

Intel[®] Technology Journal

Managed Runtime Technologies

**The Open Runtime Platform: A Flexible
High-Performance
Managed Runtime Environment**

The Open Runtime Platform: A Flexible High-Performance Managed Runtime Environment

Michal Cierniak, Microprocessor Research Labs, Intel Corporation
Marsha Eng, Microprocessor Research Labs, Intel Corporation
Neal Glew, Microprocessor Research Labs, Intel Corporation
Brian Lewis, Microprocessor Research Labs, Intel Corporation
James Stichnoth, Microprocessor Research Labs, Intel Corporation

Index words: MRTE, Java, CLI, virtual machine, interface design

ABSTRACT

The Open Runtime Platform (ORP) is a high-performance managed runtime environment (MRTE) that features exact generational garbage collection, fast thread synchronization, and multiple coexisting just-in-time compilers (JITs). ORP was designed for flexibility in order to support experiments in dynamic compilation, garbage collection, synchronization, and other technologies. It can be built to run either Java* or Common Language Infrastructure (CLI) applications, to run under the Windows or Linux operating systems, and to run on the IA-32 or Itanium® processor family (IPF) architectures.

Achieving high performance in an MRTE presents many challenges, particularly when flexibility is a major goal. First, to enable the use of different garbage collectors and JITs, each component must be isolated from the rest of the environment through a well-defined software interface. Without careful attention, this isolation could easily harm performance. Second, MRTEs have correctness and safety requirements that traditional languages, such as C++, lack. These requirements, including null pointer checks, array bounds checks, and type checks, impose additional runtime overhead. Finally, the dynamic nature of MRTEs makes some traditional compiler optimizations, such as devirtualization of method calls, more difficult to implement or more limited in applicability. To get full performance, JITs and the core virtual machine (VM)

must cooperate to reduce or eliminate (where possible) these MRTE-specific overheads.

In this paper, we describe the structure of ORP in detail, paying particular attention to how it supports flexibility while preserving high performance. We describe the interfaces between the garbage collector, the JIT, and the core VM; how these interfaces enable multiple garbage collectors and JITs without sacrificing performance; and how they allow the JIT and the core VM to reduce or eliminate MRTE-specific performance issues.

INTRODUCTION

Modern languages such as Java* and C# execute in a managed runtime environment (MRTE) that provides automatic memory management, type management, threads and synchronization, and dynamic loading facilities. These environments differ in a number of ways from traditional languages like C, C++, and Fortran, and thus provide a challenge both for language implementers and for the developers of high-performance microprocessors. This paper concentrates on language implementation challenges by describing a particular MRTE implementation developed at Intel Labs. Other articles in this issue of the *Intel Technology Journal* discuss the implications of MRTEs for microprocessors.

Intel Labs' Microprocessor Research Lab (MRL) has developed an MRTE implementation called Open Runtime Platform (ORP). ORP was designed to support experimentation with different technologies in just-in-time compilers (JITs), garbage collection (GC), multithreading, and synchronization. Over the past five years, researchers have used ORP to conduct a number of MRTE implementation experiments [15-17, 19-21, 23, 25]. At least three different garbage collectors and eight different

* Other brands and names are the property of their respective owners.

® Itanium is a registered trademark of Intel Corporation or its subsidiaries in the United States and other countries.

JITs have been developed and integrated with ORP. The version of ORP described in this paper is an internal research tool and is not publicly available.

Three characteristics of MRTEs provide the key challenges to their implementation. First, MRTEs dynamically load and execute code that is delivered in a portable format. This means that code must be converted into native instructions through interpretation or compilation. As a result, MRTE implementations typically include at least one JIT (and often several), and often an interpreter as well. In addition to the challenges of just-in-time compilation, dynamic loading adversely affects important object-oriented optimizations like devirtualization, which reduces the overhead of virtual method calls. Second, MRTEs provide automatic memory management and thus require a garbage collector. Since different applications may impose very different requirements on the garbage collector (e.g., raw throughput versus GC pause time constraints), garbage collector design becomes a significant challenge. Third, MRTEs are multi-threaded, providing facilities for the creation and management of threads, and facilities such as locks and monitors for synchronizing thread execution. The design of efficient locking schemes, given the modern memory hierarchies and bus protocols of microprocessors, is a significant challenge. In addition, the garbage collector must be designed for multiple threads and may very well need to be parallel itself.




Figure 1: Block diagram of ORP

In order to provide the flexibility needed for JIT and garbage collector experiments, we designed interfaces to cleanly separate the JIT and garbage collector parts of ORP from each other and from the core virtual machine (VM). These interfaces are represented as ovals in Figure 1. Evaluating these experiments requires performance studies, which can be meaningful only if the interfaces impose insignificant overhead. As a result, one of the key contributions of ORP is the design of clean

interfaces for JITs and garbage collectors that does not sacrifice performance. The MRTE implementation challenges described above may require cooperation between different components to achieve a good result. For example, devirtualization optimizations may require cooperation between JITs that do the optimization and the core VM that manages the class hierarchy. We had to balance the need for clean interfaces to support flexibility with the need for cooperation to overcome performance hurdles.

In the next section we elaborate on the nature of MRTEs and the challenges they provide to implementers. Then we describe ORP in detail, paying close attention to the design of interfaces that are clean and also lead to high performance.

MANAGED RUNTIME ENVIRONMENTS

In 1995, the Java programming language and the Java Virtual Machine (JVM^{*}) [22] emerged as the first mainstream managed runtime environment (MRTE). In 2000, Java^{*} was joined by Common Language Infrastructure (CLI) [10], and associated languages like C# [9], as the second major MRTE in the market. Both MRTEs have significant differences over C++ compilers and runtimes; yet they are similar to each other in most important ways. In this section, we describe the terminology and key features that distinguish MRTEs from traditional C++ systems, in particular those that may require new optimization techniques to gain full performance.

Key Features

MRTEs dynamically load and execute code. The code and other related data are loaded from *class files*, which can be read from disk, read from a network stream, or synthesized in memory by a running application. Each class file describes a single class, including its superclass, superinterfaces, fields, and methods. Concrete methods include *bytecodes* that specify what to do when that method is invoked. These bytecodes are machine independent, and are at a slightly higher level of abstraction than native instructions. As a result, MRTEs require some means to convert bytecodes into native instructions: an interpreter or a JIT. Because the MRTE controls how bytecodes are converted into native instructions, it may place additional requirements on this conversion that help it to perform functions such as garbage collection and exception throwing, which are discussed below. Because MRTEs tend to produce more

* Other brands and names are the property of their respective owners.

information about compiled bytecodes than just the native instructions, this code is referred to as *managed code*; implementations of native methods and the MRTE itself are called *unmanaged code*.

