# Detection & Mitigation of Ciphertext Side-Channels in Trusted Execution Environments

Viraj Lunani, Vedant Iyer, Wei-Lun Huang, Taeyoon Kim, and Aayush Singh

# Outline

- [Background] Trusted Execution Environments
- [Background] Ciphertext Side Channels
- [Comparison] CipherH vs. Cipherfix
- [CipherH] Automated Detection of Ciphertext Side-channel Vulnerabilities in Cryptographic Implementations
- [Cipherfix] Mitigating Ciphertext Side-Channel Attacks in Software

# Trusted Execution Environments (TEE)

### **Existing Ring Architecture Problem**



### **Existing Ring Architecture Problem**



# Trusted Execution Environment (TEE)

- Assume the OS is compromised.
- Provide isolation from the hypervisor.
  - > Access Rights
  - > Cryptography

Untrusted System		
	Run Sensitive Program Here	Trusted Execution
		Environment

### **Issues with TEEs**

- Shared Hardware = Shared Resources
- Exploitable Side Channels

Side-Channel Attack Overview



# **Ciphertext Side Channels**

# **Deterministic Encryption**

- Fixing at One Memory Cell
- ✤ Identical Plaintexts → Ciphertexts Location



PT: Plaintext

# **Dictionary and Collision Attacks**

- Dictionary Attacks
  - All Possible CTs Observed
  - CT-PT Relations Inferred
- Collision Attacks
  - ➢ Before/After a Memory Write
  - Identical vs. Different CTs

cswap(p, q, b): c = ~(b - 1); // b = 0 -> c = 00...00 t = c & (p ^ q); p ^= t; q ^= t;

(a) Constant-time swap of p and q, depending on bit b.

	Ciphertext of p		
b	before cswap	after cswap	
0	e4c80f2a	e4c80f2a	
1	e4c80f2a	aa2f2a61	

(b) Ciphertext of p, before and after calling cswap.

# CipherH vs. Cipherfix

### Patching Ciphertext Side-Channels

- At the Software Level
  - > AMD SEV cannot afford hardware patches.
- In Constant-Time Crypto Software
  - ➢ Different Secrets → Identical Control Flows + Memory Cells Accessed
- CipherH for Side-Channel Detection
  - ➤ USENIX Security 2023
- Cipherfix for Side-Channel Mitigation
  - ➤ USENIX Security 2023

# Approaches

Paper	CipherH	Cipherfix
Stage 1	Dynamic Taint Analysis, Instrumented at the LLVM-IR Level	Dynamic Taint Analysis, Instrumented at the Binary Level
Outputs	Tainted Functions	Tainted Memory Accesses (Instructions + Addresses)
Stage 2	Intra-procedural Symbolic Execution +	Masking the Tainted Memory Writes
Outputs	Vulnerable Instructions	Protected Software Binary

### Authors

- CipherH Authors
  - ➤ ≈ CipherLeaks Authors
  - > ≈  $\frac{1}{2}$  Authors of the S&P'22 Follow-up
- Cipherfix Authors
  - > ≈  $\frac{1}{2}$  Authors of the S&P'22 Follow-up
- Advantages
  - ➤ Knowing Ciphertext Side Channels Better
  - ➤ More Familiar with Implementations: e.g., CipherH
  - Expensive & Uncommon AMD EPYC Processors, with Root Privileges

# CipherH

# Automated Detection of Ciphertext Side-channel Vulnerabilities in Cryptographic Implementations



[1] CIPHERH: Automated Detection of Ciphertext Side-channel Vulnerabilities in Cryptographic Implementations

16

 $\forall k_1, k_2 \in K, W_1(k_1) = W_2(k_2)$ 

### Path Constraint

 $\exists k_1, k_2, k'_1, k'_2 \in K, W_1(k_1) = W_2(k_2) \land W_1(k'_1) \neq W_2(k'_2)$ 

 $\exists k_1, k_2, k_1', k_2' \in K, W_1(k_1) = W_2(k_2) \land W_1(k_1') \neq W_2(k_2') \land C$ 

- Unsafe Case: two different executions following the same path
  - > In one execution, the two memory writes give identical ciphertexts.
  - > In the other, the two memory writes give different ciphertexts.
- Some program may not cover all two memory accesses
- C = Conjunction of All Branch Conditions: from program entry to the second memory write.
  - > If C contains only public symbols, two executions mentioned above follow the same path.
  - If C contains secret symbols, secret symbol k is renamed and constraint solver will search for secrets used by two executions.

#### **Evaluation/Weakness**

Implementation Algorith	Algorithm	Ont	Intraprocedural Symbolic Execution		Interprocedural Symbolic Execution		Function
Implementation	Algorithm	Opt.	(Vulnerable/Analyzed) Functions	Vulnerable Program Points	(Vulnerable/Analyzed) Functions	Vulnerable Program Points	(Tainted/Covered)
WolfSSL 5.3.0	ECDSA	-02	3/53	6	1/2	12	53/92
WolfSSL 5.3.0	RSA	-02	3/30	14	3/5	30	30/78
OpenSSL 3.0.2	ECDSA	-03	4/68	6	4/11	29	68/1061
OpenSSL 3.0.2	RSA	-03	9/142	53	11/38	55	142/1296
MbedTLS 3.1.0	ECDH	-02	2/37	2	2/5	5	37/87
MbedTLS 3.1.0	RSA	-02	2/39	2	4/7	22	39/83
Te	otal		23/369	83	25/68	153	369/ 2697

- Inter-procedural → False Positives in Some Cases
  - <u>142</u> findings are true positives out of <u>153</u> findings (142/153)
  - They had <u>9 false positives</u> (9/153)
- Manual Checking For intra-procedural, we use automated process, but for inter-procedural, the developers have to check manually
- Would be problematic if no prior experience or if the library is too big

# Cipherfix

# Mitigating Ciphertext Side-Channel Attacks in Software

#### How do we encrypt memory randomly?



	AES	
FAST	2.4x	
BASE	3.9x	
ENHANCED	5.1x	

**CF-Enhanced** reduces collisions by guaranteeing that all data and masks are at least length-*w*'.

Smaller memory accesses will be modified to access surrounding bytes.

[2] Cipherfix: Mitigating Ciphertext Side-Channel Attacks in Software

# Cipherfix process



#### Pros

- Apply a random mask to each memory write.
- Binary-Level
  Implementation
  - Static + Dynamic
  - Compilation Not Required

### Cons

- Assumption: The control flow does not depend on secrets.
- Large Runtime Overhead
- CF-Fast/Base is not as secure as CF-Enhanced.
  - Mask Collision

# Readings

### **Questions/Feedback?**

- CipherLeaks [USENIX Security 2021]
  - Ciphertext (CT) Side Channels Found
- A Systematic Look at Ciphertext Side Channels on AMD SEV-SNP
  - ➢ Follow-up of CipherLeaks [IEEE S&P 2022]
- [1] CipherH [USENIX Security 2023]
  - Automated CT Side-Channel Detection
- [2] Cipherfix [USENIX Security 2023]
  - Automated CT Side-Channel Mitigation