The best master's thesis ever

Gilles De Borger

Academiejaar 2020 – 2021

Preface

Gilles De Borger

Contents

Abstract

Samenvatting

List of Figures and Tables

List of Figures

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Protected Module Architectures

Because of the increasing popularity of IoT devices more and more embedded computing devices are being connected to the Internet. These devices are often more susceptible to being exploited because they support software extensibility. Additionally because these devices are connected to a network the risk increases since attacks can be done remotely. An important technique for securing such devices is the use of hardware support for virtual memory and processor privilege levels. The OS can build on this support to isolate a process from any other malicious processes on the device. However, this introduces a sizable software layer however which is difficult to get sufficiently secure [14]. If the attacker controls the OS then its capabilities for attacking a process on the devices increase considerably [?].

Maene et. al state that *the goal of trusted computing is to develop technologies which give users guarantees about the behaviour of the software running on their devices.* An important aspect of trusted computing is therefore to protect software even when attackers have full control of the system. One means of achieving this is through the use of Protected Module Architectures (PMAs). These architectures seperate critical components into protected modules, also called enclaves, that are isolated from one another through hardware [10].

A number of Protected Module Architectures (PMAs) have been developed to address this problem, both by researchers and industry. PMAs have been developed for both low-end microcontrollers found in embedded systems [8, 4] as well as high-end processors [5]. One architecture developed for embedded systems is Sancus. Sancus is a security architecture that can provide strong isolation guarantees on networked embedded systems, and has been implemented on a modified TI MSP430 micro-controller [12]. At the higher end of the spectrum there is Intel SGX. Intel SGX is an extension added to the Intel architecture that allows applications to instantiate enclaves. Enclaves are areas in the application's memory that are protected from access from outside of the enclave, even from privileged software such as the OS [11].

Research has shown that it is possible to extract information from protected applications in PMAs. In their work Xu et. al introduce a novel type of side-channel

```
1            CMP r1 , $0
2            JEQ .l1
3            .l1 :
4            ADD r1 , r2                ; 1 cycle instruction
5            JMP .end
6            .l2 :
7            MUL r1 , r2                ; 2 cycle instruction
8            JMP .end
```

Figure 1.1: Assembly pseudo-code with a secret-dependent branch that is vulnerable to Nemesis attack

attack called controlled-attacks. These attacks are categorized by untrusted operating systems that create side-channels through its extensive control of the system. The authors were able to leverage the OS's high degree of control over the system to extract large amounts of data from applications which were until then safe from side-channel attacks [17].

1.2 Nemesis

More recently Van Bulck et. al [15] developed Nemesis, a controlled-channel attack that leverages the interrupt mechanism to extract sensitive information from enclaved applications. The authors were able to exploit timing differences in the latency between the arrival of an interrupt request (IRQ) and the execution of the first instruction in the interrupt service routine (ISR). They state that their attack is *based on the key observation that an IRQ during a multi-cycle instruction increases the interrupt latency with the number of cycles left to execute.* By carefully and deliberately interrupting a process at the right time the authors were able to infer the duration of the interrupted instruction. Potential attackers can use this information to determine where the instruction is situated in the program's control flow. When the instruction is part of a secret-dependent branch the attacker is able to infer some information about the secret, successfully leaking sensitive information from the program. Van Bulck et. al [15] showed that this attack is applicable to the whole computing spectrum. They were able to apply their attack to the aforementioned Sancus architecture as well as Intel SGX enclaves.

Figure 1.1 illustrates how such an attack might work with a piece of assembly pseudocode. An attacker who is in control of the OS could carefully interrupt the program right after the conditional jump at line 5. Depending on the value of register r1 the next interrupted instruction is either the addition instruction at line 4 or the multiplication instruction at line 7. By measuring the interrupt latency the attacker can infer which of the two instructions was being executed at the time of the interrupt and, more importantly, infer if the value in register r0 is equal to 0.

1.3 Related Work

1.4 Thesis Goal and Outline

This paper presents a novel algorithm for automatically transforming a program in order to remove any timing leaks. It achieves this by addressing the core cause of the vulnerability: differences in latencies between corresponding instructions in secret-dependent branches. Corresponding instructions are instructions that are the same distance away from a branching instruction. The proposed algorithm inserts additional instructions such that all corresponding instructions have the same latency without changing affecting the program output.

The main contributions of this paper are:

1. The paper presents a novel algorithm for automatically transforming a program to remove any timing leaks.

2. The paper presents an implementation of this algorithm for the Intel x86-64 architecture.

3. The paper presents an evaluation of the algorithm based on a suite of benchmark programs.

Chapter 2

Design

2.1 Introduction

The root cause of the vulnerability exposed by Nemesis-style attacks are differences in the latencies of two instruction that occur at the same position in two branches of a secret-dependent branching instruction. In practice an attacker can exploit this vulnerability by generating latency traces along different paths of the program's control flow. Any differences in instruction latencies will be reflected as differences in these latency traces. By carefully inspecting the relevant sections of the latency traces the attacker can infer which paths were taken for a given input. In cases where the path depends on some secret data the attacker is then able to infer information about this data, successfully leaking information from the program [15].