MRTEs manage type information, that is, they store information about all the classes, fields, and methods that they have loaded, and also about other types that they define or derive automatically, such as primitive and array types. MRTEs provide reflection facilities that allow application code to enumerate and inspect all this information about types, fields, and methods.

MRTEs provide automatic memory management. There is a region of memory belonging to the MRTE called the *heap*. When bytecodes request the instantiation of a class or the creation of an array, space for the new object is allocated in the heap. If the heap is full, the MRTE tries to reclaim the space of objects no longer in use, a process known as *garbage collection* (GC). The part of the MRTE that manages the heap, allocates objects, and performs GC is known as the *garbage collector*.

GC consists of three phases. In the first phase, the garbage collector must find all direct references to objects from the currently executing program; these references are called *roots*, or the *root set*, and the process of finding them all is called *root-set enumeration*. Within one stack frame of managed code, each native instruction may potentially have a different set of roots on the stack and in physical registers; for this purpose, a JIT usually maintains a *GC map* to provide the mapping between individual instructions and roots. In the second phase of GC, the garbage collector finds all objects reachable from the root set, as these might be used in the future; this is called *marking* or *scanning*. In the final phase, the garbage collector reclaims the space of objects not found in the first two phases.

Generational garbage collectors attempt to improve GC efficiency by only scanning a portion of the heap during a collection. Doing so requires additional support from the rest of the MRTE, particularly the JITs: a *write barrier* must be called whenever a reference type pointer in the heap is modified. The write barrier is part of the garbage collector's code and typically does a fast mark of a garbage collector data structure before completing the object field write.

MRTEs provide *exceptions* to deal with errors and unusual circumstances. Exceptions can be thrown either explicitly via a "throw" bytecode, or implicitly by the MRTE itself as a result of an illegal action such as a null pointer dereference. Each bytecode in a method has an associated list of exception handlers. When an exception is thrown, the JVM must examine each stack frame in turn, until it finds a matching exception handler among the

list of associated exception handlers. This requires *stack unwinding*, the ability to examine stack frames and remove them from the stack one by one. Note that stack unwinding is also needed to implement security policies and during root-set enumeration, as individual stack frames may also contain roots.

Most of the significant differences between CLI and Java are due to additional features in CLI. Because CLI is largely a superset of Java, it is relatively straightforward to add Java support to an MRTE or JIT compiler that already supports CLI. One addition is that CLI has a richer set of types than Java. Key among these is *value types*. Value types resemble C structures and are especially useful for implementing lightweight types such as complex numbers. CLI also supports *managed pointers* that have many uses, including the implementation of call-by-reference parameters. These may point into the runtime stack, static fields, or into the interior of objects on the heap. These pointers are called "managed" because they must be reported to a garbage collector in order to prevent an object from being prematurely collected. Managed pointers require that a garbage collector properly deal with objects that are only referenced by a pointer into their interior; this means the garbage collector needs a mechanism to locate the start of such an object, based on the interior pointer. Other additions in CLI include support for *unsafe code* that may, for example, operate on pointers and the representation of objects. Such code is often required when accessing legacy libraries. In contrast to Java, CLI objects can be set to be *pinned*, guaranteeing that such objects will not be relocated; pinning may be required for some objects when interfacing with legacy code. CLI also supports a platform library invocation service that automates much of the work involved in calling native library routines.

Optimization Challenges

MRTEs (particularly Java systems) gained an early reputation for not performing as well as traditional languages like C or C++. In part, this reputation arose because the first implementations only interpreted the bytecodes. When JITs were introduced as a way to achieve better performance than interpretation, they were thought of as not optimizing code, but rather as quick producers of native code, with quick startup and response times being the driving requirements. Over time, JIT code quality has increased, due to more mature JIT technology, dynamic recompilation techniques, and a relaxation of the fast startup requirement, particularly for longer-running server-type applications.

Despite the general maturation of JIT technology, there still remain some fundamental issues that separate an MRTE JIT from a traditional C++ compiler. One set of

issues is the lack of whole-program analysis in an MRTE. Classes can be dynamically loaded into the system at any time, and new classes may invalidate assumptions made during earlier compilations of methods. When making decisions about devirtualization, inlining, and direct call conversion, JITs must take into account the possibility that a target method may be overridden in the future (even if at compile time, there is only one possible target), and that a target class may be subclassed (even if the class is currently not extended). This generally results in extra overhead for method dispatch or inlining than would typically be present in a C++ system.

Another set of issues is the safety checks required by MRTE semantics. For example, every array access must test whether the array index falls within the bounds of the array. Every type cast must test whether it is a valid cast. Every object dereference must test whether the reference is null. C and C++ lack these runtime requirements. To achieve competitive performance, therefore, JITs must employ additional techniques to minimize the overhead.

Further performance challenges relate to the garbage collector. Some batch-style applications may demand the highest possible throughput, while other interactive applications may require short GC pause times, possibly at the cost of some throughput. Such requirements have a profound impact on the design of the garbage collector. In addition, since the garbage collector is responsible for mapping objects into specific heap locations, it may also need to detect relationships between objects and ensure that related objects are collocated in memory, in order to maximize memory hierarchy locality.

Some of these JIT-related overheads can be reduced through compiler techniques alone. Others require some level of cooperation with the core virtual machine (VM). Throughout this paper, we identify such techniques and how they are implemented in ORP.

OVERVIEW OF THE OPEN RUNTIME PLATFORM

The Open Runtime Platform (ORP) is a high-performance managed runtime environment (MRTE) that features exact generational garbage collection (GC), fast thread synchronization, and multiple just-in-time compilers (JITs), including highly optimizing JITs. All code is compiled by these compilers: there is no interpreter. ORP supports two different MRTE platforms, Java[®] [22] and Common Language Infrastructure (CLI) [10].

Basic Structure

ORP is divided into three components: the core virtual machine (VM), just-in-time compilers (JITs), and the garbage collector. The core VM is responsible for class

loading, including storing information about the classes, fields, and methods loaded. The core VM is also responsible for coordinating the compilation of methods to managed code, root-set enumeration during GC, and exception throwing. In addition, the core VM contains the thread and synchronization subsystem, although we are planning to split this into a separate component in a future version of ORP. JITs are responsible for compiling methods into native instructions. The garbage collector is responsible for managing the heap, allocating objects, and reclaiming garbage when the heap is full.

