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Motivation

The Eternal War in Memory*

Example bug: **Heartbleed**
...allows attackers to eavesdrop on communications, steal data directly from the services and users and to impersonate services and users.

Yet another memory safety bug!

DARPA CRASH

If you could revise the fundamental principles of computer-system design to improve security…

...what would you change?
Principle of least privilege

Every program and every privileged user of the system should operate using the least amount of privilege necessary to complete the job.

Saltzer 1974 - CACM 17(7)
Saltzer and Schroeder 1975 - Proc. IEEE 63(9)
Needham 1972 - AFIPS 41(1)
Principle of least privilege (2)

• Access control
  • Minimize privileges held by users (and hence their processes) in accordance to policy

• Fault tolerance
  • Limit the impact of software/hardware faults

• Vulnerability and Trojan mitigation
  • Constrain rights gained as a result of software supply-chain compromise (Karger IEEE S&P 1987)
  • Motivation for sandboxing, privilege separation, and software compartmentalization used to mitigate vulnerabilities in contemporary applications
Architectural least privilege

- Classical buffer-overflow attack
  - Buggy code overruns a buffer, overwriting an on-stack return address
  - Overwritten return address is loaded and jumped to, corrupting control flow

- Why did we allow these privileges:
  - Ability to overrun the buffer?
  - Ability to inject a code pointer that can be used as a jump target?
  - Ability to execute data as code?

- Wouldn’t eliminate the bug – but would provide effective vulnerability mitigation
Software compartmentalization decomposes software into isolated compartments that are delegated limited rights. Able to mitigate not only unknown vulnerabilities, but also as-yet undiscovered classes of vulnerabilities/exploits!
Application-level least privilege (2)
Code-centred compartmentalisation

- Compartmentalization options for software describe a **compartmentalization space**
  - Each trade off security against performance and programming complexity
- But MMU-based processes are problematic:
  - Poor spatial protection granularity
  - Limited simultaneous-process scalability
  - Multi-address-space programming model
REVISITING RISC
IN AN AGE OF RISK
CTS RD: Revisiting the hardware-software interface for security

Oct. 2011: Capability microkernel runs sandbox on FPGA

Jun. 2012: CheriBSD capability context switching

Nov. 2012: Sandboxed code on CheriBSD; trojan mitigation demo

Dec. 2013: Lightweight CheriBSD domain switching

Nov. 2014: tcpdump uses multiple domain switches per packet

Sep. 2015: CheriABI helloworld

Oct. 2010: Project starts

Nov. 2011: FPGA tablet + microkernel

May 2012: FPGA prototype + FreeBSD

April 2013: multi-FPGA CheriCloud

Jun. 2015: 128-bit LLVM and CheriBSD

Jul. 2014: ‘fat capabilities’ first ISA and FPGA prototype

Jun. 2015: 128-bit “candidate 3” FPGA prototype

ACM CCS 2015: program analysis, compartmentalization

Nov. 2015: 128-bit Cheri ISAv4 specification

LAW 2010: capabilities revisited

RESoLVE 2012: hybrid capability-system model

ISCA 2014: hybrid MMU/capability model, architecture

ASPLOS 2015: C-language compatibility

IEEE S&P 2015: operating systems, compartmentalization
Guiding design principles

- De-conflate virtualization and protection using a hybrid model
  - Hybrid capability-system model
  - Memory Management Unit (MMU) protects virtual addresses
  - Capabilities protect pointers – “unforgeable tokens of authority”
- RISC approach – keep instructions simple, targeted at compilers
  - C-language pointers map cleanly into ISA-level capabilities
  - Tags, bounds, permissions, monotonicity, sealing protect pointers
  - Spatial safety protects against many pointer-misuse vulnerabilities
  - Temporal safety protects against many memory re-use attacks
  - Scalable compartmentalization for exploit-independent mitigation
- Target: C-language TCBs – OS kernels, language runtimes, …
CHERI architectural elements