The goal of the algorithm outlined in this section is to ensure that latency traces cannot be used to leak information in this way. It does this by inserting additional instructions into branches of a secret-dependent branching instruction. These instructions are carefully selected such that they have the same latency as their corresponding instruction in the other branch. This ensures that any instructions that occur at the same position in two different branches have the same latency. As a result the sections of latency traces that correspond to these branches will be identical, making it impossible for an attacker to infer information.

The proposed algorithm inserts additional instructions into the functions of a program through manipulation of the function's control flow graph. This graph consists of nodes and vertices, where each node contains a sequence of instructions. One of the main operations performed on the graph is the alignment of a set of nodes. This operation consists of inserts additional instructions into nodes such that all instructions at a given position in any of the nodes have the same latency.

Not all structures found in a control flow graph are suitable for alignment. The aforementioned alignment operation therefore has some conditions on the structure of the control flow graph that need to be met. The other main operation of the algorithm consists of inserting additional nodes into the graph such that these conditions are met.

Section 2.2 will formally define the property that needs to hold for a program in

order for Nemesis-style attacks to be mitigated. Section 2.3 introduces the CFG data structure and translates the aforementioned property to such structures. Finally, sections 2.4 and 2.5 describe the insertion and alignment of nodes, respectively.

2.2 Nemesis-sensitive property

In their paper Pouyanrad et. al have formally defined the Nemesis-Sensitive property. Let $region^{then}(ep)$ and $region^{else}(ep)$ capture the set of execution points belonging to the branch target and the other region of some branching instruction ep. Let ep^i be the i'th instruction in a region. A program P with a secret-dependence branch in ep and $region^{then}(ep)$ and region $region^{else}(ep)$ with the same number of execution points, satisfies the nemesis-sensitive property if and only if:

$$\forall ep^i \in region^{then}(ep) : \forall ep^j \in region^{else}(ep) \ such \ that \ i = j :$$
$$(s_{ep^i} \xrightarrow{t} s_{ep^i_{next}}) \wedge (s_{ep^j} \xrightarrow{t'} s_{ep^j_{next}}) \iff t = t' \tag{2.1}$$

[13]

The relation $s \xrightarrow{t} s'$ models the transition between program states s and s', declaring that the transition between s and s' takes a time t. For a given instruction this time t is equal the instruction's latency. This property states that for any two corresponding instructions in the branches their latencies should be the same.

If this nemesis-sensitive property holds for a program then an attacker is not able to infer which branch was taken by the program based on latency traces of the program.

2.3 CFG

The Control Flow Graph (CFG) is a data structure that represents the control flow of a function. If a program has multiple functions then each function is represented by its own CFG. A CFG consists of nodes V and directed edges E. Each node V contains a contiguous sequence of instructions that is always executed as a whole. This implies that any branching instruction can only occur at the end of a node, and an instruction that is the target of a branching instruction can only occur at the start.

An edge is drawn from node v to node v' if and only if the last instruction in v can be followed by the first instruction in v' when following program control flow. The algorithm only considers branching instructions that are binary in nature, so a node in the CFG can have at most 2 successors. A node is said to be secret-dependent if its last instructions is a secret-dependent branching instruction.

Each node has a latency sequence associated with it. This latency sequence is equal to the latencies of the node's instructions. A latency trace along a path of the CFG is then equal to the concatenation of the latency sequences of each node along the path. Figure 2.1 shows an example of a such a CFG, along with the original

(a) C program

(b) Corresponding CFG

Figure 2.1: Example program with corresponding CFG

program it is created from. The CFG also contains the latency for each instruction. Note that by convention the only node with no incoming edges is considered the starting node of the CFG.

Following the property described in section 2.1, the nemesis-sensitive property can be defined for a node in the CFG. Let v be a secret-dependent node. Let v_f be a node such that all paths from v to some leaf go through v_f. Then $region^{then}(v)$ can be defined as the set of nodes reachable following the first of v's outgoing edges up to and including v_f and $region^{else}(v)$ as the set of nodes reachable following the other outgoing edge up to and including v_f.

Any differences in the latency sequences of two nodes can only be used to infer which branch was taken at the nearest branching point that is an ancestor of both nodes. Any differences in latencies between two nodes that are descendants of v_f can therefore only be used to infer information about which branch was taken at v_f. This means that all nodes below v_f do not have to be considered. If no such node v_f exists then the regions simply consist of all nodes reachable from v through one of its outgoing edges.

Let $n^i \in region(v)$ be a node such that there is a path going to it from node v of length i. The depth of $region(v)$ is defined as being the length of the longest path from v to some node $v' \in region(v)$ that does not contain a cycle.

A secret-dependent node v and $region^{then}(v)$ and $region^{else}(v)$ with the same depth satisfies the nemesis-sensitive property if and only if

$$\forall n^i \in region^{then}(v) : \forall n^j \in region^{else}(v) \; such \; that \; i = j :$$
$$latencies(n^i) = latencies(n^j) \tag{2.2}$$

where $latencies(n)$ is a function mapping a node n to its latency sequence. This

7

Figure 2.3: then-else regions for secret-dependent nodes

property states that the latency sequence of any two nodes that are the same distance away from some secret-dependent node need to have identical latency sequences. If this property holds then the critical sections of latency traces will be identical and cannot be used to infer information about the secret-dependent branch.