ORP is written in about 150,000 lines of C++ and a small amount of assembly code (this includes the core VM code, and excludes the JIT and garbage collector code). It compiles under Microsoft Visual C++ 6.0* and GNU g++, and it runs under Windows (NT/2000/XP*), Linux*, and FreeBSD*. ORP supports both IA-32 [7] and Itanium[®] processor family (IPF) [8] CPU architectures. ORP uses the GNU Classpath library [1], an open source implementation of the Java class libraries, and OCL [12], an open source implementation of the CLI libraries that is ECMA-335 [10] compliant.

ORP was originally designed with two JITs for Java. The *Simple Code Generator* (known as the *O1 JIT* [15]) produces code directly from the JVM bytecodes [22] without applying complex optimizations. Its optimizations include strength reduction, load-after-store elimination, and simple versions of common-subexpression elimination (CSE), eliminating array-bounds checks, and register allocation.

The *Optimizing Compiler* (known as the *O3 JIT*) converts JVM bytecodes to an intermediate representation (IR) that can be used for more aggressive optimizations. Besides the optimizations performed by the O1 JIT, O3 applies inlining, global optimizations (e.g., copy propagation, dead-code elimination, loop transformations, and constant folding), as well as more complete implementations of CSE and elimination of array-bounds checks.

* Other brands and names are the property of their respective owners.

[®] Itanium is a registered trademark of Intel Corporation or its subsidiaries in the United States and other countries.




Figure 2: Structure of dynamic compilation

As shown in Figure 2, ORP can run in a mode that uses both the O1 and O3 JITs. In this mode, when a method is invoked for the first time, ORP uses O1 to compile the method in a way that instruments the generated code with counters that are incremented on every method call and on every back edge of a loop. When a counter reaches a predetermined threshold, ORP invokes O3 to recompile the method. The dynamic recompilation approach allows ORP to avoid the cost of expensive optimizations, while applying those optimizations to the methods where the payoff is likely to be high. It also provides the O3 JIT with profiling information that can help guide the optimizations.

ORP also supports a very simple JIT for CLI (currently only on the IA-32 platform), known as the *OO JIT*. It does no optimizations and was designed for simplicity and to ease debugging. For each CLI bytecode instruction, it generates a sequence of machine instructions that is fixed for each set of operand types.

StarJIT [14] is a new JIT designed to plug into ORP. It supports Java and CLI, and it produces aggressively optimized code for IA-32 and IPF. It translates JVM and CLI bytecodes into a single common intermediate representation on which the rest of StarJIT operates. StarJIT includes an SSA-based optimizer and supports profile-based optimizations as well as dynamic optimizations that are based on continuous profiling and monitoring during program execution.

ORP has supported many different GC implementations over its lifetime, including a simple stop-the-world collector, an implementation of the Train Algorithm [18], and a concurrent collector [19]. There is support in the VM and JIT interfaces for moving collectors (in which objects can be relocated over their lifetimes) and for generational collectors (which require write barrier support from JITs and the core VM). ORP also supports dynamic linking of the GC module, making it possible to select a specific GC implementation via a command-line option.

Common Support for Java and CLI

CLI and Java are semantically similar enough that most of ORP's implementation is common to both runtimes. Both Java and CLI require approximately the same support for class loading, exception handling, threads, reflection, runtime, and low-level (non-library specific) native methods. Of course, CLI uses a different object file format than Java, so the object file loaders are different. Similarly, the class libraries for the two runtimes are different and require a different set of native method implementations. CLI's bytecode instructions are different, so there are differences in the JITs. However, these differences are relatively minor, and most of the code in the StarJIT is common. In general, the significant differences between CLI and Java are due to additional features in CLI. This means if an MRTE (or JIT) supports CLI, it is relatively straightforward to add support for Java.

ORP has relatively few Java-specific or CLI-specific source files beyond those that load classes and those that implement the native methods required by the different CLI and Java class libraries. The MRTE-specific source changes are mostly in short sequences of code that are conditionally compiled when ORP is built. We are currently refactoring ORP to share even more code, which will significantly reduce the need for conditionally compiled code sequences. For example, to indicate an attempt to cast an object to a class of which it is not an instance, a Java MRTE must throw an instance of *java.lang.ClassCastException*, whereas a CLI MRTE must throw *System.InvalidCastException*. Refactoring this part of ORP's implementation simply involves raising the exception stored in a variable that is initialized to the appropriate value.

THE CORE VIRTUAL MACHINE

The core virtual machine (VM) is responsible for the overall coordination of the activities of the Open Runtime Platform (ORP). It is responsible for class loading: it stores information about every class, field, and method loaded. The class data structure includes the virtual-method table (vtable) for the class (which is shared by all instances of that class), attributes of the class (public, final, abstract, the element type for an array class, etc.), information about inner classes, references to static initializers, and references to finalizers. The field data structure includes reflection information such as name, type, and containing class, as well as internal ORP information such as the field's offset from the base of the object (for instance fields) or the field's address in memory (for static fields). The method data structure contains similar information.

These data structures are hidden from components outside the core VM, but the core VM exposes their contents through functions in the VM interface. For example, when a just-in-time compiler (JIT) compiles an access to an instance field, it calls the VM interface function for obtaining the field's offset, and it uses the result to generate the appropriate load instruction.

There is one data structure that is shared across all ORP components, including JITs and garbage collectors, which describes the basic layout of objects. Every object in the heap, including arrays, begins with the following two fields:

```
typedef struct Managed_Object {  
    VTable *vt;  
    uint32 obj_info;  
} Managed_Object;
```

No other fields of the `Managed_Object` data structure are exposed outside the core VM. The first field is a pointer to the object's vtable. There is one vtable for each class,¹ and it stores enough class-specific information to perform common operations like virtual-method dispatch. The vtable is also used during GC, where it may supply information such as the size of the object and the offset of each reference stored in the instance. The second field, `obj_info`, is 32 bits wide on both IA-32 and Itanium[®] processor family (IPF) architectures, and it is used in synchronization and garbage collection. This field also stores the instance's default hashcode. Class-specific instance fields immediately follow these two fields.

Garbage collectors and JITs also share knowledge about the representation of array instances. The specific offsets at which the array length and the first element are stored are determined by the core VM and are available to the garbage collector and JITs via the VM interface.

