

# Secure Information Flow Verification with Mutable Dependent Types

Andrew Ferraiuolo, Weizhe Hua, Andrew C. Myers,  
G.Edward Suh

# Background

- HDL: hardware description languages
- IFC: information flow control
- Type of variables(signal) are annotated with security labels
  - T(trusted); U(untrusted)
- Security policy
  - Flow is allowed from trusted(T) signals to untrusted (U) ones, but flow is not allowed in the other direction
- Type system
  - Untrusted signals do not affect trusted ones

# Multiple security levels

- To design efficient hardware, hardware resources can be shared among multiple security levels over time.
- SecVerilog: sharing is permitted through *dependent types*

---

```
1  reg [31:0] {T} creg, [31:0] {U} untr, [31:0] {T} trst;
2  ...
3      creg <= untr; // not allowed
4      creg <= trst; // allowed
5  ...
6  reg {T} mode;
7  // mode_to_lb(0) = T, mode_to_lb(1) = U
8  reg [31:0] {mode_to_lb(mode)} gpr;
9  ...
10 if (mode == 1'b0) creg <= gpr;
11 ...
```

---

**Figure 1: SecVerilog code example.**

# Problem

- Both value and label change together
- SecVerilog fails to typecheck this secure code
  - It doesn't distinguish between updates that occur in the current clock cycle and the next cycle
  - Line 4 is rejected
- SecVerilogLC can detect label is updated and conclude

---

```
1 reg {f(label)} data;  
2 reg {f(next_label)} next_data;  
3 always@(posedge clk)  
4     data <= next_data;  
5     label <= next_label;  
6 end
```

---

**Figure 2: A label propagation example.**

# Implicit downgrading

---

```
1 // mode_to_lb(0) = T, mode_to_lb(1) = U
2 reg {T} v, {T} trst, {U} untr;
3 reg {mode_to_lb(v)} shared;
4 ...
5     if (v == 1'b1) shared <= untrusted;
6     else          trusted <= shared;
7 ...
```

---

**Figure 3: Implicit downgrading example.**

- Solution: dynamic clearing
  - Compiler automatically inserts logic to clear dependently labeled registers whenever the labels of these registers are changed

# Approach

- Making the propagation of signals on clock edges
- Introduce a syntax for testing labels for the next clock cycle
- Use the type system to statically establish that registers are securely updated also

---

```
1 wire com {T} mode_switch;
2 assign mode_switch = decode_out[4];
3
4 reg seq {U} epc;
5 reg seq {T} mode;
6 reg seq {mode_to_lb(mode)} pc;
7 // mode_to_lb(0) = T, mode_to_lb(1) = U
8 always@(seq) begin
9     if (rst) pc <= 16'b0;
10    else if (mode_switch && (next mode == 1'b0))
11        pc <= 'SYSCALL_PC_VAL; //switch to kernel mode
12    else if (mode_switch)
13        pc <= epc; //return to user mode
14    ...
15 end
```

---

Figure 4: PC during mode switches.

# Evaluation

- A self designed processor
- $P_c \leftarrow (F) \text{ stage} \leftarrow \text{untrusted value}$

# Overhead

- Baseline processor :1487 lines
- SecVerilogLC : 257 lines were changed
- 14 cubes were added to gabdke exokucut diwbgrades
- TSMC 65nm process and target clock :2ns
  - Baseline:29638um<sup>2</sup>
  - Labeled design: 29843 um<sup>2</sup>