Figure 2.3 illustrates how the borders of each region are defined. The secret-dependent node is marked in green, while the two branches are marked in red and blue. In the second example, the node marked in purple belongs to both regions. In example 2.2a there is no node such that all paths from the secret-dependent node to a leaf go through it, so the regions extend all the way to the leaves. In example 2.2b all paths that start in the secret-dependent node go through the node 6. Any differences in nodes 7 and 8 can only be used to infer information about the branch in node 6. These nodes therefore do not have to be considered.

2.4   Equalising

There are 2 structures found in a program's control flow graph that make it impossible to enforce the nemesis-sensitive property for a node as defined in the previous section. These structures are shown in figure 2.4. The first stage of the algorithm consists of inserting nodes such that these structures no longer occur.

The first such structure occurs when a function contains some sequence of instructions that is only executed if some condition is true and is illustrated in figure 2.4a. Analogously the corresponding CFG will contain a conditional node that is only reached if the condition is true. A consequence of this is that there will be some node in the CFG that has at least two paths to it. One path will contain the conditional node while the other will not. Additionally, the path with the conditional node will be longer than the other path.

In such cases it is impossible to align the latency traces of the two paths since of

the latency traces will always be longer than the other one. Because the nodes in the shorter path form a subset of the nodes in the longer path it is impossible to modify the shorter path without also modifying the longer path, making it impossible to ever equalize the lengths of the traces.

The second problematic structure occurs when one of the branches is shorter than the other one, as shown in figure 2.4b. In such cases there will be some nodes in one branch that have no corresponding nodes in the other branch, making it impossible to align them.

The nemesis-sensitive property as defined in section 2.2 entails that it is impossible for a node to satisfy the property if one of these structures occurs in its branches, since in both cases the regions have different depths. The first stage of the algorithm therefore consists of first equalizing all path lengths and then equalizing branches. Algorithms 1 and 2 depict pseudo-code for equalizing paths lengths and equalizing branches respectively.

2.4.1 Extract Sub-graph

The different procedures described in this section only need to take into account the branches of secret dependent nodes. These branches correspond to the regions $region_{then}(v)$ and $region_{else}(v)$ as defined in section 2.3. The procedure *ExtractSubgraph*, shown in algorithm 1, extracts the subset of the graph that contains only the nodes that belong to either one of these regions for a given secret-dependent node. The edges of this new CFG are all the edges of the original CFG whose head and tail are a part of this subset.

To determine which nodes are a part of this subgraph all immediate dominators are determined starting from node n. A node u is said to dominate another node w with respect to n if every path from n to w passes through u. Node v is the immediate dominator of w if v dominates w and every other dominator of w dominates v [9]. The immediate dominator is determined for each node reachable from n. If all leaves reachable from n have the same immediate dominator d then all paths from n to some leaf go through d. In this case any descendants of d are not part of $region_{then}(v)$ or $region_{else}(v)$ and do not have to be included in the sub-graph.

If such a node d exists then the nodes that are a part of the sub-graph are all nodes that are on a path from n to d. If d does not exists the sub-graph nodes are all nodes that are on a path from n to some leaf. This definition is analogous to the definition for $region_{else}(v)$ and $region_{then}(v)$ as defined in section 2.3.

2.4.2 Equalize paths

To equalize all path lengths starting from some secret-dependent node v, first a subset of the graph's nodes are extracted such that only the regions $region^{then}(v)$ and $region^{else}(v)$ are considered. Next the length of the longest path is computed from v to all nodes in the sub-graph.

Let (u, v) be an edge in the sub-graph. Let $d(u)$ and $d(v)$ be the length of the longest path to u and v. If the difference between $d(u)$ and $d(v)$ is more than one

(a) optional node   (b) unequal branches

Figure 2.4: problematic structures in CFG

then there exists at least two paths to v. The first path goes through u and has length $d(u) + 1$. The second path goes through a different predecessor of v and has length $d(v)$.

The procedure for equalizing the path lengths iterates over all edges of the subgraph. If the distances to u and v differ by more than one then nodes are inserted into the edge between u and v such that the path that goes to v through u is of the same length as the longest path to v.

2.4.3 Equalize branches

The branches of the CFG can be equalized in a similar way. Given some secret-dependent node v a subset of the graph's nodes are extracted. The lengths of the longest paths are computed for all nodes in the sub-graph. The maximum path length is then determined as being the longest path length to one of the leaves of the CFG. The procedure then iterates over all leaves in the sub-graph and determines the difference between the distance to the leaf and the maximum path length. If this difference is larger than zero then additional nodes are inserted as the predecessor to the leaf until the distance to the leaf is equal to the maximum path length. Because the final instruction in a leaf is a return statement any new nodes have to be added as predecessors.

2.5 Alignment

During the alignment stage the nodes of the CFG are aligned in a level-wise manner. The alignment of a set of nodes consists of inserting instructions such that all instructions at a given position across all nodes in the set have the same latency. The level of a node is defined as being the distance between the root of the graph

and the node. The first stage of the algorithm ensures that all paths to a given nodes have the same length making the level of a node a well defined value. The alignment stage iterates over all the levels of the sub-graph and aligns the set of nodes found at that level. Algorithm 3 depicts pseudocode for this stage of the algorithm.

