a low space-per-cost ratio, to persist the object state data. For other type of object data that are accessed more often and are smaller in size, we configure a key-value database (e.g., Infinispan [27]) for persistence, which is faster and more efficient for frequent accesses.

We know that the Class and Function Specifications are frequently-accessed and infrequently-updated. Besides, they are short in size and are common across multiple objects. These features make these types of data suitable for in-memory caching. Therefore, as depicted in Figure 3, we configure every components of OaaS that deals with the Class and Function Specification data to locally cache these data via an in-memory hash table that mirrors the key-value database.

E. Object Control Module

1) **Object Controller**: Object Controller is a key component of the OaaS platform that offers the object and class abstractions to the developer. It specifies and manages the characteristics of the classes, objects, and functions within OaaS. It exposes REST APIs that enable the developer to register and deploy the containerized functions within OaaS. The function registration involves validating the function specifications and persist them into a shared key-value database (called *Specs Database* in Figure 2) to allow other OaaS components access them. Function deployment is the process of introducing the function container to the Knative orchestrator. Upon validating the specification of a new function, it is forwarded into a queue (known as *Function Provisioning* in Figure 2 and implemented via Kafka Topic [23]) to be deployed on Kubernetes in a later step (as elaborated in Section III-F). The reason for handling function deployment asynchronously and transferring the function specification via the message queue is to guarantee that the specification is handled by the next component in the system and it is not affected by possible transient failures of the underlying system.

Object Controller is also responsible for creating objects in cooperation with the Storage Adapter component. To create a new object, the developer has to submit the object specifications to the Object Controller and it calls the Storage Adapter to allocate a URL where the object state (e.g., video file) can be uploaded by the developer.

2) **Task Manager**: Task Manager is the central component of the Object Control Module that is primarily responsible for handling the function execution requests. It translates the function invocations into one (or more) task(s) and submit it (them) to the Function Execution Module where the Knative Broker routes the task(s) to the corresponding function container.

The function call that is initially requested by the user is high-level and only includes basic information, such as the object ID, function name, and inputs. Task Manager receives the request and augments it with other information that are necessary to execute the desired function, including the URL of input object state, and the URL where the output object state shall be stored.

Enabling macro functions and dataflow abstraction involves dealing with the concurrency and ordering of the functions' execution that is handled by the Task Manager. Upon receiving a macro function invocation, the Task Manager component...
generates the invocation graph as its internal state and uses it to coordinate ordering of the functions. For that purpose, upon receiving the task completion event (from the Task Completion Handler), the Task Manager readily generates the next task based on the invocation graph. In the case of a task failure, the Task Manager propagates the failure status to the dependent tasks in the invocation graph.

Task Manager exposes the object access interface (OAI) to enable end-users transparently access the object’s state and functions. OAI operates based on the web services and provides two modes of object access:

(i) Synchronous mode that is suitable for instantaneous function call use cases, and retrieving the object state. In this mode, the Task Manager holds the HTTP connection with the user application until the output object state is ready. For instance, let video1 be the identifier of a video object, transcoded one of its functions, and video2 be the output object. Then, a synchronous function call to the object is made in the form of: 

```
video1:transcode(var=1024)/video2.
```

(ii) Asynchronous mode that is suitable for long (non-interactive) function execution use cases (e.g., macro function invocations). In this case, the Task Manager does not hold the HTTP connection, instead, responds immediately with the specifications of the prospective output object. The user application can use the specifications to check the object completion status at a later time. For instance, an asynchronous function call to the object of previous example is in the form of: 

```
video1:transcode(var=1024).
```

To reduce the latency of accessing output object state, the Task Manager avoids unnecessary data movements. To that end, it leverages the HTTP redirect mechanism [29] to make the URL of the output object state, provided by the storage adapter, available to the Content Delivery Service. In that case, the output object state bypasses the Task Manager, and the Content Delivery Service can fetch the state in one hop and make it available to the user application.

With all these responsibilities of the Task Manager, it can potentially become the bottleneck of OaaS. To avoid that, we design the Task Manager to be scalable by making it stateless, hence, its container can be easily scaled out to multiple instances. The problem in making the Task Manager stateless is the “internal state” that it has to maintain to support macro functions. To handle this problem, we configure the Task Manager to persist its internal state in the Specs Database.

