

# A First Practical Fully Homomorphic Crypto-Processor Design

The Secret Computer is Nearly Here

Peter Breuer

Email: Peter.T.Breuer@gmail.com

Jonathan Bowen

London South Bank University

London, UK

Email: jpbowen@gmail.com

**Abstract**—Following a sequence of hardware designs for a fully homomorphic crypto-processor – a general purpose processor that natively runs encrypted machine code on encrypted data in registers and memory, resulting in encrypted machine states – proposed by the authors in 2014, we discuss a working prototype of the first of those, a so-called ‘pseudo-homomorphic’ design. This processor is in principle safe against physical or software-based attacks by the owner/operator of the processor on user processes running in it. The processor is intended as a more secure option for those emerging computing paradigms that require trust to be placed in computations carried out in remote locations or overseen by untrusted operators.

The prototype has a single-pipeline superscalar architecture that runs OpenRISC standard machine code in two distinct modes. The processor runs in the encrypted mode (the unprivileged, ‘user’ mode, with a long pipeline) at 60-70% of the speed in the unencrypted mode (the privileged, ‘supervisor’ mode, with a short pipeline), emitting a completed encrypted instruction every 1.67-1.8 cycles on average in real trials.

## I. INTRODUCTION

IN 2013, the authors published theory [1] showing that if the arithmetic in a standard processor is modified appropriately, then, given three provisos detailed below, the processor continues to operate correctly, but all the states obtained in the processor and memory are encryptions of the states obtained in an unmodified processor running the same program. That is a rather unintuitive result, given the common experience that modifying a computer program even slightly, or even a slight bug in an arithmetic library – or worse, in a hardware unit – gives rise to catastrophically different program results. Nevertheless, it is so, as the 2013 paper proved, and a second paper in 2014 [2] set out several routes to implementation. However, the provisos referred to above are not trivial, and represent engineering challenges to be overcome on the way to a practical product. In this paper we report on a completed prototype that implements one of the first and simplest of the options discussed in [2], which, following the nomenclature there, will be referred to as KPU (‘krypto processor unit’) designs. The KPU designs work by modifying arithmetic, and the outcome is a processor in which user mode processes run with encrypted data in memory, in registers, and on busses. In principle, the operator physically in charge of the processor can see only encrypted data with physical probes, while supervisor mode processes,

which run unencrypted within the processor, likewise can see only encrypted user data with software probes. The KPU therefore has relevance to running securely in the Cloud, or for tamper-proofing computing machinery such as voting or banking machines in physically remote locations.

**The first proviso** is that *the modified arithmetic within the processor of a KPU must be a ‘homomorphic image’ of ordinary computer arithmetic*. That does not imply that within the processor merely some 1-to-1 rearrangement of the conventional (2s complement) encoding of numbers in 32-bit binary has been effected. In principle, an arbitrary 1-to-n encryption, such as Rijndael-64 [3] with 32 bits of padding under the encryption, may be chosen. The block size of the encryption  $\mathcal{E}$  (64 bits for Rijndael-64) must coincide with the register size and physical memory word size in the processor, so using a 256-bit encryption means designing for 256-bit registers and memory busses, etc, but apart from that the choice of encryption is up to the designer.

However, the ‘homomorphic image’ property boils down to mathematical constraints  $\mathcal{E}(x + y) = f(\mathcal{E}(x), \mathcal{E}(y))$  and other relations set out in [1], which specify what the encrypted output  $\mathcal{E}(x + y)$  from the modified arithmetic logic unit (ALU) in the processor must be when the encrypted inputs  $\mathcal{E}(x)$  and  $\mathcal{E}(y)$  are presented, so the designer will choose an encryption that achieves a satisfactory trade-off between the security of  $\mathcal{E}$  and the feasibility of implementing an appropriate function  $f$  in hardware. We will return to this topic below, but we note at this point that the requirement is formally weaker than classical expressions of homomorphism in encryption, which have  $\mathcal{E}(x + y) = \mathcal{E}(x) + \mathcal{E}(y)$ . That is not quite a question of ‘what is in a name’ as to whether the function is called ‘ $f$ ’ or ‘+’; it emphasizes that the designer is not obliged to co-opt the familiar ‘+’ for  $f$ .