2.5.1 Basic Operation

The core of the alignment operation consists of repeatedly selecting a reference node and inserting instructions into the other nodes to match the latencies of the reference. Each iteration a set of candidate nodes is determined, from which the reference node is then selected.

An index variable i_{ref} is used to keep track of the position of the first instruction that has not yet been aligned. This variable is initially equal to zero and is incremented every iteration. The instruction at position i_{ref} in the reference node is called the reference instruction.

The algorithm iterates over all nodes that are not the reference node and verifies if the instruction at position i_{ref} has the same latency. If the two latencies are not equal or if the node is shorter than the reference node a new instruction is inserted at position i_{ref}. The latency of this new instruction is equal to the latency of the reference instruction. Once this has been repeated for all nodes in the set then all instruction with at position i_{ref} have the same latency and the variable can be incremented.

2.5.2 Selecting the Reference Node

Because an instruction is potentially added to each node that is not the reference node the reference node needs to have at least as many instructions as the node with the largest number of instructions. This ensure that at some point all nodes have the same number of instructions. The set of candidate nodes therefore consists of all nodes that have n_{max} instructions, where n_{max} is the number of instructions in the longest node.

The instruction in the reference node at position i_{ref} determines what instructions are inserted into the other nodes. There are some restrictions on the selection of the reference node. These stem from the fact that branching instructions are special cases that will result in the insertion of branching instruction in the other nodes. Additionally a branching instruction cannot be inserted into the middle of a node since this will change the program's control flow. A node can therefore not be selected as the reference node when the instruction at position i_{ref} is a branching instruction, unless during the very last iteration.

If among the set of candidate nodes there is at least one node with a non-branching instruction at position i_{ref} then this node is selected as the reference node. If there are multiple such nodes then a candidate node can be selected arbitrarily. The case where all candidate nodes have a branching instruction at position i_{ref} can only occur during the very last iteration. At this point any of the candidate nodes are suitable and one is selected arbitrarily again.

11

2.5.3   Constructing NOP instruction

Any instructions that is inserted into the program can have no effect on the program outcome. In this regard they are the same as the no-operation instruction and are referred to as NOP instructions. For each latency class a template NOP instruction has been determined. For some latency classes a NOP instruction exists that has no effect on the program state. These can be inserted into the program as-is. For other latency classes the NOP instruction modifies some register value. In these cases the algorithm selects a registers that can safely be used. This needs to be a register that is not in use at the time of execution of the instruction in order to guarantee that the program outcome is not changed.

There are two types of free registers. A register can be free because its current value is no longer used. This occurs when the register is overwritten at some later point without being read first. Alternatively a register can be free because it isn't used anywhere in the current function. In the latter case, however, it is possible that the register is in use by the caller, since there is no guarantee that the caller stored all the registers it uses.

The function is statically analyzed to determine which registers are free to use for this purpose. If a register of the first type exists then it can be used as the operand of the NOP instruction and the resulting instruction can be inserted as-is into the node. If no such registers exists, a free register of the second type is selected. In this case additional instructions are inserted into the program to ensure that the original value of the register is not lost. In the root of the CFG additional instructions are inserted to push the register value onto the stack, while in every leaf instructions are inserted that pop the value from the stack. Once these instructions have been inserted the register effectively becomes a free register of the first type and can later be reused when construction additional NOP instructions.

If there are no free registers available, any register is arbitrarily selected. Additional instructions are inserted before and after the NOP instruction to push and pop the register value. To ensure the nodes are still balanced these push and pop instructions are inserted across all nodes of the current level.

If the reference instruction is a branching instruction the the NOP instruction will also be a branching instruction. The target of the branching instruction is then the address of the first instruction of the node's successors.

If the reference instruction is a call to a function then the NOP instruction will be a call to the same function. The instruction is simply duplicated into the current node. If the function contains no secret dependent node then this ensures that any latency traces cannot leak information from the program. Otherwise the function that is called needs to be aligned as well. It is only safe to insert a call to a function this way if the function in question has no effects on the program state. If the function does modify the program state then inserting additional calls can result in erroneous program outputs.

2.6 The algorithm

2.6.1 Cycles

The operations described in section 2.4 require the CFG to be acyclic. To account for this all cycles are removed from the CFG beforehand and later restored. The edge that needs to be removed is determined based on the depths of the nodes in the cycle. The depth of a node is defined as being the length of the longest path to the node from the root. Removing the cycle is done by removing the edge from that graph that connects the deepest node to the most shallow node. The tail and head are stored for all edges that are removed so that they can later be restored.

The removal of these edges has no effect on the operations of the algorithm if the cycle is not part of a branch of a secret dependent node. Cycles within a branch of a secret dependent node are not supported by the proposed algorithm. In this case the algorithm correctly aligns the nodes of the branches but the latency traces will still not be identical. The branch that contains the cycle will be executed a higher number of times, resulting in a longer latency trace.

2.6.2 Closing timing leaks

Algorithm 4 illustrates the top-level operation of the algorithm. The secret-dependent branching instructions are passed to the algorithm as arguments. Determining which branching instructions are secret-dependent is not part of the proposed algorithm. The user has to provide the algorithm with the address of the target instruction.