Another small but important piece of shared information is the following. The garbage collector is expressly allowed to use a portion of the vttables to cache frequently used information to avoid runtime overhead. This cached information is private to the garbage collector and is not

¹ Because there is a one-to-one correspondence between a *Class* structure and a vtable, it would be possible to unify them into a single data structure. We chose to separate them to make sure that offsets to entries in the vtable that are used for method dispatch are small, and that instructions generated for virtual method dispatch can be encoded with shorter sequences. Also, the information in vttables is accessed more frequently, so collocating it improves spatial locality and reduces DTLB misses.

[®] Itanium is a registered trademark of Intel Corporation or its subsidiaries in the United States and other countries.

accessed by other ORP components. Apart from the basic assumptions about object layout and this vtable cache, all interaction between major ORP components is achieved through function calls.

The VM interface also includes functions that support managed code, JITs, and the garbage collector. These functions are described as part of the discussion of the specific components, which we turn to next.

THE JUST-IN-TIME COMPILER INTERFACE

Just-in-time (JIT) compilers are responsible for compiling bytecodes into native managed code, and for providing information about stack frames that can be used to do root-set enumeration, exception propagation, and security checks.

Compilation Overview

When the core virtual machine (VM) loads a class, new and overridden methods are not immediately compiled. Instead, the core VM initializes the vtable entry for each of these methods to point to a small custom stub that causes the method to be compiled upon its first invocation. After a JIT compiles the method, the core VM iterates over all vttables containing an entry for that method, and it replaces the pointer to the original stub with a pointer to the newly compiled code.

The Open Runtime Platform (ORP) allows many JITs to coexist within it. Each JIT interacts with the core VM through the JIT interface, which is described in more detail below, and must provide an implementation of the JIT side of this interface. The interface is almost completely CPU independent (the only exception being the data structures used to model the set of physical registers used for stack unwinding and root-set enumeration), and it is used by both our IA-32 JITs and our Itanium[®] processor family (IPF) JITs. JITs can be either linked statically or loaded dynamically from a dynamic library.

As previously mentioned in the ORP overview, managed code may include instrumentation that causes it to be recompiled after a certain number of invocations. Another option is to have a background thread that supports recompiling methods concurrently with the rest of the program execution.

Native methods are also "compiled" in the following sense. When a native method is invoked for the first time, the core VM generates a custom wrapper for that native method, and installs it in the appropriate vttables. The purpose of the wrapper is to resolve the different calling conventions used by managed and native code.

Interface Description

The JIT interface consists of a set of functions that every JIT is required to export and a set of functions that the core VM exports. One obvious function in the JIT interface instructs the JIT to compile a method. The JIT interface also includes some not-so-obvious JIT-exported functions that implement functionality that is traditionally thought of as being part of the core VM. These include functions to unwind a stack frame and to enumerate all roots in a stack frame. Stack unwinding is required for exception handling, garbage collection (GC), and security. To allow exact GC, the JIT interface provides a mechanism to enumerate exactly the roots of a stack frame. Given an instruction address, the JIT consults the GC map for that method and constructs the root set for the frame. This is in contrast to some other JIT interfaces such as the Sun JDK 1.0.2* JIT interface [3] that assumes conservative scanning of the stack. Of course, if a conservative collector were used with ORP, this mechanism for root-set enumeration would never be used.

There are two basic solutions to providing stack unwinding and root-set enumeration from the stack:

1. A white-box approach in which the core VM and all JITs agree on a common format for GC maps. At compile time, JITs create GC maps along with native code, and then the core VM can unwind and enumerate without any further help from the JITs.
2. A black-box approach in which each JIT can store GC maps in an arbitrary format understood only by that JIT. Whenever the core VM unwinds the stack or enumerates roots, it calls back into the appropriate JIT for the frame in question, and the JIT decodes its own GC map and performs the operation.

ORP uses the latter scheme, the black-box approach. The advantage of ORP's approach is simplicity and flexibility in JIT design. For example, the O3 JIT supports GC at every native instruction [25], but the simpler O1 JIT only supports GC at call sites and backward branches. This is all possible through the same JIT interface.

Support for Multiple JITs

To support multiple JITs simultaneously, the core VM maintains an array of pointers to *JIT* objects that represent each JIT. The standard ORP/Java/IA-32 configuration includes two statically linked JITs, O1 and O3. Additional JITs may be specified on the command line by supplying the name of a library containing its implementation.

* Other brands and names are the property of their respective owners.

When a method is invoked for the first time, the custom stub transfers control to the core VM, which tries each JIT in turn until one returns success. If no JIT succeeds, ORP terminates with a fatal error.

Core VM Support for JITs and Managed Code

The VM interface includes functions to allocate memory for code, data, and JIT-specific information. The core VM allocates this memory, rather than JITs, which allows the space to be reclaimed when it is no longer needed (however, ORP does not currently implement unloading or GC of methods). The VM interface also includes functions to query the exception information provided in the application class files and to set the exception information for managed code. The core VM uses this latter information during exception propagation.

The core VM also provides runtime support functions for use by managed code. They provide functionality such as throwing exceptions, subtype checks, complex arithmetic operations, and other nontrivial operations.

Optimizations

As mentioned in the section on MRTes, there are safety requirements and features such as dynamic class loading that can affect the applicability or effectiveness of traditional compiler optimizations. To get performance comparable to unsafe, static languages like C++, JITs must include optimizations that reduce or eliminate safety overheads, and that can work effectively even in the presence of dynamic loading. Some of these optimizations can be implemented entirely in the JITs, but some require cooperation from the core VM. Here we outline some of the key problems and their solutions, along with the additional interface functions that provide the needed cooperation.

Null-check elimination. Java and CLI semantics require null-pointer dereferences to throw an exception. As object dereferences are typically frequent in applications, this safety check might be costly if implemented naively. Compiler analysis can often prove that certain null checks are redundant, and thereby eliminate the checks: many null checks still remain, however.

Some help can be obtained from the core VM. It can instruct the operating system and the hardware to catch null-pointer dereferences and notify the core VM, which can then identify the offending instruction and throw the exception. The IA-32 version of ORP uses this technique, eliminating the need for most null checks by managed code.