**The second proviso** has to do with memory addressing in the KPU and the kind of programs that can run in it. Because data addresses look no different from other numbers, and are produced dynamically in the course of a program, for example by adding an offset to a base address, in the KPU designs of [2], *data addresses are encrypted* exactly as other data is. However, *program addresses are not encrypted* because the program counter in any processor is most often advanced by a constant (the length of an instruction in bytes) at each tick of




Fig. 1. A 32-bit processor arithmetic logic unit (ALU) modified for encrypted operation (ALU') with a 64 bit block size by the addition of decryption units (D) on the inputs and an encryption unit (E) on the output.

the clock. That would allow an attack against the encryption, if the same encryption were used for program addresses as for data addresses. The simplest solution, adopted by all the KPU designs in [2], is not to encrypt program addresses at all.

In consequence, *running programs must never combine program addresses with ordinary data values*. A conforming program may not perform arithmetic computations on program addresses. In other words, it must never jump to a subroutine whose address is the square root of Elvis's birthdate written backwards. Programs that are written to respect the distinction between the two types are called *crypto-safe* in [4], where a formal type-system for machine code is set out that ensures machine code programs may run successfully in a KPU.

That appears restrictive because, for example, dynamic loaders and linkers compute program addresses at run time and they will not be able to. However, the restriction only applies to a KPU running in the encrypted mode of operation, and the designs in [2] envisage that it runs encrypted in the (unprivileged) 'user' mode while the (privileged) 'supervisor' mode runs unencrypted. That allows dynamic loaders to operate successfully in the conventional way in supervisor mode.

**The third proviso** referred to in the first paragraph of this article is due to the fact that many different binary codes may be generated during execution for what the programmer intended to be the same memory address, as a consequence of the encryption of memory addresses and the 1-to-n nature of good encryptions. All the KPU designs in [2] treat memory as a possible adversary that should not be privy to the encryption, so there is no way for the memory unit to know that these different encryptions should all alias the same data. That gives rise in programming terms to *hardware aliasing*, in that the same address (as seen by a program running under the encryption) sporadically accesses different data. To avoid it, *programs have to be compiled following a particular style* [5]–[7]. The 'trick' depends on the processor being deterministic at bottom in all things, including calculation of the encrypted addresses. So to reproduce a particular encrypted address exactly it suffices to store it for recovery later, or to repeat exactly the calculation that produced it in the first place. Making use of those two coding strategies, compilation for the KPU works (we have modified the GNU gcc 4.9.1 compiler and




Fig. 2. A 16-bit encrypted arithmetic logic unit (ALU') embedding 8GB arithmetic tables for each of  $n$  operators.

assembler port for the OpenRISC 1.1 architecture (opencores.org/or1k/Architecture\_Specification) to suit; the source code is at [sf.net/p/or1k64kpu-gcc](http://sf.net/p/or1k64kpu-gcc) and [sf.net/p/or1k64kpu-binutils](http://sf.net/p/or1k64kpu-binutils) respectively).

Of the KPU design options set out in [2], the three that are relevant to our prototype are:

a) *Pseudo-homomorphic* : Instead of using an encryption with special properties to achieve the necessary homomorphic property (proviso #1 above), or innovative hardware in the ALU, this is in concept an ordinary RISC [8] design with the standard ALU augmented only by encryption/decryption ('codec') units affixed inline to the inputs and the outputs (Fig. 1). That is an elegant design only from the mathematical point of view – we demonstrated formally in [1] that that design must work correctly, and in a pilot project in Java (see [sf.net/p/kpu](http://sf.net/p/kpu)) at the same time we constructed an object model of a standard pipelined RISC processor and dropped in an ALU modified with codecs 'fore and aft' as in Fig. 1 and verified experimentally that it operated as predicted. But the design (i) does not immediately offer speed (the encryption and decryption of data on every instruction lengthens the time to complete an instruction by a factor of twenty), (ii) does not appear to offer good prospects for physical security, since unencrypted data is being processed internally and encryption and decryption using keys is taking place.