Based on the given instructions the secret-dependent nodes of the CFG are determined. These are all nodes that contain a secret-dependent instruction. First the equalizing operations are applied for each secret-dependent node. Only once all necessary nodes have been inserted is the CFG aligned. This order of operations ensures that the algorithm works correctly even when secret-dependent node is nested inside the branch of another secret-dependent node. This can occur when, for example, a program contains a nested if-statement. Cycles are removed from the CFG and restored as described in the previous section.

Algorithm 1: Equalize Path Lengths

---

1 Procedure EqualizePathLengths(*g: CFG, v: Node*)

2   *subgraph* ← ExtractSubGraph (g, v)

3   *longestPathLengths* ← ComputeLongestPathLengths(*subgraph, v*)

4   **forall** *(u, v)* ∈ Edges(*subgraph*) **do**

5   diff ← *longestPathLengths*[u] - longestPathLengths[v]

6   **if** *diff > 1* **then**

7   *head* ← v

8   **for** *i* ∈ *1, 2, ..., diff-1* **do**

9   *newNode* ← CreateNode()

10   InsertNodeBetween(*newNode, u, head*)

11   *head* ← newNode

12   **end**

13   **end**

14 Function ComputeLongestPathLengths(*g: CFG, s: Node*)

15   dist = {n : -1 | n ∈ Nodes(*g*) }

16   dist[s] ← 0

17   **forall** *n* ∈ TopologicalOrder(*g*) **do**

18   **forall** *succ* ∈ Successors(*n*) **do**

19   dist[succ] ← Max(*dist[succ], dist[n] + 1*)

20   **end**

21   **end**

22   **return** dist

23 Function ExtractSubGraph(*g: CFG, n: Node*)

24   *immedidateDominators* ← computeImmediateDominators(*g, n*)

25   *leafDominators* ← { *u* ∈ Nodes(*g*) |(*u,v*) ∈ *leafDominators* ∧*v* ∈ Leaves(*g*) }

26   **if** | *leafDominators* | = *1* **then**

27   dominator ← leafDominators[0]

28   **else**

29   dominator ← ∅

30   *subgraphNodes* ← { }

31   **if** *domintor ≠ ∅* **then**

32   **forall** *path* ∈ computeAllPaths(*g, n, dominator*) **do**

33   *subgraphNodes* ← *subgraphNodes* ∪ ({*p*|*p* ∈ *path*} \ *subraphNodes*)

34   **end**

35   **else**

36   **forall** *l* ∈ Leaves(*g*) **do**

37   **forall** *path* ∈ computeAllPaths(*g, l, dominator*) **do**

38   *subgraphNodes* ← *subgraphNodes* ∪ ({*p*|*p* ∈ *path*} \ *subgraphNodes*)

39   **end**

40   **end**

41   *subgraphEdges* ← {(*u,v*)|*u* ∈ *subgraphNodes* ∧ *v* ∈

14   *subgraphNodes* ∧ (*u,v*) ∈ Edges(*g*) }

42   **return** (*subgraphNodes, subgraphEdges*)

Algorithm 2: Equalize Branches

---

1 **Procedure** EqualizeBranches(*g: CFG, n: Node*)
2   *subgraph* ← ExtractSubGraph (g, v)
3   *longestPathLengths* ← ComputeLongestPathLengths(*subgraph, v*)
4   *maxPathLength* ←
      Max({*longestPathLengths*[*v*] | *v* ∈ Leaves(*subgraph*)})
5   **forall** *leaf* ∈ Leaves(*subgraph*) **do**
6   diff ← *longestPathLengths[leaf]* - maxPathLength
7   **if** *diff > 0* **then**
8   v ← leaf
9   **for** *i* ∈ *1, 2, ..., diff* **do**
10   newNode ← CreateNode()
11   AddNode(*g, newNode*)
12   **forall** *p* ∈ Predecessors(*v*) **do**
13   AddEdge(*g, (p, newNode)*)
14   RemoveEdge(*g, (p, v)*)
15   **end**
16   AddEdge(*g, (newNode, v)*)
17   **end**
18   **end**

Algorithm 3: Align CFG

---

1 Procedure AlignCFG(*g: CFG, n: Node*)

2   subgraph ← ExtractSubGraph(*g, v*)

3   pathLengths ← ComputeDistanceFromNode(*subgraph, v*)

4   levels ← { l | u ∈ Nodes(*subgraph*) ∧ pathLengths[u] = l }

5   **forall** *l ∈ levels* **do**

6   levelNodes ← { u | u ∈ Nodes(*subgraph*) ∧ pathLengths[u] = l }

7   AlignNodes(*subraph, levelNodes*)

8   **end**

9 Procedure AlignNodes(*g: CFG, ns : NodeSet*)

10   index ← 0

11   **while** *True* **do**

12   nodeLengths ← { node: CountInstructions(*node*) | node ∈ Nodes(*g*) }

13   candidates ← {n | n ∈ Nodes(*g*) ∧ nodeLengths[n] = Max(*nodeLengths*) }

14   referenceNode ← SelectReferenceNode(*candidates*)

15   referenceInstruction ← GetNodeInstruction(*referenceNode, index*)