F. Function Execution Module

1) Handling Task Execution: For a given function call on an object, the Object Control Module is in charge of converting it to task that is composed of a pointer to the object state and a function call. The Function Execution Module receives the created task, and takes care of its execution and successful completion. Schematic view of the steps taken to handle a function call is listed in Figure 4b.

The Function Execution Module utilizes Knative Broker, a component of Knative Eventing, to consumes the “task event” generated by the Task Manager in the Cloud Events format [19], and route the received task to the associated function container. In the next step, Knative Serving is utilized to enable auto-scaling (and scale-to-zero) on the function container. It is noteworthy that the OaaS platform is modular and Knative can be replaced by other serverless engines without any major change to the other modules.

The Task Completion Handler component is in charge of tracking the function execution and forwarding the completion event to the Task Manager. We note that each function container includes an HTTP server to be able to handle the messages in the Cloud Events format. After executing a task, the HTTP server issues a 2xx status code, otherwise the task is deemed failed.

2) Deploying Functions: Recall that, in addition to handling tasks, the Function Execution Module is in charge of deploying developer-defined functions. The key component of OaaS that is responsible for this is the Kube Provisioner. As it is expressed in Figure 4a, Kube Provisioner receives a function deployment request (that includes function specifications) from the Function Provision component via subscribing to Kafka Topic [23]. Upon receiving the request, Kube Provisioner translates the requested function specifications into the Kubernetes configuration format and forwards it to the Kubernetes API Server where the function container image is fetched from the registry (e.g., Docker Hub) and is deployed with the help of Knative Controller. This process makes the new function ready to be called (routed to) by the Knative Broker.

G. Data Management Module

The Storage Adapter is primarily responsible for efficient and secure access to the object state. As shown in Figure 2, it also communicates with the Specs Database to retrieve the class specifications it requires to verify authorized accesses to the object state.

Other components of OaaS that need to access the state of an object have to do it through the Storage Adapter. We originally designed the Storage Adapter to work with S3-compatible object storage system (e.g., Ceph [26] and MinIO [25]), however, the adapter can be extended to support other storage types too (e.g., in-memory databases). To improve the efficiency of retrieving the object state data, Storage Adapter is designed to avoid unnecessary data movements. That is, instead of relaying state data to the requester component—because S3 protocol is HTTP-based—the Storage Adapter can employ the HTTP redirect mechanism and only send the URL of the state data to the requester. For that purpose, the Storage Adapter digitally sign the URL of the state data with a secret key to generate the authorized URL, and then puts it as the location field in the HTTP header. As such, the S3-preserved URL only grants access to the state data addressed by the URL. In this manner, the Storage Adapter preserves the object state security via preventing unauthorized access of a function to another object’s state through learning its URL. Moreover, this mechanism decouples the object state storage from the function logic, such that in implementing a function, the developer does not need to know the storage details, such as the storage type, location, organization, and authentication.
I. Details of the Interactions Between OaaS Components

To elaborate on the OaaS platform operations, in this part, we provide the flow of interactions between the OaaS components. We consider two main scenarios supported by the OaaS platform: (a) developing a class and deploying its function(s); and (b) invoking a function of an object by the end-user. For each scenario, Figure 4 shows the involved components and the interaction steps.

1) Function Deployment Scenario: As shown in Figure 4a, this scenario is initiated by the developer who writes a YAML script to submit the specifications of a new function to OaaS. The Object Controller validates the specification and rejects it if it is invalid. Then, in Step 4, the Object Controller persists it into the Specs Database and, in Step 5, publishes a new specification into a message queue, called Function Provisioning, which is implemented via Kafka Topics.

Kube Provisioner subscribes to the Function provisioning and upon receiving a new message from it, it generates the Knative resource definitions based on the new function specification, and submits it to the Kubernetes API Server. The Knative Controller subscribes to the Kubernetes API Server to synchronize its resources: the service container, broker, and trigger.