The core VM is not always able to assist in this way, though. One frequent example involves devirtualization

of method invocations. A virtual dispatch typically involves dereferencing the object to extract its vtable, which implicitly contains a null reference check. A devirtualized call removes the implicit null check, and thus an explicit check must be added back to the managed code. (If this is not done, then program semantics could be changed if the null-reference exception is never raised, or if it is raised only after some visible side effect that should not have occurred.) In our experience with ORP, the vast majority of these explicit checks can be removed through simple compiler analysis, either by proving that the null check is dominated by a previous explicit or implicit null check, or that an implicit null check happens shortly thereafter, without any intervening side effects.

Array-bounds checking. Java and CLI semantics require out-of-bounds array accesses to throw exceptions. The core VM provides a function that tells JITs, at compilation time, the offset into the array at which the array length is stored, and the JIT is responsible for testing the array index and throwing an exception if necessary. Therefore, managed code does not have to execute a function call to determine the array length.

In a few cases, JITs can prove that all array accesses are within the array bounds. If the array is created within the same scope that it is accessed, it may be possible to symbolically prove that the array index is within bounds. If the application explicitly tests the array index against the bounds (for example, in a loop that explicitly iterates from the lower to the upper bound of the array), then the implicit bounds check can also be eliminated. Unfortunately, such instances of “clean” source code seem to be rare in practice.

In many cases, JITs can eliminate most array bounds checks through “loop cloning.” The JIT generates two versions of the loop, one with bounds checks and one without. Loop prolog code is also created that tests the starting and ending conditions of the loop and determines which version of the loop to execute.

Note that both of these techniques are completely within the capabilities of JITs and require no cooperation from the core VM.

Fast subtype checking. Both Java and CLI support single inheritance and, through interfaces, multiple supertypes. An instance of a subtype can be used where an instance of the supertype is expected. Testing whether an object is an instance of a specific supertype is frequent: many thousands of type tests might be done per second during program execution. These type tests can be the result of explicit tests in application code (for example, Java’s *checkcast* bytecode) as well as implicit checks during array stores (for example, Java’s *aastore* bytecode). These array store checks verify that the types

of objects being stored into arrays are compatible with the element types of the arrays. Although *checkcast*, *instanceof*, and *aastore* take up at most a couple of percent of the execution time for our Java benchmarks, that is enough to justify some inlining into managed code. The core VM provides an interface to allow JITs to perform a faster, inlined type check under some conditions that are common in practice.

Direct-call conversion. In ORP, devirtualized calls are still by default indirect calls. Even though the target method may be precisely known, it may not have been compiled yet, or it may be recompiled in the future. By using an indirect call, the managed code for a method can easily be changed after the method is first compiled, or after it is recompiled.

Unfortunately, indirect calls may require additional instructions (at least on IPF), and may put additional pressure on the branch predictor. Thus it is important to be able to convert them into direct calls. To allow this to happen, the core VM includes a callback mechanism to allow JITs to patch direct calls when the targets change due to compilation or recompilation. Whenever a JIT produces a direct call to a method, it calls a function to inform the core VM of this fact. If the target method is (re)compiled, the core VM calls back into the JIT to patch and redirect the call.

Devirtualization and dynamic loading. The O3 JIT performs class-hierarchy analysis to determine if there is a single target for a virtual-method invocation. In such cases, the compiler generates code that takes advantage of that information (for example, direct calls or inlining) and registers that class-hierarchy assumption with the core VM. If the core VM later detects that loading a class violates a registered class-hierarchy assumption, it calls back into the JIT that registered the assumption, to instruct it to deoptimize the code to use the standard dispatch mechanism for virtual methods. This is a variant of guarded devirtualization and does not require stack frame patching (see [17] for more details). The following functions in the JIT interface are used in this scheme:

- *method_is_overridden(Method_Handle m)*. This function checks if the method has been overridden in any of the subclasses.
- *method_set_inline_assumption(Method_Handle caller, Method_Handle callee)* This function informs the core VM that the JIT has assumed that *caller* nonvirtually calls the *callee*.
- *method_was_overridden(Method_Handle caller, Method_Handle callee)* The core VM calls this function to notify the JIT that a new class that overrides the method *callee* has just been loaded.

This small set of methods, though somewhat specialized, was sufficient to allow JITs to implement an important optimization without requiring detailed knowledge of the core VM's internal structures.

Fast constant-string instantiation. Loading constant strings is another common operation in Java applications. In our original JIT interface, managed code had to call a runtime function to instantiate constant strings. We extended the interface to reduce the constant-string instantiation at runtime to a single load, similar to a load of a static field.

To use this optimization, JITs, at compile time, call the function `class_get_const_string_intern_addr()`. This function interns the string and returns the address of a location pointing to the interned string. Note that the core VM reports this location as part of the root set during GC.

Because these string objects are created at compile time regardless of which control paths are actually executed, there is the possibility that applying this optimization blindly to all managed code will allocate a significant number of unnecessary string objects. Our experiments confirmed this: performance of some applications degraded when JITs use fast constant strings. Fortunately, the simple heuristic of not using fast strings in exception handlers avoids this problem.

Native-Method Support

ORP gives JITs wide latitude in defining how to lay out their stack frames, and in determining how they use physical registers. As a consequence, JITs are responsible for unwinding their own stack frames and enumerating their roots, and must implement functions for this that the core VM calls. However, since a native platform compiler, not a JIT, compiles unmanaged native methods, the core VM cannot assume any such cooperation. As a result, the core VM generates special wrapper code for most native methods. These wrappers are called when control is transferred from managed to native code. They record enough information on the stack and in thread-local storage to support unwinding past native frames and enumerating Java Native Interface (JNI) references during GC. The wrappers also include code to perform synchronization for native synchronized methods.

In ORP, managed code can interact with native code using one of four native interfaces:

- Direct calls
- Raw Native Interface² (RNI)

² ORP's implementation of RNI is very close to but not identical to the original Raw Native Interface that is used in the Microsoft Java SDK [4].

- Java Native Interface (JNI)
- Platform Invoke (PInvoke)

CLI code uses PInvoke, and Java code uses RNI and JNI. For optimization purposes, native methods may be called directly. RNI, JNI, and PInvoke require a customized wrapper as discussed above. In Java most of the methods use JNI.

Interestingly, we also found JNI methods to be useful for implementing CLI's *internal call* methods. These are methods implemented by the MRTE itself that provide functionality that regular managed code cannot provide, such as `System.Object.MemberwiseClone`.

Native interfaces comparison. JNI and PInvoke are the preferred interfaces and are the only native-method calling mechanisms available to application programmers. However, a few native methods are called so frequently, and their performance is so time-critical, that ORP internally uses either a *direct* call interface or RNI for better performance.