b) *Lookup*: This design embeds the encrypted arithmetic tables for the ALU directly (Fig. 2). That obviates both the need for codecs and for keys (and corresponding questions of provision and safekeeping). However, the space requirement for as little as 16-bit operation is already considerable, and 20-bit operation is probably the limit with present technology (requiring access to Terabyte-sized RAM storage for each of the tables for operations such as addition or multiplication; note, however, that such motherboards are already available off the shelf – see for example the Supermicro Xeon 7000 -based range at [supermicro.com/products/motherboard/Xeon7000/](http://supermicro.com/products/motherboard/Xeon7000/)). One might consider increasing the number of bits by putting ALUs together in modular fashion, but aside from anything else that means memory hardware that offers multiple addressing for simultaneous retrieval, if the storage requirement is not

to multiply up with the number of modules. At most dual-port (read twice simultaneously) RAM is available at present, though quad-port RAM is not far off.

c) *Partially homomorphic*: The problem with the fully homomorphic encryption (FHE; homomorphic with respect to both addition and multiplication) first created by Gentry [9], [10] in 2009 and its subsequent improvements and improved implementations at IBM and elsewhere [11], [12] is that it runs at on the order of one bit-op per second, with approximately a million-bit block size, so it is quite impractical for use. Otherwise it would fit perfectly in a KPU design, requiring no modification of the ALU from standard as far as addition and multiplication go (division, shift right and the comparator relations would still require modification, however).

A half-way house towards an encryption that achieves the ‘homomorphic image’ requirement on its own account is a partially homomorphic encryption (PHE). RSA [13] is the canonical example, but it is homomorphic with respect to multiplication, in that  $\mathcal{E}(x*y) = \mathcal{E}(x)*\mathcal{E}(y)$ , which is not very convenient. The Pallier encryption [14] is additively homomorphic instead, which lends itself much more easily to use in a KPU. The idea would be to implement addition in the modified ALU as standard addition over the Pallier encryption, making use of its homomorphic property,  $\mathcal{E}(x+y) = \mathcal{E}(x) + \mathcal{E}(y)$ , to implement the other standard ALU operations, multiplication, division, etc, in terms of addition.

Unfortunately, that is mathematically impossible. However, a single extra look-up table for the signs of encrypted numbers makes it possible. The explanation is that the single operation ‘if  $(x > k_0 \ \& \ y > k_1 \ \& \ \dots)$  then  $x \leftarrow K_1, y \leftarrow K_2, \dots$ ’ is computationally complete – this is the only statement form in Conway’s famous Fractran programming language [15] –, and that may be implemented given the homomorphic addition plus table of signs, then all the other (encrypted) operations of the ALU may be implemented in terms of it, either directly in hardware or as software routines. Indeed, an encrypted processor based on a stack machine model (instead of the von Neumann model) with the Fractran statement as its only non-control machine instruction, together with a 16-bit Pallier crypto-system plus table of signs is described in [16], so we have confirmation that the Pallier system plus table of signs is feasible. A functional difference between the KPUs discussed here and the stack machine of [16] is that the latter does not experience hardware aliasing (see proviso #3 above), since no (encrypted) memory addresses are involved (stack ‘addresses’ are explicit unencrypted offsets from the bottom of the stack, essentially individual local variable names). However, stack machines are not generally implemented directly in hardware, and it would be unwise to expect that interfacing one with all the i/o interrupts, caches, busses and other paraphernalia found on board a modern processor would be easy. A 1 Terabyte table of signs is enough to feed a 43-bit Pallier encryption, however, no matter whether the encrypted processor is a stack machine or von Neumann design.