- **Tagged memory** tags capability-sized words in DRAM as pointers
- **Capability register file** holds in-use capabilities (pointers)
- **Program counter capability** extends program counter
- **Default data capability** ($ddc$) controls legacy MIPS loads/stores
- **NB**: System control registers are also extended – e.g., $epc \rightarrow epcc, TLB
Pointers today

- Pointers are **integer virtual addresses**
  - Pointers (usually) point into *allocations, mappings*
  - **Derived** from other pointers via integer arithmetic
  - **Dereferenced** via jump, load, store
- **No integrity protection**: easily accidentally/maliciously overwritten
- **Arithmetic errors** lead to out-of-bounds memory leaks/overwrites
- **Inappropriate pointer use** – e.g., executable data, format strings
Tags for integrity and provenance

- **Tags on capability registers** indicate a valid capability
  - **Dereferencing** an untagged capability throws an exception
- **Tagged memory** holds tags when capabilities are loaded/stored
  - Capabilities can be **embedded** within data structures
- Tags track **pointer provenance**:
  - Tag is set in **primordial capabilities**
  - **Valid capability manipulations** maintain tag
  - **Data stores** to in-memory capabilities clear tags
• **Capability bounds** restrict access to a range of memory
  - **Base, length, and base-relative offset**
  - Pointer can float within bounds – and beyond
• **Set bounds** instruction subsets a current range
  - Used by heap, stack **allocators** – but also for explicit subsetting
• **Out-of-bounds dereference** throws a hardware exception
Permissions

- Permissions limit how a pointer may be dereferenced
  - Load, store, instruction fetch (and others)
  - E.g., cannot jump to a data pointer, write to a code pointer
- Permission mask instruction reduces permissions
- Unauthorized dereference throws a hardware exception

Virtual address space
• Capability instructions and tags implement **guarded manipulation**

• **Pointer provenance:** pointers must be derived from other pointers

• **Monotonicity:** cannot increase rights associated with a capability
  • **Bounds** can be narrowed but not widened
  • **Permissions** can be cleared but not set

• Data received over the network cannot be interpreted as a pointer

• Heap pointers cannot be manipulated to allow access other heap objects
Sealed capabilities

- **Sealed bit** provides **strong encapsulation**
  - Enforce a **TCB-defined calling convention**
  - Sealed capabilities are **immutable, cannot be dereferenced**
- **Object types** atomically link multiple capabilities
  - **Object capabilities** pair **code and data capabilities**
  - Foundation for secure **hardware-software object invocation**
256-bit architectural capabilities

• **CHERI capabilities** are **fat pointers** with **strong integrity**
  - **Tags** protect integrity; can’t dereference invalid capability
  - **Bounds** limit range of address space accessible via pointer
  - **Permissions** limit operations – e.g., load, store, instruction fetch
  - **Guarded manipulation** enforces monotonic rights decrease

• **Architectural** description not the **micro-architectural** implementation
128-bit micro-architectural capabilities

- Exchange **bounds precision** for **register size**, **cache footprint**
  - **Floating-point**(-like) bounds relative to pointer
  - Must support **out-of-bound C pointers** – unlike prior schemes
  - Must retain **monotonicity** for safe delegation!
  - Care required with **security-imprecision trade offs**
- DRAM tag density from 0.4% to 0.8% of memory size
- Fully functioning prototype with software stack on FPGA
Architectural least privilege

**CHERI memory protection:**
- Eliminates out-of-bounds accesses
- Prevents injected data being used as a code or data pointer
- Data pointers cannot be used as branch or jump targets
- Efficiently implements least privilege, mitigating as-yet undiscovered attack techniques and software trojans

While:
- Retaining current programming languages and models
- Supporting incremental deployment
## Virtual memory and capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Virtual Memory</th>
<th>Capabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protects</td>
<td>Virtual addresses and pages</td>
<td>References (pointers) to C code, data structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>MMU, TLB</td>
<td>Capability registers, tagged memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>TLB, page tables, lookups, shootdowns</td>
<td>Per-pointer overhead, context switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compartment scalability</td>
<td>Tens to hundreds</td>
<td>Thousands or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain crossing</td>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>Function calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimization goals</td>
<td>Isolation, full virtualization</td>
<td>Memory sharing, frequent domain transitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHERI hybridizes these models: pick two!**
Binary and source-code compatibility