The direct interface simply calls the native function without any wrapper to record the necessary information about the transition from managed code to native code. The lack of a wrapper means that ORP cannot unwind its stack frame. This means that the direct native interface can only be used for methods that are guaranteed not to require GC, exception handling, or security support.

For the PInvoke, RNI, and JNI interfaces, ORP generates a specialized wrapper for each method. This wrapper performs the exact amount of work needed based on the method's signature. This specialization approach reflects the general ORP philosophy of performing as much work as possible at compile time, so that minimum work is required at runtime. The wrapper first saves enough information to unwind the stack to the frame of the managed code of the method that called the native function (described in more detail below), performs locking for synchronized methods, and then calls the actual native method.

RNI and JNI are very similar; the only major difference between them is how references to managed objects are handled. In RNI, references are passed to native code as raw pointers to the managed heap. In JNI, all references are passed as handles. JNI handles incur additional overhead but they make writing and debugging native methods much simpler.

CLI's PInvoke is designed to simplify the use of existing libraries of native code. It supports the look up by name of functions in specified dynamic link libraries (DLLs). It handles the details of loading DLLs, invoking functions with various calling conventions, and marshalling arguments and return values. PInvoke automatically

translates (*marshals*) between the CLI and native representations for several common data types including strings and one-dimensional arrays of a small set of types.

Stack unwinding for native methods. Unwinding a thread's stack proceeds by first identifying, for each frame, whether it is managed or native. If the frame is managed, the corresponding JIT is called to unwind the frame. Otherwise, the core VM uses a last managed frame (LMF) list to find the managed frame nearest the native frame. Each thread (in thread-local storage) has a pointer to the LMF list, which links together the stack frames of the wrappers of native methods. Included in these wrapper stack frames and the LMF list is enough information to find the managed frame immediately before the wrapper frame, as well as the previous wrapper frame. Also included are the callee-saved registers and the instruction pointer needed to unwind to the managed frame.




Figure 3: LMF List after the call to a native method

Figure 3 shows a thread stack just after a call to a native method. The thread-local LMF variable points to the head of the LMF list. During unwinding, the LMF list is traversed as each native-to-managed transition is encountered, and the wrapper information is used to unwind past native frames.

JNI optimizations. The core VM generates specialized JNI wrappers to support the transition from managed to native code. The straightforward implementation of these wrappers calls a function to allocate storage and initialize JNI handles for each reference argument. However, most

JNI methods have only a small number of reference parameters. To take advantage of this fact, we use an inline sequence of instructions to allocate and initialize the JNI handles directly. This can improve by several percent the performance of applications that make many JNI calls.

Flexibility Versus Performance

For JITs, the performance impact of using interfaces is minimal, since interface functions are called infrequently during program execution. Naturally, the compilation interface is used once for every method that is compiled (including the wrapper generation for native methods), but the number of methods executed is typically orders of magnitude greater than the number compiled, and the compilation cost far exceeds the interface cost. Depending on the application, the number of calls related to exception unwinding and root-set enumeration may be much higher than the compilation-related calls. Once again, though, the cost of performing these operations generally greatly exceeds the cost of using the interface.

THE GARBAGE COLLECTION INTERFACE

The main responsibility of the garbage collector is to allocate space for objects, manage the heap, and perform garbage collection (GC). The GC interface defines how the garbage collector interacts with the core virtual machine (VM) and the just-in-time (JIT) compilers, and it is described in detail below. First we describe the typical garbage collection process in the Open Runtime Platform (ORP).

Overview of Garbage Collection

Typically, when the heap is exhausted, GC proceeds by stopping all managed threads at GC-safe points, determining the set of root references [26], performing the actual collection, and then resuming the threads. A garbage collector relies upon the core VM to enumerate the root set. The core VM enumerates the global references and thread-local references in the runtime data structures. Then it enumerates each frame of each thread stack, and calls the JIT that produced the code for the frame to enumerate the roots on that frame and to unwind to the previous frame.

The garbage collector is also responsible for allocating managed objects. As such, whenever the core VM, managed code, or native methods need to allocate a new object, they call a function in the GC interface. If the heap space is exhausted, the garbage collector stops all managed threads and performs GC as described above.

A generational garbage collector also needs support from the core VM and from managed code to execute a write

barrier whenever a reference field of a managed object is changed. In particular, this requires the JIT to insert calls to the write barrier function in the GC interface into managed code, where appropriate.

Overview of the Interface

Using an interface for GC potentially has a much greater performance impact than using a JIT interface, since a large number of objects are created and garbage-collected during the lifetime of a typical managed runtime environment (MRTE) application. Calling a core VM function to access type information would slow down common GC operations such as object scanning. A common solution to this problem is to expose core-VM data structures to the garbage collector, but this exposure increases the dependency between the garbage collector and the core VM.

The solution in ORP is to expose core-VM data structures only through a call interface (which provides good separation between the core VM and the garbage collector), but to allow the garbage collector to make certain assumptions and to have some space in vtables and thread local storage. In our experience, these non-call parts have been a very important feature of the GC interface. The following sections describe the explicit functions in the GC interface, as well as the implicit data layout assumptions shared between the core VM and the garbage collector.

Data Layout Assumptions

Part of the GC interface consists of an implicit agreement between the core VM and the garbage collector regarding the layout of certain data in memory. There are four classes of memory assumptions in the interface.

First, the garbage collector assumes the layout of objects described previously, in terms of the *Managed Object* data type. This allows it to load an object's vtable without calling into the core VM. In addition, it can use the *object_info* field for certain purposes such as storing a forwarding pointer while performing GC. However, this field is also used by the synchronization subsystem, so the garbage collector must ensure it does not interfere with those uses.

Second, the core VM reserves space in each vtable for the garbage collector to cache type information it needs during GC. This cached information is used in frequent operations such as scanning, where calling the core VM would be too costly. When the core VM loads and prepares a class, it calls the GC function *gc_class_prepared* so that the garbage collector can obtain information it needs from the core VM through the VM interface and store it in the vtable.

Third, the core VM reserves space in thread-local storage for the garbage collector, and during thread creation it calls *gc_thread_init* to allow the garbage collector to initialize this space. The garbage collector typically stores a pointer to per-thread allocation areas in this space.

