MAGE: Mutual Attestation for a Group of Enclaves without Trusted Third Parties

Guoxing Chen, Yinqian Zhang Department of Computer Science and Engineering The Ohio State University chen.4329@osu.edu, yinqian@cse.ohio-state.edu

Abstract-Intel Software Guard Extensions (SGX) local and remote attestation mechanisms enable an enclave to attest its identity (*i.e.*, the enclave measurement, which is the cryptographic hash of its initial code and data) to an enclave. To verify that the attested identity is trusted, one enclave usually includes the measurement of the enclave it trusts into its initial data in advance assuming no trusted third parties are available during runtime to provide this piece of information. However, when mutual trust between these two enclaves is required, it is infeasible to simultaneously include into their own initial data the other's measurements respectively as any change to the initial data will change their measurements, making the previously included measurements invalid. In this paper, we propose MAGE, a framework enabling a group of enclaves to mutually attest each other without trusted third parties. Particularly, we introduce a technique to instrument these enclaves so that each of them could derive the others' measurements using information solely from its own initial data. We also provide a prototype implementation based on Intel SGX SDK, to facilitate enclave developers to adopt this technique.

I. INTRODUCTION

As storage and computation outsourcing to clouds become more and more prevalent, cautious users and security researchers raise questions on whether the cloud providers could keep their data private and execute their applications as expected. Trusted execution environments (TEEs) offer solutions to these concerns. A TEE is a secure component of a processor that protects the confidentiality and integrity of the code and data it executes upon. Examples of TEEs include Intel Software Guard Extensions (SGX), AMD Secure Encrypted Virtualization (SEV), and ARM TrustZone. Among them, Intel SGX, due to its convenient development and deployment model, is widely considered the most promising TEE solution, drawing attention from both industry and academia since its introduction [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21]. Commercial clouds, such as Microsoft Azure [22] and Alibaba Cloud [23] have offered SGX platforms for confidential cloud computing. A startup called Fortanix [24] adopts SGX to provide runtime encryption solutions.

Intel SGX provides software applications a shield execution environment, called *enclave*, to execution their proprietary code on secret data. This is achieved through a set of hardware and microcode extensions, including a special CPU execution mode (*i.e.*, enclave mode), an extended memory management unit that performs isolation during address translation, a memory encryption engine that sits between the CPU and the memory controllers. Intel SGX assumes privileged adversaries, such as malicious operating systems or rogue administrators. Therefore, the enclave memory is automatically encrypted with an encryption key known only to the CPU, and properly isolated so that it is not accessible to even the most privileged software. Only code inside the enclave region is able to access the enclave memory when executed under the enclave mode.

Trusting an enclave via remote attestation. Before provisioning any secrets to an enclave, the enclave must be "trusted". This trust is established via remote attestation [25]. In the context of attestation, the enclave is denoted the *attester* and the entity that wishes to establish trust on the attester is denoted the *attestee*, which could be either the user of the enclave (*i.e.*, a human empowered by code) or *another enclave*. Any software component between them can be considered as untrusted or even malicious. The establishment of trust can be achieved by answering the following three questions, the first two of which have been addressed by Intel SGX:

- *Is the attester an enclave?* A particular private key, called *attestation key*, is used to sign the message (a data structure called *quote*) the attester sends to the attestee to prove that the producer of the message is indeed an enclave running on an SGX platform. The attestation key is endorsed by a root secret called *root provisioning key*, which is burnt into the SGX processor during the manufacturing process, and could only be used to sign messages produced by enclaves. Hence, when the quote is verified to be valid, the attestee can be assured that the attester is indeed an SGX enclave. Intel SGX also provides another simpler mechanism, called *local attestation*, to address the case when the attester is also an enclave running on the same platform as the attester.
- What is its identity? To address this question, Intel SGX adopts two types of identities: (1) the enclave identity, *i.e.*, the enclave measurement (MRENCLAVE), which is the cryptographic hash of the initial code and data of an enclave, and thus is used to identity the enclave's contents. The enclave measurement is calculated by the hardware when loading enclave code and data during enclave creation. Hence, the integrity of the enclave measurement is thus protected by the hardware; (2) the *sealing identity* (MRSIGNER), which is the cryptographic hash of a public RSA key that identifies the enclave's developer. Both identities are included in quotes. Hence, the same time when verifying the quotes.
- *Is the identity trusted?* After the attestee is convinced that it is communicating with a real enclave with its specific identities MRENCLAVE and MRSIGNER, it is solely

the attestee's decision whether an enclave with the given MRENCLAVE and/or MRSIGNER can be trusted. Note that a user of an enclave is not necessarily the developer of the enclave. For example, in the cases of running smart contracts or microservices in enclaves [26], [27], the users and the developers are different parties. If the user chooses to trust a developer, any enclave signed by the developer will be trusted. This is clearly not intended in cases where the users and the developers are separate parties. In this paper, we consider a trust model where enclaves are trusted by their measurements (MRENCLAVE), not their developers (MRSIGNER). Hence, the attestee needs to hold the measurement of a trusted attester in advance, so that the verification can be carried out easily. Particularly, when the attestee is also an enclave, the trusted attester's measurement will be hardcoded into its own initial enclave data [28], [29], [30].