Moreover, there is a technique set out in [2] that in principle ‘cubes the security’, while only tripling the storage

requirement. The idea (‘ABC typing’) is to encrypt each of the elements  $f(a, b) = c$  of an encrypted calculation using a different encryption. That is  $a = \mathcal{E}_A(x)$ ,  $b = \mathcal{E}_B(y)$ ,  $c = \mathcal{E}_C(z)$ . The compiler can generate code that respects this type discipline and the processor ALU can be designed to implement it. While an attacker may guess the key for encryption A, say, in order to know he/she is right about A, the keys for encryptions B and C must also be guessed. Only then can the attacker confirm that an observed  $c$  encrypts  $z$  that is the sum of  $x$  and  $y$ . If the keyspace for each of encryptions A, B and C is size 43 bits, then  $3 \times 43 = 129$  bits of keyspace must be searched overall. The technique is readily applied when the function  $f$  is implemented via lookup table, requiring three lookup tables instead of one (inputs of type A and B, B and C, C and A respectively are valid). In the case when the  $f$  is the Pallier system addition, since the Pallier partial homomorphism may be ‘upgraded’ to fully homomorphic by a lookup table of signs (the homomorphic multiplication then being implemented by a software routine) the technique described by Gentry in [9] for changing from one FHE to another without decryption may be applied (essentially: run the decryption algorithm of one over the other’s encryption, using the second’s encryption of the first’s key).

Another technique discussed in [2] and applicable to all design solutions is to encrypt each bit of data differently. A 16-bit lookup-table solution for a 1-bit processor becomes a  $32 \times 16$ -bit lookup-table solution for 32-bit operation, requiring also 16-to-16-bit translation tables between 1-bit ALU modules. But the technique does not improve security beyond 16 bits, because the arithmetic of the least significant bit can be attacked independently, then the second bit can be attacked, and so on, so we will not consider that direction here.

**The prototype described in this paper** implements option (a) above, the ‘pseudo-homomorphic’ option. Option (b), a lookup table-based solution, is not viable at present, because too much memory is required for acceptable security. Option (c), using the Pallier or similar partially homomorphic cryptosystem, also still needs a Terabyte-size table of signs for even 43 bit encryption, which is also not sufficiently secure for general use. The enhancements using ABC typing discussed above would improve the numbers, but it is still the subject of research. To be acceptable for, say, banking applications, right now a pseudo-homomorphic solution using a standard  $n$ -bit encryption best fits the bill. Moreover,  $n$  can conveniently be adjusted from one prototype to another in line with hardware resources, matching register size and bus width.

The objections to a pseudo-homomorphic solution are those already noted: (i) it is slow, (ii) it is physically vulnerable. However, (ii) is an objection already overcome [17] by Smartcard manufacturers, who overlay parts of their chips that contain keys and encryption apparatus with delicate traces that cause the chip to fail if disrupted by a physical probe, so it is not an insuperable objection. Memory does not contain unencrypted user data in a KPU, so it is not vulnerable to ‘cold boot’ [18]–[20] attacks either (essentially, physically freezing the memory sticks in order to retain an image of the

DRAM contents even without power), and only the processor chip needs Smartcard-like protection. As to (i), we have been able to innovate in the architecture design so as to achieve in encrypted running 60-70% of the speed in unencrypted running, with an encrypted instruction being completed every 1.67-1.8 cycles, as described below.

## II. ARCHITECTURE

The prototype KPU is based on the OpenRISC 1.1 32/64 bit architecture and instruction set specification ([opencores.org/or1k/Architecture\\_Specification](http://opencores.org/or1k/Architecture_Specification)). It runs instructions uniformly 32 bits in length on 32- or 64-bit data stored in memory and registers. Encrypted data physically occupies 64 bits, but it contains only 32 bits of meaningful data when decrypted.

In user mode, the processor runs on encrypted data and executes only the 32-bit instruction set (i.e., those instructions that target 32-bit data). A 64-bit instruction run in user mode raises an ‘illegal instruction’ exception. As per the OpenRISC specification, user mode instructions access all 32 general purpose registers (GPRs), and also a very few permitted special purpose registers (SPRs). Attempts to write ‘out of bounds’ SPRs are ignored in user mode and zero is read.

In supervisor mode the processor may execute either 32- or 64-bit instructions and access to registers is unrestricted. There is no enforced division of memory into ‘supervisor’ and ‘user’ parts, so a supervisor mode process can read user data from memory, but the user data will be in encrypted form.