Fourth, the garbage collector assumes arrays are laid out in a certain way. It can call a VM function to obtain the offset of the length field in an array object, and for each array type, the offset of the first element of arrays of that type. It can further assume that the elements are laid out contiguously. Using these assumptions, the garbage collector can enumerate all references in an array without further interaction with the core VM. Note that the two offsets can be cached in vtables or other garbage collector data structures.

Initialization

The GC interface contains a number of functions that are provided to initialize certain data structures and state in the core VM and the garbage collector at specific points during execution. These points include system startup, as well as when new classes are loaded and new application threads are created.

At the startup of ORP, the core VM and the JITs call the GC interface function *gc_requires_barriers* to determine what kinds (if any) of write barriers the garbage collector requires. Write barriers are used by some generational, partial collection, and concurrent garbage-collection techniques to track the root sets of portions of the heap even in the presence of updates to those portions. If the garbage collector requires write barriers, then JITs must generate calls to the GC function *gc_write_barrier* after code that stores references into an object field.

As previously mentioned, the core VM calls *gc_class_prepared* upon loading a class, and *gc_thread_init* upon creating a thread. Also, the core VM calls *gc_init* to initialize the garbage collector, *gc_orp_initialized* to tell the garbage collector that the core VM is sufficiently initialized that it can enumerate roots, and thus that GC is allowed, and *gc_next_command_line_argument* to inform the garbage collector of command line arguments.

Allocation

There are several functions related to allocating space for objects. The function *gc_malloc* is the main function, and it allocates space for an object given the size of the object and the object's vtable. There are other functions for special cases such as pinned objects. These allocation functions are invoked by the core VM or by the managed code.

Root-Set Enumeration

If the garbage collector decides to do GC, it first calls the VM function *orp_enumerate_root_set_all_threads*. The core VM is then responsible for stopping all threads and enumerating all roots. These roots consist of global and thread-local object references. Global references are found in static fields of classes, JNI global handles, interned constant strings, and other core VM data structures. Thread-local references are found in managed stack frames, local JNI handles, and the per-thread data structures maintained by the core VM. The core VM and the JITs communicate the roots to the garbage collector by calling the function *gc_add_root_set_entry(Managed_Object**)*. Note that the parameter points to the root, not the object the root points to, allowing the garbage collector to update the root if it moves objects during GC.

After the core VM returns from *orp_enumerate_root_set_all_threads*, the garbage collector has all the roots and proceeds to collect objects no longer in use, possibly moving some of the live objects. Then it calls the VM function *orp_resume_threads_after*. The core VM resumes all threads; then the garbage collector can proceed with the allocation request that triggered GC.

Flexibility Versus Performance

Relatively few interface functions need to be called during GC, largely as a result of the cached type information. However, within managed code, there are potentially many GC interface crossings. The majority of these are object allocation (both of objects and of arrays) and write barriers. The write barrier sequence consists of just a few straight-line instructions with no control flow, and the extra call and return instructions have not proven to be a performance issue in practice. For object and array allocation, the extra call and return instructions are also not a significant source of overhead for MRTE applications (but the same is not true in functional languages). However, if future benchmarks warranted it, the JIT and GC interfaces could be extended to allow inlining of the fast-path of allocation into managed code.

PERFORMANCE OF THE OPEN RUNTIME PLATFORM

For our work to be relevant to other groups that we work with, and to Intel as a whole, the Open Runtime Platform (ORP) must perform as well as commercial Java^{*} virtual machines (JVM^s). As a result, we have put significant effort into designing our interfaces to impose minimal overhead. The purpose of this section is not to provide any in-depth analysis of ORP's performance, but merely to show that ORP is comparable with commercial JVMs

on a set of standard benchmarks. A more extensive performance analysis appears in another study [24].

Many commercial JVMs have been developed for the IA-32 platform. A few examples include IBM JDK 1.3.1^{*} [2], Sun HotSpot JDK 1.4.0^{*} [11], and BEA JRockit JVM 1.3.1^{*} [13]. We compare ORP with Sun HotSpot JDK 1.4.0^{*} [11] for SPEC JVM98 [6]³ which is a set of benchmarks that are designed to reflect the workload on a client machine.

The comparison appears in Figure 4. These numbers are taken on a 2.0 GHz dual-processor Pentium[®] 4 Xeon[™] machine without Hyper-Threading, with 1GB of physical memory, and running RedHat Linux 7.2^{*}. We set the initial and maximum heap sizes to the same value of 48 MB for both VMs by using the *-Xms* and *-Xmx* command line options.

We are unable to strictly follow the official run rules for these benchmarks because, for example, the Java class library we use, GNU Classpath, does not support AWT and thus cannot run the applets that are required for a conforming SPEC JVM98 run. We have tried to approximate as closely as possible the conditions required for conforming runs within the limits of our research infrastructure. We use unmodified benchmarks, each of which is run from the command line.

Performance numbers are presented in a relative fashion so that the performance of ORP is normalized to 1, and numbers greater than 1 indicate better performance than ORP (the graph shows the inverse of the execution time). ORP was run in its default configuration (all methods were compiled by the O3 JIT), and the only parameter we modified was the heap size.

* Other brands and names are the property of their respective owners.

³ As a research project, the information based on the components of SPEC JVM98 are published per the guidelines listed in the SPEC JVM98 Run and Reporting rules section '4.1 Research Use' (<http://www.spec.org/jvm98/rules/runrules-20000427.html#Research>). As such these results do NOT represent SPEC JVM98 metrics but only run times and are not directly comparable to any SPEC metrics. Also, as such, enough information is being provided to allow people to reproduce the results.

[®] Pentium is a registered trademark of Intel Corporation or its subsidiaries in the United States and other countries.

[™] Xeon is a trademark of Intel Corporation or its subsidiaries in the United States and other countries.




Figure 4. Relative performance to Sun HotSpot Client

ORP performance compares well with Sun HotSpot on these benchmarks. We believe that this performance comparison demonstrates that using interfaces can be consistent with good performance.

CONCLUSION

Along with a general overview of the Open Runtime Platform (ORP), we have described our use of strict interfaces between the core virtual machine (VM) and other components, in particular just-in-time compilers (JITs) and the garbage collector. These interfaces have allowed us and others to construct new JITs and garbage collectors without having to understand or modify the internal structure of the core VM or other components. Contrary to conventional wisdom, we are able to provide this level of abstraction and yet still maintain high performance. The performance cost of using interfaces is minor for the JITs, where interface crossings are infrequent. For the more heavily crossed interface of the garbage collector, we maintain high performance by exposing a small, heavily used portion of the Java object structure as part of the interface and allowing caching of frequently used information. Our experience has shown that this approach is effective in terms of both software engineering and performance.