2) Function Invocation Scenario: The function invocation occurs via the object access interface. As we can see in Figure 4b, this scenario begins by the end-user invoking the function of an object and ends by receiving the output object state data. The Content Delivery Service handles the invocation by holding the connection and forwarding it to the Task Manager (Step 2). Subsequently, the Task Manager validates the request, loads the related context (e.g., object, class, and function specification), generates the function execution task, and in Step 4 submits it to the Knative Broker. In Step 5, the Broker routes the task to the requested Function container with the help of Knative Serving. In Step 7, the Function component solicits the object state from the Storage Adapter via the URL included in the task request. Then, in Step 8, the Storage Adapter redirects the request to the actual object state in the State Storage. Once the Function container receives the object state (Step 9), it executes the function, produces the output object state, and persists it using HTTP PUT on the State Storage (Step 10) through the presigned URL generated by the Storage Adapter. In Step 11, the Function informs the Task Completion Handler about the task completion status. Next, in Step 12, the Task Completion Handler forms a completion redirection to the output object state location. Ultimately, in
Step 14, the Content Delivery service leverages the redirect location to retrieve the output object state from the State Storage and replies to the user (Step 15).

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A. Experimental Setup

We deploy the OaaS platform on a cluster of VMs allocated on our local servers that include Dell PowerEdge R380 and R840 machines with 10 Gbps fiber interconnect, collectively 160 processing cores, 760 GB memory, and 8 TB RAID storage. The cluster configured for the experiments includes three VMs with 16 vCPUs and 32 GB memory that have Kubernetes installed. Ceph is used as the data layer for the object storage. Infinispan is a distributed key-value database that we employed for the Specs Database. The OaaS platform was implemented using Java and the Quarkus framework [28].

As Knative is an increasingly popular platform that supports containerized functions, we use it as the baseline and compare the performance of OaaS against it. For both platforms, we use the same containerized functions. To make the containerized functions of Knative behave the same way as the OaaS functions, we create events (that mimics task events in OaaS) and feed them directly to Knative containers. In both cases, we use Gatling [13] for load generation. We implemented two use cases to serve as the workload. Firstly, we developed a video transcoding using FFmpeg [39] that is CPU-intensive and aligns with the motivation of this paper; Secondly, we develop a string concatenation function which is lightweight and only concatenates the content of a text file (i.e., the state) with another input string. The other characteristics of the workloads are specific to each experiment and are explained in the respective sections.

B. Measuring the Imposed Overhead of OaaS

Although OaaS provides a high-level abstraction for the developers, it is not free of charge and imposes an overhead to the underlying system. As such, in this experiment, we focus on measuring its imposed overhead. Considering Knative as the baseline, we consider the extra latency of a function call in OaaS as the metric to measure overhead. We particularly study two sources of the overhead in OaaS: (a) The object state size, which highlights the overhead of OaaS in dealing with the stored data; and (b) The concurrency of the function invocation, which focuses on the overhead imposed by the OaaS platform itself.

We examine two objects: The first object has a one-second-long video file (as its state) and a transcoding operation, which exhibits a compute-intensive behavior, as its function. The second object has a text file (1.8 KB) as its state, and a function that concatenates the state contents with its input string (8 Bytes) argument. In this case, the processing time is only a fraction of the data loading time, hence, we consider it exhibiting a data-intensive behavior. We note that, in both cases, the functions persist their result as a new object state.

To measure the overhead of state data size, we conduct the experiment on both video and string objects with various state data sizes that are shown in Figure 5. To generate objects with various data sizes, we increase the input video length from 1—30 seconds. To assure that the examined videos have the same data size per video length ratio, the longer videos are generated from repeating the same content of the 1-second video. The resolution of the 1-second video is 1920×1080 and its size is 105 KB. Similarly, the text files for string concatenation have 10—1000 KB. For each object, we invoke the associated function and measure its completion time. On each worker VM, we configure two function containers (i.e., in total, 6 worker containers). To concentrate only on the overhead of data access and avoid other types of overheads, we configure Gatling to assign only one task per worker and set it to repeat this operation 30 times (hence, in total, 180 tasks are examined). To analyze the improvements offered by the URL redirection and data tiering, we examine three versions of OaaS: the full version; without data tiering; and without both URL redirection and data tiering (shown as OaaS with no optimization in Figure 5). In this figure, the horizontal axes of both subfigures represent different state sizes for video and text, respectively, and the vertical axes represent the average task execution time (latency) in second.