OpenRISC instructions divide into two kinds: ‘immediate’ instructions, which carry 16 bits of data in the (32-bit) instruction itself, and ‘register’ instructions, which do not. The immediate instructions are problematic in user mode because we want them to carry data in encrypted form. But encrypted data takes up 64 bits and an instruction is only 32 bits long, so it does not fit. To solve this problem, a *prefix* instruction has been added to the instruction set. An immediate instruction will be preceded in the instruction stream by two prefix instructions, each carrying a 24-bit segment of the encrypted datum, and the immediate instruction itself carries only the final 16-bit segment. Those OpenRISC immediate instructions that are supposed to carry fewer than 16 bits of data (register shifts and rotations each carry 5 or 6 bits) have been respecified to contain exactly 16 bits of data.

The instruction pipeline in (unencrypted) supervisor mode is the standard short 5-stage fetch, decode, read, execute, write pipeline expected of a RISC processor [8], except that it is physically embedded in a longer pipeline that is traversed in full by (encrypted) user mode instructions. The pipeline is configured in two different ways for the user mode instructions as shown in Fig. 3 (the hardware for those stages with two different configurations is doubled). The reason is that, in order to reduce the frequency with which codecs are brought into action for user mode instructions, ALU operation is effectively *extended in the time dimension*, so that it covers a series of consecutive (encrypted) arithmetic operations in user mode. Only the beginning of the series is associated with a decryption event, when encrypted data in memory or registers




Fig. 3. Physically the same pipeline is configured in two different ways, ‘A’ and ‘B’, for two different kinds of user mode instructions during encrypted working.

is converted, and only the end of the series is associated with an encryption event. Longer series mean less frequent codec use. It turns out that two pipeline configurations cover the needs of instruction processing when codec use is required.

The ‘A’ configuration is deployed when a store instruction puts an encrypted result into memory, or a load instruction decrypts incoming data from memory. The ‘B’ configuration is used when encrypted immediate data in an ‘add immediate’ instruction is read in. Instructions that do not exercise the codec pass through with the pipeline in ‘A’ configuration, because the early execution makes results available for early forwarding to instructions entering behind, avoiding pipeline stalls. The codec covers 10 stages in this implementation.

To support this mode of operation, the ALU possesses a private set of user-mode-only registers that shadow the GPRs (and the few SPRs accessible in user mode). These are intended to contain the decrypted version of the encrypted data in the ‘real’ GPRs and SPRs. They are mapped in during read and write stage of a user mode instruction, and mapped out for supervisor mode instructions, so they are unavailable to supervisor mode. This protocol automatically maintains the register entries in decrypted form in the shadow registers from one instruction to the next during user mode operation.

Additionally, a small user-mode-only data cache caches the unencrypted version of any encrypted data that is written to memory during user mode operation. On load from memory, this cache is checked first. Almost all execution stack reads in normal operation are intercepted by this mechanism. The cache is physically within the processor boundary, so will be covered by the measures that protect the processor chip from spying or interference (e.g., Smartcard-like fabrication).

Note that in the KPU, program addresses are unencrypted (as opposed to data addresses, which are encrypted), which potentially is a source of confusion in user mode, because unencrypted data is kept in shadow registers within the ALU, while encrypted data is passed to memory and the ‘real’ registers. A particular protocol addresses the issue: unencrypted 32-bit addresses zero-filled to 64 bits are regarded as the ‘encrypted’ form, and they are ‘decrypted’ to an ‘unencrypted’ form consisting of the same data with the top 16 bits of 64

rewritten to 0x7fff. Thus an instruction such as jump-and-link (JAL) in user mode, which fills the return address (RA) register with the program address of the next instruction, writes the zero-filled address to the RA shadow register, and the 0x7fff form to the real RA register. The padding under the encryption is always arranged so that real encrypted data avoids looking like either of these forms of program address.