- MIPS code lives side-by-side with CHERI code
- Incremental adoption – e.g., return addresses, stack pointers, heap pointers, by type, etc.
Software deployment models

Hybrid MMU-capability models: protection and compartmentalization within virtual address spaces

Single-address-space systems are possible but not our focus
COMPARTMENTALIZATION
CheriBSD object capabilities

- In-process object-capability model
- Protection domain
  - Capability register file, transitive closure over reachable in-memory capabilities
- Domain transition
  - Register transformation within a thread
  - libcheri implements classes, objects
- Encapsulation, mutual distrust
- Objects are pairs of sealed code and data capabilities with identical types
- Capability arguments / return values allow memory and object references to be delegated efficiently
Object-capability call and return

- **Initial object** has ambient authority to full address space and system calls
- **Compartmentalization runtime** constructs object with explicitly delegated rights
- **Synchronous function-call-like CCall/CReturn** supports current application/library interfaces
- **Trusted stack** stitches together stacks of mutually distrusting objects
- **CCall/CReturn ABI** clears unused registers to prevent data/capability leakage between objects
Application implications

**Pros**

- Single address-space programming model
- Referential integrity matches programmer model
- Only modest work to insert protection-domain boundaries
- Objects permit mutual distrust
- Constant (low) overhead relative to function calls even with large memory flows

**Cons**

- Still have to reason about the security properties
- Shared memory is more subtle than copy semantics
- Capability overhead in data cache is real and measurable
- ABI subtleties between MIPS and CHERI compiled code
- Lower overhead raises further cache side-channel concerns
VALIDATION AND REFINEMENT
CTSRD: Revisiting the hardware-software interface for security

Oct. 2010: Project starts

Oct. 2011: Capability microkernel runs sandbox on FPGA

Jun. 2012: CheriBSD capability context switching

Jul. 2012: LLVM generates CHERI code

Nov. 2012: Sandboxed code on CheriBSD; trojan mitigation demo

Dec. 2013: Lightweight CheriBSD domain switching

Jun. 2014: CHERI + CheriBSD + LLVM

Aug. 2014: tcpdump uses multiple domain switches per packet

Sep. 2015: CheriABI helloworld

Oct. 2015: CHERI ISA specification

Nov. 2015: 128-bit FPGA CheriCloud prototype

Oct. 2016: 'fat capabilities' first ISA and FPGA prototype

LAW 2010: capabilities revisited

RESolVE 2012: hybrid capability-system model

ISCA 2014: hybrid MMU/capability model, architecture

ASPLoS 2015: C-language compatibility

IEEE S&P 2015: operating systems, compartmentalization

ACM CCS 2015: program analysis, compartmentalization
**CHERI II experimental prototype**

**Hardware:**
- 64-bit MIPS + CHERI ISA extensions
- Formal ISA model (in Cambridge L3)
- BSV HDL prototypes (FPGA target)
- Pipelined, L1/L2 caches, MMU, multicore
- Capability extensions, tagged memory
- 256-bit and 128-bit prototypes

**Software:**
- CheriBSD operating system
- CHERI clang/LLVM compiler
- Adapted applications
- Open-source HW and SW
• **Capability coprocessor** provides capability registers, instructions

• $ddc, pcc$ interpose on **MIPS** load/store ISA, instruction fetch

• Processing ‘before’ MMU makes capabilities **address-space relative**

• **Tag controller** associates tags with in-memory capabilities

• Our implementation: **memory partitioned**, with a region holding all tags
Demo Tablet Platform

Terasic DE-4 tablet hosting 100MHz CHERI processor, CheriBSD OS
Pointer-intensive benchmarks for pure-capability code (worst case)