The general trend in Figure 5 is that, in all cases, the average task execution time increases for larger object states. We observe that OaaS constantly imposes a slightly higher overhead (on average 0.03 seconds) than Knative. The low overhead is because of using the HTTP redirection and, to some extent, data tiering mechanisms to procure the object state to the function containers. The difference in the overhead of OaaS is more clearly visible in the text concatenation (Figure 5b), but it is more disordered for video transcoding (Figure 5a). This is because of the higher execution time and randomness of compute-intensive tasks that dominate the OaaS overhead time. The figures express that the URL redirection is more influential for the larger state sizes, whereas, the data tiering impact is abstract from the state size. In particular, we see that URL redirection and data tiering mechanisms collectively mitigate the overhead of OaaS on average by 73% for the video transcoding tasks and 43% for the concatenation tasks.

To measure the impact of concurrent function invocations on the imposed overhead of OaaS, we examine the two basic
objects considered in the previous experiment too. To conduct this experiment, as shown in the horizontal axis of Figure 6, we increase the degree of concurrent tasks (function calls) on the same object, and measure the overhead in form of the average time it takes to complete a task (vertical axis). We observe that increasing the concurrency of invoking video transcoding function (Figure 6a) does not raise the overhead by more than 0.2 seconds (for 60 concurrent calls), which is practically insignificant. In contrast, the difference is more noticeable for the string concatenation function (Figure 6b) that grows by up to 27% when the degree of concurrency is 160. In analyzing the reason for the growth, we noticed that the CPU is not fully utilized, hence, this is not causing the slow down. To see if the bottleneck is because of the OaaS architecture, we conducted another experiment with the “no-op” function and observed a higher throughput than the concatenation function. This indicates that the the OaaS architecture has the capability of handling more concurrent tasks, hence, it is not the root cause for the bottleneck. By digging more, we realized that the performance difference between Knative and OaaS is because we submit the function calls directly to Knative Serving, whereas, in OaaS, the invocations pass through the Broker (see Figure 2) that internally uses Kafka messaging system and persists messages into the storage, hence, slows down the system due to using more IOPS. The reason that we do not observe this overhead for video transcoding is its compute-intensive behavior that causes the processing time dominates the overhead. These results collectively show that although the OaaS platform comes with an overhead, the overhead becomes insignificant for more compute-intensive functions.

C. Scalability of the OaaS Platform

To study the scalability of OaaS, we deploy and evaluate it on the worker clusters with different sizes via scaling up the number of vCPUs on each one of the three worker VMs—from 4 to 32 vCPUs. That is, the total number of deployed cores ranges from 12 to 96 vCPUs. In each case, we deploy the two object functions: transcoding a video object and concatenating to a string object with the same settings as the previous experiment. We consider the speedup as the metric to measure the impact of scale-up. We assume that the scale-up degree of 4 vCPUs as the base that has the speedup value one, and the speedup of other scale-up degrees are calculated with respect to this base speedup value. Specifically, for each function in each scale-up degree, we find the maximum throughput (i.e., the number of tasks that are complete within one minute). Then, the speedup value of that scale-up degree is calculated relative to the throughput of the scale-up degree of 4 vCPUs.

In this experiment, shown in Figure 7, we observe that up to the 16 vCPUs per VM, the OaaS platform offers almost the same speedup as Knative. The reason is that the OaaS components are implemented multi-threaded with the non-blocking I/O that scales well in the multiple VM cores. The Figure also shows a speedup drop and a plateau for the scale-up to 32 vCPUs. Although part of this behavior is attributed to the Amdahl’s law, we realized that our servers cannot host 32 vCPUs in one CPU socket, therefore, the overhead of memory access is increased 33. Another reason is that the performance variation increases on larger VMs that perturbs the efficacy of the load balancing method embedded in Knative. The reason that the speedup of string concatenation is less affected by this problem is that this function exhibits more data-intensive behavior, hence, it hits the IOPS bottleneck, instead of the processing bottleneck. The conclusion is that the OaaS scalability is comparable to Knative and the only limiting factors for both platforms are the physical machine limitations, and the task behavior.