In principle, encrypted addresses emanating from the KPU fall anywhere in the full 64-bit range (although the addresses under the encryption are 32-bit). Since no real machine ever has a full 64 bits-worth of memory available, conventionally address translation takes place within the memory management unit to a physically backed area of memory via a ‘translation look-aside buffer’ (TLB). However, the TLB is conventionally organised at page-sized granularities, saying where each 8KB-sized area of logical addressing should be translated to in physical addressing terms. That architecture is not appropriate for a KPU, because encrypted addresses are not clustered, if the encryption is any good. Instead, the KPU’s TLB must be organised with word-sized granularity. Further, all encrypted addresses generated in user mode are remapped by the TLB to a pre-set range with the allocation serially ordered by ‘first-come, first-served’. Since data that will later be accessed together tends also to be addressed for the first time in close sequence, this allows conventional cache lookahead policies to operate successfully.

Moreover, it has turned out to be possible in this ‘pseudo-homomorphic’ design to pass the unencrypted data address to the memory unit during the processing of load and store instructions, with no additional processing. We are nervous of the security implications, so we do not suggest that that should be done. However, the bare 32-bit address could be hashed or encrypted in a different way to 64 bits from there.

### III. PERFORMANCE

The OpenRISC ‘or1ksim’ simulator ([opencores.org/or1k/Or1ksim](http://opencores.org/or1k/Or1ksim)) has been modified to run the KPU prototype discussed here. The code comes with the OpenRISC specification-compliant exception conditions and actions built in, as well as a comprehensive set of peripheral devices, caches, buffers, etc. It contains a Verilog compiler backend as an alternative to direct execution in the simulator. The simulator was upgraded to 64 bit simulation from 32 bits (see [sf.net/p/or1ksim64ptb](http://sf.net/p/or1ksim64ptb)), following the OpenRISC 1.1 specification document at [opencores.org/or1k/Architecture\\_Specification#OpenRISC\\_1000\\_architecture\\_1.1](http://opencores.org/or1k/Architecture_Specification#OpenRISC_1000_architecture_1.1), and then the processor core simulation was changed to encode the pipeline discussed in this paper, with full forwarding of data between pipeline stages for instructions running in the same processor mode, and a branch prediction cache. Performance measurements on the simulator are made directly on the pipeline, and are not estimates. Supervisor mode and user mode are accounted separately, so comparisons between encrypted and unencrypted working are made on the same architecture. That modified simulator code is available from [sf.net/p/or1ksim64ptb](http://sf.net/p/or1ksim64ptb).

The processor instruction set tests from the or1ksim suite have been modified to run in a KPU. The original tests ran in supervisor mode, which would not have tested a KPU, in which supervisor mode is unencrypted. The assembler source code was rewritten to run in (encrypted) user mode instead, making system calls when access to data such as the state of the carry or overflow flags in the processor status register (SR) is required for the test reports. OpenRISC’s port of the GNU ‘gas’ assembler v2.24.51 has been modified to produce encrypted machine code for this KPU target and the modified source code is available at [sf.net/p/or1k64kpu-binutils/](http://sf.net/p/or1k64kpu-binutils/).

One question that modifying the testsuite has settled is whether or not it is possible to run encrypted code that does anything useful in a conventional sense. After all, local peripherals work unencrypted, without privy access to encryption mechanisms in the processor or elsewhere, so even output on the local display seems a priori to be problematic. Fortunately, the original or1ksim code is ‘tricked out’ with a special debugging no-op instruction that sidesteps the need to interact with an output peripheral and the testsuite uses it to do all its report I/O. The ‘trick’ no-op prints the contents of register r3 directly on the screen, and we have not had to do anything more for I/O other than maintain the use of those no-op instructions in the testsuite code. In user mode, the ALU’s shadow r3 register provides a decrypted value for printout, and in supervisor mode the value in the r3 register is unencrypted, so the testsuite printout is comprehensible to an observer.