16   **forall** *node ∈ {n | n ∈ Nodes(g) ∧ n ≠ referenceNode }* **do**

17   **if** *index < nodeLength[node]* ∧ Latency(GetNodeInstruction(*node, index*)) = Latency(*referenceInstruction*) **then**

18   continue

19   **if** IsBranch(*referenceInstruction*) **then**

20   newInstruction ← GetBranchInstruction()

21   insertInstruction(*node, newInstruction*)

22   **else**

23   reg ← SelectRegister()

24   newInstruction ← GetNOPInstruction(Latency(*referenceInstruction*), *reg*)

25   insertInstruction(*node, newInstruction*)

26   **end**

27   **end**

28 Function SelectReferenceNode(*candidates: NodeSet, index: Integer*)

29   **for** *n ∈ candidates* **do**

30   candidateInstruction ← GetNodeInstruction(*n, index*)

31   **if** ¬ *(*IsBranch(*candidateInstruction*) ∨ IsReturn(*candidateInstruction*)*)* **then**

32   **return** n

33   **end**

34   **return** candidates[0]

Algorithm 4: Close timing leaks

---

1 Procedure CloseTimingLeaks(*g: CFG, instrs: [Instruction]*)

2   targetNodes ← $\{n | n \in \mathbf{Nodes}(g) \wedge \exists instr \in instrs : instr \in n\}$

3   removedEdges ← RemoveCycles(*g*)

4   **forall** *node* ∈ *targetNodes* **do**

5   EqualizePathLengths(*g, node*)

6   EqualizeBranches(*g, node*)

7   **end**

8   **forall** *node* ∈ *targetNodes* **do**

9   AlignCFG(*g, node*)

10   **end**

11   RestoreCycles(*g, removedEdges*)

Chapter 3

Implementation

RetroWrite

The algorithm has been implemented in X lines of Python code as part of the RetroWrite framework. RetroWrite is a binary rewriting tool developed for statically instrumenting C and C++ binaries. The authors are able to leverage relocation information present in position independent code to produce assembly files that can be reassembled into binaries. On top of this the framework provides a rewriting API that allows for flexible and expressive transformations of the reconstructed assembly files [3]

The RetroWrite frameworks implements a logical abstraction for rewriting passes to operate on. These come in the form of data structures that represent the logical units of a program, Each of these data structure provide an interfaces for analyzing and modifying the underlying data. One such logical abstraction is the *InstructionWrapper*. This datastructure stores among other things, the instruction address, the mnemonic, and the operand string, and provides an interface for modifying the underlying instruction and for prepending or appending additional instructions. The *Function* datastructure contains a set of instructions and a function that maps each instruction to all instruction that can follow it.

The proposed algorithm is implemented as an additional abstraction layer on top of these data structures. Each node of the CFG consists of a sequence of *InstructionWrapper*s. The edges of the CFG are reconstructed based on data inside the *Function* instances. The CFG data structure implements an interface for the insertion of additional nodes into the graph and the insertion of additional instructions into nodes. This interface is built on top of the RetroWrite API, so all modifications to the CFG result in modification to the underlying *InstructionWrapper* instances. RetroWrite provides functionality for writing the instruction to assembly files. This assembly file can then be compiled using any of-the-shelf compiler.

The RetroWrite framework imposes some restrictions on the binary. The binary must be compiled as position independent code, it must contain instructions from x86_64 architecture, and it cannot be stripped of symbols [7]. As a result the implementation only supports binaries that meet these restrictions.

Binary Rewriting

Implementing the algorithm as part of a binary rewriting framework has two main advantages. Firstly the algorithm can be applied to existing binaries. It does not require recompilation of original code. Secondly the algorithm does not require the source code of the program. It can be applied to third-party software.

Secret-dependent branches

The detection of secret dependent branches is not part of the algorithm or the implementation. The user has to provide the algorithm with the address of the target instruction. At the time of writing secret dependent branching instructions need to be identified through manual inspection. However, research has shown that static detection of these side channels is possible, though this is currently limited to the MSP430 architecture [13].

Instruction Latencies

The construction of NOP instructions as described in section 2.5.3 is based on data that measures the latency of instructions in the x86-64 architecture. Intel provides some data regarding the latencies of commonly used instructions [1] but this data is not complete. To obtain better data Abel et. al [2] developed novel algorithms to infer the latency throughput, and port usage based on automatically-generated microbenchmarks. The authors claim that their results are more accurate and precise than existing work. Another source of data on instruction latencies is provided by Agner Fog who provides the results of his own measurements [6].

The data provided by Abel et. al is used as the primary source of instruction latencies. In the case where an instruction is not covered by their work the data provided by Agner Fog and Intel are used as a secondary source. If a program contains an instruction that is not covered by any of the datasets then the program cannot be aligned. The exception to this rule are branching instructions. There is no latency information available about these instructions in any of the sources. To account for this all branching instructions are aligned with new branching instructions. To preserve the control flow of the program the target of the branching instruction is equal to the address of the next instruction.

Chapter 4

Evaluation

4.1 Benchmark Suite

Winderix et. al. [16] have created the first benchmark suite of programs with timing side-channel vulnerabilities. This suite consists of a collection of synthetic programs with a wide range of control-flow patterns as well as third party benchmark programs from different sources. To evaluate the proposed algorithm a subset of this benchmark suite was selected.