Our experience with ORP's component design has been positive and has encouraged us to modularize our implementation further. We are currently developing interfaces for other managed runtime environment (MRTE) components such as ORP's threading and synchronization subsystems, to simplify experimentation with other runtime technologies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work would not be possible without contributions from the entire Open Runtime Platform (ORP) development team. We also thank ORP users outside of Intel for their contributions and GNU Classpath developers, for providing an open-source class library for Java.

REFERENCES

- [1] GNU Classpath, <http://www.classpath.org>
- [2] Jikes Research Virtual Machine. IBM, <http://www.research.ibm.com/jikes>
- [3] The JIT Compiler Interface Specification, Sun Microsystems, http://java.sun.com/docs/jit_interface.html
- [4] Microsoft SDK for Java. Microsoft Corp., <http://www.microsoft.com/java/>
- [5] SPEC Java Business Benchmark 2000, Standard Performance Evaluation Corporation, <http://www.spec.org/jbb2000>
- [6] SPEC JVM98, Standard Performance Evaluation Corporation, <http://www.spec.org/jvm98>
- [7] *Intel Architecture Software Developer's Manual*, Intel Corp., 1997.
- [8] *IA-64 Architecture Software Developer's Manual*, Intel Corp., 2000.
- [9] "C# Language Specification," ECMA-334. ECMA, 2002.
- [10] Common Language Infrastructure, ECMA-335. ECMA, 2002.
- [11] Java 2 Platform, Standard Edition (J2SE) v. 1.4.1, Sun Microsystems, 2002.
- [12] Open CLI Library (OCL). Intel Corp., 2002, <http://sf.net/projects/ocl>
- [13] WebLogic JRockit JVM Version 1.3.1, BEA, 2002, http://commerce.bea.com/downloads/weblogic_jrockit.jsp
- [14] Adl-Tabatabai, A.-R., Bharadwaj, J., Chen, D.-Y., Ghuloum, A., Menon, V., Murphy, B., Serrano, M.J. and Shpeisman, T., "StarJIT: A Dynamic Compiler for Managed Runtime Environments," *Intel Technology Journal*, 7 (2003).
- [15] Adl-Tabatabai, A.-R., Cierniak, M., Lueh, G.-Y., Parikh, V.M. and Stichnoth, J.M., "Fast, Effective Code Generation in a Just-In-Time Java Compiler," *ACM Conference on Programming Language Design*

and Implementation, Montreal, Canada, 1998, pp. 280-290.

- [16] Cierniak, M., Lewis, B.T. and Stichnoth, J.M., "Open Runtime Platform: Flexibility with Performance using Interfaces," *Joint ACM Java Grande - ISCOPE 2002 Conference*, Seattle, Washington, 2002.
- [17] Cierniak, M., Lueh, G.-Y. and Stichnoth, J.M., "Practicing JUDO: Java Under Dynamic Optimizations," *ACM Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, Vancouver, British Columbia, 2000.
- [18] Hudson, R. and Moss, J.E.B., Incremental Collection of Mature Objects, *International Workshop on Memory Management*, 1992.
- [19] Hudson, R. and Moss, J.E.B., Sapphire: Copying GC Without Stopping the World, *Java Grande*, 2001.
- [20] Hudson, R., Moss, J.E.B., Sreenivas, S. and Washburn, W., "Cycles to Recycle: Garbage Collection on the IA-64," *International Symposium on Memory Management*, 2000.
- [21] Krintz, C. and Calder, B., "Using Annotations to Reduce Dynamic Optimization Time," *ACM Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, 2001.
- [22] Lindholm, T. and Yellin, F., *The Java Virtual Machine Specification, Second Edition*, Addison-Wesley, 1999.
- [23] Shpeisman, T., Lueh, G.-Y. and Adl-Tabatabai, A.-R., "Just-In-Time Java Compilation for the Itanium Processor," *International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT'02)*, Charlottesville, Virginia, 2002.
- [24] Shudo, K., "Performance Comparison of JITs," January 2002. <http://www.shudo.net/jit/perf>
- [25] Stichnoth, J.M., Lueh, G.-Y. and Cierniak, M., "Support for Garbage Collection at Every Instruction in a Java Compiler," *ACM Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, Atlanta, Georgia, 1999, pp. 118-127.
- [26] Wilson, P.R., "Uniprocessor Garbage Collection Techniques," in revision (accepted for ACM Computing Surveys).
<ftp://ftp.cs.utexas.edu/pub/garbage/bigssurv.ps>

AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHIES

Michal Cierniak is a senior staff researcher in the Programming Systems Lab. He joined Intel in 1997 and has over ten years of experience in compiler design and over six years of experience in managed runtime design.

Michal has a Ph.D. degree from the University of Rochester, an M.S. degree from the University of Edinburgh, and an M.S. degree from the Silesian University of Technology. His e-mail address is michal.cierniak@intel.com.

Marsha Eng is a researcher in the Programming Systems Lab. Marsha joined Intel in 2001, with an M.S. degree in Computer Engineering from the University of California, San Diego, and a B.S. degree, also in Computer Engineering, from the University of Washington. Her e-mail address is marsha.eng@intel.com.

Neal Glew is a staff researcher in the Programming Systems Lab. He received a Ph.D. degree in Computer Science from Cornell University in January 2000. His e-mail address is neal.glew@intel.com.

Brian Lewis is a senior staff researcher in the Programming Systems Lab. Brian joined Intel in 2002. He previously worked at Sun, Olivetti Research, and Xerox. While at Sun Microsystems Laboratories, Brian worked on the development of virtual machines for several languages. He also worked on techniques for binary translation as well as portions of the Spring research operating system. Brian received a Ph.D. and M.S. degree in Computer Science and a B.S. degree in Mathematics from the University of Washington. His e-mail address is brian.t.lewis@intel.com.

James Stichnoth is a senior staff researcher in the Programming Systems Lab. Jim joined Intel in 1997, with a Ph.D. degree in Computer Science from Carnegie Mellon University. Jim has worked extensively on both the core VM and the JITs in the Open Runtime Platform (ORP). His e-mail address is james.m.stichnoth@intel.com.

Copyright © Intel Corporation 2003. This publication was downloaded from <http://developer.intel.com/>.

Legal notices at <http://www.intel.com/sites/corporate/tradmarx.htm>.

For further information visit:

developer.intel.com/technology/itj/index.htm