Aside from printing, however, yes, it has been possible to write all the (thirty or forty) system calls for execution in supervisor mode that proved necessary. There are calls, for example, to blindly set or clear various SR flags that determine if an arithmetic overflow triggers an exception or not. System status flags that may be set in user mode are cleared by the hardware when changing to supervisor mode, so supervisor mode cannot get information from them (the flags are saved by the hardware in a special register to which supervisor mode has no access for recovery to user mode later), but that has not proved fatal to full reporting of the exception handling.

Table I displays the performance statistics summary from the modified instruction set add test (‘is-add-test’) of the or1ksim testsuite. The statically compiled executable contains 185628 machine code instructions, which occupy 742512 bytes in the 769454 byte executable, the rest being comprised of the executable file headers, symbol table, etc. Table I shows that when this test was run (successfully) to completion, 222006 instructions were executed, so there are few loops and subroutines (the code is largely built using assembler macros) in 315640 cycles. If one reckons with a 1GHz clock, then the speed was just over 700Kips (instructions per second) overall.

In supervisor mode, pipeline occupation is just under 90%, at 892Kips for a 1GHz clock (wait states, cycles in which the pipeline fails to complete an instruction, comprise 4.9% of the 45.2% total), which one may take as a baseline for a single pipeline superscalar design. In user mode pipeline occupation is only 54.9%, as measured by numbers of non-wait states, for 549Kips with a 1GHz clock. Measured against supervisor

TABLE I  
PERFORMANCE DATA, OR1K3SIM TESTSUITE INSTRUCTION SET ADD TEST.

@exit : cycles 315640, instructions 222006			
mode	user	super	
register instructions	0.2%	0.2%	
immediate instructions	7.3%	9.2%	
load instructions (cached)	0.9% ( 0.9%)	2.8%	
store instructions (cached)	0.9% ( 0.9%)	0.0%	
branch instructions	1.0%	4.9%	
jump instructions	1.1%	4.8%	
no-op instructions	6.4%	15.8%	
prefix instructions	11.5%	0.0%	
mf/tspr instructions	0.1%	2.7%	
sys/trap instructions	0.5%	0.0%	
wait states (stalls)	24.7% (22.1%)	4.9% ( 3.8%)	
(refills)	( 2.7%)	( 1.1%)	
total	54.8%	45.2%	

Branch Prediction Buffer			
hits	10328 ( 55%)	misses	8219 ( 44%)
right	8335 ( 44%)	right	6495 ( 35%)
wrong	1993 ( 10%)	wrong	1724 ( 9%)

User Data Cache			
read hits	2942 (99%)	misses	0 ( 0%)
write hits	2933 (99%)	misses	9 ( 0%)

mode, that is 61.6% of the unencrypted speed.

The wait states are caused by real data hazards in the pipeline. Most (84%) are due to a load instruction feeding directly to an arithmetic instruction. The stall occurs because the data address for the load instruction is only calculated in execute stage, so the data cannot at that time already be available to the instruction sitting in read stage just behind.

The data indicates that a dual pipeline might be beneficial, perhaps enabling speed over 70% of unencrypted running.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

A superscalar pipeline design for an encrypted processor has been described here, with performance measured at 60-70% of unencrypted processing while embedding a 10-cycle (Rijndael) 64-bit encryption. Registers, memory and busses contain encrypted data in this ‘pseudo-homomorphic’ design.

#### REFERENCES

[1] P. T. Breuer and J. P. Bowen, “A fully homomorphic crypto-processor design: Correctness of a secret computer,” in *Proc. Intl. Symp. on Engineering Secure Software and Systems (ESSoS 2013)*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, no. 7781. Springer, Heidelberg, Feb. 2013, pp. 123–138. [Online]. Available: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36563-8\\_9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36563-8_9)

[2] —, “Towards a working fully homomorphic crypto-processor: Practice and the secret computer,” in *Proc. Intl. Symp. on Engineering Secure Software and Systems (ESSoS 2014)*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, J. Jörjens, F. Pressens, and N. Bielova, Eds. Springer International Publishing, Feb. 2014, vol. 8364, pp. 131–140. [Online]. Available: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04897-0\\_9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04897-0_9)

[3] J. Daemen and V. Rijmen, *The Design of Rijndael: AES – The Advanced Encryption Standard*. Springer Verlag, 2002.