All programs that contain loops inside vulnerable branches were discarded from the synthetic programs in the benchmark suite, since they are not supported by the proposed algorithm. The original authors of the Nemesis attack provide two case studies to demonstrate their attack. The first case study is a password comparison routine from the Texas Instruments MSP430 Bootstrap Loader (BSL). The second case study is secure keypad application that guarantees secrecy of its PIN code [15]. Both of these are included in the benchmark suite created by Winderix et. al and are also selected as a benchmark for the proposed algorithm.

The implementation of Nemesis and the benchmark suite created by Winderix et. al are implemented for the Sancus environment. Any pieces of code specific to this environment have been removed from the benchmark programs. The semantics of the programs remain unchanged.

One additional synthetic programs was added to the benchmark suite to evaluate a case that was not yet covered. This program contains a call to a function that modifies a non-local variable though a pointer. This function is only called in one branch of a secret-dependent branch.

4.2 Experiment Setup

The algorithm is evaluated using three metrics. The first metric aims to measure the effectiveness of the algorithm. A static analysis tool was developed to verify whether or not program satisfies the Nemesis-sensitive property as specified in section 2.2. Given a program and a set of secret-dependent branches, this tool partitions instructions into sets according to their positions in secret dependent branches.

Following the notation of section 2.2, let ep be a secret dependent branch, and let ep^n be the n'th instruction in a region, then define the set

$$ep_i = \{ep^n | i = n \wedge (ep^n \in region_{then}(ep) \vee ep^n \in region_{else}(ep)\} \qquad (4.1)$$

The static analysis verifies that both the regions have the same number of execution points, and that for each set ep_i it holds that all instruction have the same latency.

The second metric aims to measure the correctness of the algorithm. The algorithm is considered to work correctly if it does not change the program output. For each program in the benchmark suite a number of input values were determined such that all possible paths of the program control flow were covered. These values were supplied as inputs to both the original program and the balanced program, generating two output values. The output values were then compared to verify that the algorithm correctly modified the program without changing the output.

The effect on the program's performance is evaluated by measuring the increase in the sum of the latencies along paths in the programs CFG. To measure this increase CFGs are constructed from the original binary and from the modified binary. For each path in the original CFG its corresponding path in the modified CFG is determined. To do so a mapping is created that maps all nodes in the original CFG to their corresponding node in the balanced CFG. This mapping takes into account the condition of a branching instruction, and can be defined inductively. The root of the original CFG is mapped to the root of the root of the balanced CFG. If two nodes are mapped and they both have one successor then their successors are mapped. If two nodes are mapped and they have two successors, then then nodes that are reached if the branching condition is true are mapped, and those that are reached if the condition is false are mapped.

Formally, let G denote the original CFG, and let G' denote the modified CFG. Let $succ(n)$ be the successors of node n, and let $succT(n)$ be the successor of node N when the branching condition is true. Let F be the function that maps between the two CFGs.

1. $F(root(G)) = root(G')$

2. $F(n) = n' \wedge succ(n) = \{s\} \wedge succ(n') = \{s'\}$
$$\implies F(s) = s'$$

3. $F(n) = n' \wedge succ(n) = \{s,t\} \wedge succ(n') = \{s',t'\} \wedge succ_T(n) = s \wedge succ_T(n') = s'$
$$\implies F(s) = s', F(t) = t'$$

Let p be a path in G

$$p : p_1 \rightarrow p_2 \rightarrow ... \rightarrow p_n$$

Then its corresonding path in G' is defined as follows

$$p' : F(p_1) \rightarrow F(p_2) \rightarrow ... \rightarrow F(p_n)$$

This definition requires that G and G' are isomorphic. If during the first stage of the algorithm additional nodes were inserted in the CFG then this will not be true.

Benchmark	Effectiveness	Correctness	Performance					
			path1	path2	path3	path4	path5	path6
call	✓	✓	1.32	1.17				
call2	✓	✗	1.25	1.22				
diamond	✓	✓	1.35	1.06	1.06			
fork	✓	✓	1.43	1.15				
ifcompound	✓	✓	1.31	1.26	1.11	1.11	1.09	1.09
indirect	✓	✓	1.44	1.32	1.20	1.11		
multifork	✓	✓	1.80	1.58	1.41	1.41		
triangle	✓	✓	1.30	1.16				
bsl	✓	✓	1.42	1.00				
keypad	✓	✓	1.67	1.55	1.45	1.02	1.12	

Figure 4.1: Results of the evaluation experiments. A check mark in the second column indicates that all timing-leaks were closes. A checkmark in the third column indicates that the program output has not changed. The third column contains the increase in the sum of the latencies along various paths in the program, expressed as a percentage increase.

Therefore before being able to evaluate the effect on runtime the first stage of the algorithm has to be reapplied on G such that it is isomorphic to G'

To evaluate the effect on runtime performance the sum of the latencies along all relevants paths in G are compared to the sum of the latencies of their corresponding paths. A relevant path is a path that starts in secret-depdendent node and ends in a final node of one of the branches. Any nodes that do not belong to such a path are not affected by the algorithm and are therefore not considered in this evaluation.