- Primary cost: D-cache footprint from pointer-size increase
- Cycles overhead vs. data-size parameter (range of working-set sizes)
  - 8.1% - 80.1% 256-bit capabilities
  - 2.5% - 24.3% 128-bit capabilities
- “In the noise” for Dhrystone & tcpdump (256-bit capabilities)
- Other security/performance options – e.g., only return-address capabilities
Sandboxing: Domain-switching overhead

cycles overhead

- 1: socket
- 2: pipe
- 3: shm mem + pipe
- 4: shm mem + sem
- 5: pthread + sem
- 6: invoke
- 7: func

payload/bytes

process-based separation approaches

Inter-thread baseline

cheri domain X

Function-call baseline
Library compartmentalization

- Compartmentalize within libraries without disturbing public API/ABI
- Allows unmodified applications to benefit from compartmentalization of key system classes/libraries
- Memory-based APIs are extremely inefficient to pass between processes
- Very efficient between CHERI compartments as pointers delegate memory access
CHERI papers (1)

- **ISCA 2014**: Fine-grained, in-address-space memory protection
  - Deconflate virtualization and protection
  - Hybrid model adds capabilities while retaining an MMU
  - Capabilities: pointers with tags, permissions, bounds
  - Manual annotations protect selected stack/heap pointers
  - C-language TCBs: OSes, language runtimes, etc.

- **ASPLOS 2015**: Explore and refine C-language compatibility
  - Converge fat-pointer and capability models
  - Binary-compatibility models and C compilation
  - Large-scale software study of C-language compatibility
CHERI papers (2)

• **Oakland 2015**: Hybrid hardware-software compartmentalization
  - **Sealed capabilities** and **object types**
  - Hardware-enforced **object-capability model**
  - Efficient, in-address-space **HW-SW domain transition**
• **ACM CCS 2015**: Compartmentalization modeling and analysis
  - **Conceptual model** for software compartmentalization
  - **LLVM-based static analysis tools** to analyze compartmentalized designs to validate security goals
  - **Annotations** for security goals, compartments, sensitive data, vendor information, past vulnerabilities, …
• **Analyses** of Chromium, OpenSSH; KDE compartmentalization
CHERI technical reports

• **Capability Hardware Enhanced RISC Instructions: CHERI Instruction-Set Architecture.** (UCAM-CL-TR-876).
  - ISA v4 released in November 2015
  - Experimental 128-bit capabilities, domain-switching optimisations, further C-language support; also chapters on protection model

  - New document released in November 2015
  - Compiler, OS internals
Current R&D directions

- Improve architecture, micro-architectural performance
  - Converge register files, 128-bit “compressed” capabilities
  - Opcode footprint reduction through ISA load/store reuse
- Explore and mature software security and development models
  - Compiler, linker, and ABI refinement
  - Control-Flow Integrity (CFI)
  - Compartmentalization programming models
  - Selected system calls within compartments (a la Capsicum)
  - Complete pure-capability CheriBSD implementation
  - Temporal safety (e.g., accurate C garbage collection)
Broader implications

- Model is applicable to other RISC ISAs – ARMv8, RISC-V, etc.
  - Some design decisions are ‘deep’ – e.g., tags, monotonicity
  - Others are ‘shallow’ – e.g., separate vs. merged register files
- Many incremental SW paths, security/performance tradeoffs
  - Deploy for some or all data or code pointers? (e.g., stack, CFI)
  - Deploy in key class libraries – no need to recompile applications
- Kernel compartmentalization (i.e., microkernels)
- Language runtimes / JIT: Java, Javascript, memory safety
- Reduce protection pressure on the TLB/page-table system
  - Opportunity for large page sizes as physical memory grows toward petabytes (e.g. HP’s, “The Machine”)
Conclusions

• RISC ISA and CPU design implement capability model

• In-address-space pointers become capabilities
  • Complements MMU-based virtual memory
  • Fine-grained memory protection for code, data
  • Scalable compartmentalization
  • Strong compatibility with C-Language TCBs

• Open-source implementation, ISA specification: http://www.cheri-cpu.org/