[4] P. T. Breuer and J. P. Bowen, “Typed assembler for a RISC crypto-processor,” in *Proc. Intl. Symp. on Engineering Secure Software and Systems (ESSoS 2012)*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, G. Barthe, B. Livshits, and R. Scandariato, Eds., no. 7159. Springer, Feb. 2012, pp. 22–29.

[5] —, “Certifying machine code safe from hardware aliasing: RISC is not necessarily risky,” in *Software Engineering and Formal Methods*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, S. Counsell and M. Núñez, Eds., no. 8368. Heidelberg: Springer International Publishing, 2014, pp. 371–388, proc. SEFM 2013 Collocated Workshops (OpenCert 2013). [Online]. Available: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05032-4\\_27](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05032-4_27)

[6] —, “Avoiding hardware aliasing: Verifying RISC machine and assembly code for encrypted computing,” in *Proc. 2nd IEEE Workshop on Reliability and Security Data Analysis (RSDA 2014), IEEE International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering Workshops (ISSREW) 2014*. Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Computer Society, Nov. 2014, pp. 365–370.

[7] P. T. Breuer, J. P. Bowen, and S. J. Pickin, “Processor rescue: Safe coding for hardware aliasing,” in *Proc. SoMeT 2015*, ser. Communications in Computer and Information Science, H. Fujita and G. Guizzi, Eds., no. 532. Springer International Publishing, Switzerland, Sep. 2015, pp. 137–148.

[8] D. A. Patterson, “Reduced instruction set computers,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 8–21, Jan. 1985.

[9] C. Gentry, “Fully homomorphic encryption using ideal lattices,” in *Proceedings of the Forty-first Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC ’09. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2009, pp. 169–178. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1536414.1536440>

[10] M. van Dijk, C. Gentry, S. Halevi, and V. Vaikuntanathan, “Fully homomorphic encryption over the integers,” Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2009/616, 2009, <http://eprint.iacr.org/>.

[11] C. Gentry and S. Halevi, “Implementing Gentry’s fully-homomorphic encryption scheme,” in *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2011*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, K. Paterson, Ed. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011, vol. 6632, pp. 129–148. [Online]. Available: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20465-4\\_9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20465-4_9)

[12] Z. Brakerski, C. Gentry, and V. Vaikuntanathan, “(leveled) fully homomorphic encryption without bootstrapping,” in *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, ser. ITCS ’12. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2012, pp. 309–325. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2090236.2090262>

[13] R. Rivest, A. Shamir, and L. Adleman, “A method for obtaining digital signatures and public-key cryptosystems,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 120–126, Feb. 1978.

[14] P. Paillier, “Public-key cryptosystems based on composite degree residuosity classes,” in *Advances in cryptology – EUROCRYPT’99*. Springer, 1999, pp. 223–238.

[15] J. H. Conway, “Fractran: A simple universal programming language for arithmetic,” in *Open Problems in Communication and Computation*. Springer, 1987, pp. 4–26.

[16] N. G. Tsoutsos and M. Maniatakos, “The HEROIC framework: Encrypted computation without shared keys,” *IEEE Trans. on CAD of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 875–888, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TCAD.2015.2419619>

[17] O. Kömmerling and M. G. Kuhn, “Design principles for tamper-resistant smartcard processors,” in *Smartcard ’99, Chicago, Illinois, USA, May 10-11, 1999*, May 1999, pp. 9–20.

[18] P. Simmons, “Security through amnesia: A software-based solution to the cold boot attack on disk encryption,” in *Proc. 27th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC’11)*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2011, pp. 73–82.

[19] M. Gruhn and T. Müller, “On the practicability of cold boot attacks,” in *8th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security (ARES 2013)*, Sep. 2013, pp. 390–397.

[20] J. A. Halderman, S. D. Schoen, N. Heninger, W. Clarkson, W. Paul, J. A. Calandrino, A. J. Feldman, J. Appelbaum, and E. W. Felten, “Lest we remember: cold-boot attacks on encryption keys,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 91–98, 2009.