4.3 Results

The results of the experiments are summarized in figure 4.1. The algorithm was able to ensure the Nemesis-sensitive property holds for all programs, as verified by the static analysis tool described in the previous section. This effectively closes the timing leaks found in the program.

In all but one test case the algorithm had no effect on the program output. The erroneous test case contains a call to a function that modifies the global state of the program in one of its secret dependent branches. During balancing of the program this function call is copied to the other branch. Because the function call has side effects the final output of the program is different.

The effects on program performance are summarized in the last 6 columns of figure 4.1. These results are sorted from largest to smallest. The increase in latencies ranges from 1.00 times up to 1.8 times.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1   Discussion

One limitation of the proposed algorithm is the lack of support for cycles within secret-dependent branches. However, the results show that the algorithm is effective in closing timing leaks. This indicates that it is possible modify the algorithm such that it is able to close these leaks even in the presence of cycles.

The root cause of the issue the fact that a section of the first branch will be executed a higher number of times than the corresponding section in the second branch. As a consequence one of the latency traces will be, even when the relevant sections are aligned. A solution that addresses this would have to make more extensive changes to the program. Before aligning the nodes, the structure of the cycle would have to be duplicated into the second branch such that the corresponding section is is executed the same number of times. This requires additional analysis to determine which register contains the loop counter and how many time it is incremented. The duplication of the cycle also requires more significant changes than those implemented by the current algorithm. Due to the added complexity such a solution is not included in the proposed algorithm and is left to future research.

A second limitation is the incomplete coverage of the latency data. There are certain instructions for which there is no available latency data. If these instructions are encountered in branches of a secret-dependent branching instruction then the algorithm is not able to close the timing leaks. However this issue was not encountered during evaluation of the algorithm. This indicates that the most commonly used instructions are present in the data and that the coverage of the data is sufficient to close timing leaks in most programs.

5.2   Future work

Bibliography

[1] *Intel® 64 and IA-32 Architectures Optimization Reference Manual.*

[2] A. Abel and J. Reineke. uops.info: Characterizing latency, throughput, and port usage of instructions on intel microarchitectures. In *ASPLOS*, ASPLOS '19, pages 673–686, New York, NY, USA, 2019. ACM.

[3] S. Dinesh, N. Burow, D. Xu, and M. Payer. Retrowrite: Statically instrumenting cots binaries for fuzzing and sanitization. *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1497–1511, 2020.

[4] K. Eldefrawy, D. Perito, and G. Tsudik. Smart: Secure and minimal architecture for (establishing a dynamic) root of trust. 01 2012.

[5] D. Evtyushkin, J. Elwell, M. Ozsoy, D. Ponomarev, N. A. Ghazaleh, and R. Riley. Iso-x: A flexible architecture for hardware-managed isolated execution. In *Proceedings of the 47th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, MICRO-47, page 190–202, USA, 2014. IEEE Computer Society.

[6] A. Fog. Instruction tables:lists of instruction latencies, throughputs and microoperation breakdowns for intel, amd, and via cpus, Mar 2021.

[7] HexHive. Hexhive/retrowrite.

[8] P. Koeberl, S. Schulz, V. Varadharajan, and A.-R. Sadeghi. Trustlite: A security architecture for tiny embedded devices. 04 2014.

[9] T. Lengauer and R. E. Tarjan. A fast algorithm for finding dominators in a flowgraph. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 1(1):121–141, Jan. 1979.

[10] P. Maene, J. Götzfried, R. de Clercq, T. Müller, F. Freiling, and I. Verbauwhede. Hardware-based trusted computing architectures for isolation and attestation. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 67(3):361–374, 2018.

[11] F. McKeen, I. Alexandrovich, A. Berenzon, C. V. Rozas, H. Shafi, V. Shanbhogue, and U. R. Savagaonkar. Innovative instructions and software model for isolated execution. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Hardware and Architectural Support for Security and Privacy*, HASP '13, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery.

[12] J. Noorman, J. Van Bulck, J. T. Mühlberg, F. Piessens, P. Maene, B. Preneel, I. Verbauwhede, J. Götzfried, T. Müller, and F. Freiling. Sancus 2.0: A low-cost security architecture for IoT devices. *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security (TOPS)*, 20(3):7:1–7:33, September 2017.

[13] S. Pouyanrad, J. T. Mühlberg, and W. Joosen. Scfmsp: Static detection of side channels in msp430 programs. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security*, ARES '20, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.

[14] R. Strackx, J. Noorman, I. Verbauwhede, B. Preneel, and F. Piessens. *Protected Software Module Architectures*, pages 241–251. 01 2013.

[15] J. Van Bulck, F. Piessens, and R. Strackx. Nemesis: Studying microarchitectural timing leaks in rudimentary cpu interrupt logic. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, CCS '18, page 178–195, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.

[16] H. Winderix, J. T. Mühlberg, and f. Piessens. Compiler-assisted hardening of embedded software against interrupt latency side-channel attacks. 2021.

[17] Y. Xu, W. Cui, and M. Peinado. Controlled-channel attacks: Deterministic side channels for untrusted operating systems. *2015 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 640–656, 2015.