D. Case Study: Development Efficiency Using OaaS

In this part, we provide a real-world use case of object development using the OaaS paradigm that demonstrates how it makes the development process of cloud-native serverless applications easier and faster. We discuss the details of implementing this use case via both FaaS and OaaS paradigms and demonstrate the advantages of OaaS over FaaS.

The use case is a video processing application that employs a machine learning model to perform face detection on the video contents. The detailed workflow of functions needed for this purpose, depicted in Figure 8, includes a function
Fig. 8: Use case of developing a face detection workflow for a video.

(Function1) to split the input video into multiple video segments, that are processed concurrently on multiple instances of Function2 whose job is to extract the frames of each video segment. Then, Function3 is in charge of performing the face detection on the requested video frames and generating an object in the JSON format. These functions have to persist their output object on the storage so that the next function in the workflow can consume it.

To implement this use case in FaaS, the developer must implement the following steps: (i) Configuring a cloud-based object storage and maintaining the credential access token for the functions to use. (ii) The functions’ business logic has to be implemented and configured to react to the trigger events. (iii) Data management within the functions that itself involves three steps: (a) allocating the storage addresses to fetch or upload data; (b) authenticating access to the object storage via the access token; and (c) implementing the fetch and upload operations on the allocated addresses.

Upon completing the implementation of the three functions, the developer has to connect them as a workflow via utilizing the function orchestrator service (e.g., AWS Step Functions). Finally, the dashboard service invokes the workflow upon receiving a request from the end-user and collects the results.

On the other hand, implementing this use case in the OaaS paradigm involves defining three classes, namely Video, Image, and JSON_records in form of three classes with the following details: (a) Video class with video_splitting() and frame_extracting() functions; It also has a macro function, called wf_face_detect(detect_interval), that includes the whole workflow of function calls, with the requested face detection period as its input, and a JSON_record object, as the output. (b) Image class with the face_detection() function. (c) JSON_record class that does not require any function. In fact, the Dashboard Service invokes the wf_face_detect(detect_interval) macro function directly using the object access interface, and receives the JSON_record object as the output. We note that in developing the class functions, the developer does not need to involve in the data locating and authentication steps. In fact, the OaaS platform injects the presigned URL of the state data into the event message of the task (Step 4 in Figure 4b) to enable the functions to fetch and upload the state data.

As we can see, the OaaS paradigm aggregates the state storage and the function workflow in the platform and enables cloud-native dataflow programming. As such, the developers are relieved from the burden of learning the internal mechanics of multiple functions and pipelining them. Moreover, the OaaS paradigm removes the storage management logic from the developer code and relieves him/her from the state data management details, hence, the developer can only focus on the algorithm and the business logic.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this research, we presented the OaaS paradigm that incorporates the state management into cloud functions and offers the cloud object abstraction. We developed a working prototype of the OaaS platform that relieves the developer from the burden of state management, hence, improving the cloud-native applications development efficiency. To make the OaaS platform scalable, we make the object state immutable (i.e., creating a new object instead of updating it). This approach also preserves the object state consistency without requiring any synchronization mechanism that limits the scalability. Moreover, the immutable object abstraction enables cloud-based dataflow programming where a workflow of functions can be transparently defined without concurrency and synchronization concerns. We evaluated the OaaS platform in terms of ease-of-use, imposed overhead, and scalability. The evaluation results demonstrate that OaaS streamlines cloud programming and is ideal for the use cases that require persisting the state or defining a workflow of operations. OaaS offers scalability with a negligible overhead, particularly, for the compute-intensive tasks.

There are several avenues to improve the OaaS platform: (i) Existing serverless platforms allow us to prototype the OaaS platform quickly. However, it curbs the potentials of the OaaS platform by preventing low-level customization. As such, one avenue of the future work is to develop an object-based serverless platform from scratch to allow optimizations such as data locality through scheduling the sequence of tasks on the same machine. (ii) OaaS currently forces an object to have a persistent state which limits the performance in the use cases that do not need persistence, e.g., for intermediate data in a workflow. Supporting ephemeral objects is another future avenue that can reduce the storage access and improve the efficiency.
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