Mutual attestation. Note that the aforementioned trust establishment is unidirectional, *i.e.*, from an attester to an attestee. When the attestee is also an enclave, mutual attestation may be necessary. Mutual attestation is a mechanism that allows the communicating enclaves to attest each other and then establish a trust relationship. This is necessary, for example, in the following scenarios:

- Two enclaves from different developers running on the same machine authenticate each other. They trust less the reputation of the other developer, but the enclave identity of each other (after inspecting their code).
- An enclave running in a web server provisions secrets to an enclave running in the client's browser, while neither the web server nor the browser is trusted by the enclaves [31].
- When data needs to be exchanged between SGX-enhanced privacy-preserving blockchains [32], [27], [26], [33], an enclave from one blockchain needs to first attest the identity of another enclave from a different blockchain.

Mutual attestation without trusted third parties (TTP). Mutual attestation can be achieved by simply performing attestation twice, one per each direction, by a trusted user. The user may also delegate this effort to a trusted third party (TTP). A TTP could be a stand-alone server that performs remote attestation with each enclave, validates the results (in collaboration with Intel's attestation services), and exchanges secrets with the two enclaves as a middle man to bootstrap the trust. However, integrating a user or a TTP into the application's operation dramatically increases the trusted computing base (TCB) of the entire application. The security of the application will hinge upon the trustworthiness of the software stack of the user or the TTP, rather than solely the security of the enclave code itself (and, of course, that of the CPU hardware). Therefore, it is often desired to perform mutual attestation without TTPs.

In this paper, we aim to provide a mechanism for a group of (two or more) enclaves to mutually attest one another by their enclave identity. However, we found this problem non-trivial. Consider the cases of mutual attestation with two enclaves that would establish mutual trust with each other. The difficulty to do so lies in that both enclaves need to wait for the other enclave's measurements to be finalized before they could include them in their initial data to finalize their measurements and release them. The situation has some similarity to the deadlock problem, in that both parties wait on the data held by each other before they can proceed. To our best knowledge, no prior work has addressed this problem.

Our solution: MAGE. The key challenge of mutual attestation for a group of enclave without trusted third parties is to enable each of these enclaves to obtain the measurements of other enclaves in the same group from its own enclave memory, so that during the attestation phase, the enclave could verify whether the measurement of the attester is the same as one of the trusted enclaves in the same group. As such, we propose a framework, dubbed MAGE, to allow a group of enclaves to derive the measurements of other enclaves in the group from some intermediate states instead of the final outputs of the other enclaves' measuring process. The key observation is that the measurement calculation is deterministic and sequential. Knowing intermediate states and information to perform subsequent measuring operations would be sufficient to derive the final output, *i.e.*, the enclave measurement. When designed carefully, the problem could be resolved as all enclaves could generate intermediate states of their measuring processes and share them with others simultaneously.

Particularly, MAGE adds at the end of each enclave an extra data segment with the same content which includes the intermediate hash value of each trusted enclave's content right before the extra data segment. Hence, during runtime, each enclave knows the intermediate hash value of another trusted enclave (retrieved from the extra data segment) and the content left to be added (i.e., the extra data segment), and thus could derive the that trusted enclave's measurement. We have implemented a prototype of MAGE by extending the Intel SGX SDK. The evaluation suggests that to enable mutual attestation for up to 85 enclaves, 62 KB enclave memory overhead for each enclave is introduced and roughly 21.7μ s is needed to derive one measurement. We also plan to open-sourced it on Github. While the proposed scheme is originally designed for Intel SGX, the method can be easily extended to different types of TEEs, e.g., AMD SEV, and even between different types of TEEs, as long as they adopt similar mechanisms for the calculation of measurements.

Paper outline. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Sec. II provides necessary background for this paper. Sec. III presents motivating scenarios and Sec. IV gives an overview of the proposed scheme. The main component, the technique for enclaves to mutually derive each other's measurements is presented in Sec. V. We present a prototype implementation and evaluate the performance in Sec. VI. Sec. VII discusses improvements and extensions. Sec. VIII presents related works and Sec. IX concludes this paper.

II. BACKGROUND

A. SGX Memory Organization

Intel Software Guard Extensions (SGX) is a new hardware feature introduced on recent Intel processors. Intel SGX provides a shielded execution environment, called *enclaves*, to protect sensitive code and data from untrusted system softwares. Particularly, Intel SGX reserves a specified range



Fig. 1. Enclave measurement calculation flow.

of DRAM, called *Processor Reserved Memory* (PRM), which will deny accesses from any software (including the operating system) other than the enclave itself. The enclave's code, data, and related data structures are stored in a subset of PRM, called *Enclave Page Cache* (EPC), which is further split into 4 KB EPC pages.

When creating an enclave, the SGX instruction ECREATE will be called to create the first EPC page, called SGX Enclave Control Structure (SECS) page, which maintains the metadata of the enclave to be created, such as the base address, the size of enclave memory required, and the identity of the enclave. Then, via the SGX instruction EADD, two types of EPC pages will be added: (1) *Thread Control Structure* (TCS) pages that store information needed for logical processors to execute enclave code, such as the start address of enclave code when entering enclave mode via the SGX instruction EENTER; and (2) regular (REG) pages that store the enclave's code, data and other related data structures such as State Save Area (SSA), which is used to store enclave code's execution context during interrupts to protect the execution context from being learned by the untrusted system software (the processor will clear the execution context before transferring control to the interrupt handler and resume the execution context from the copy in the SSA after the interrupts are resolved and the enclave's execution is resumed). Note that when adding either a TCS page or a REG page, a 64-byte data structure, called Security Information (SECINFO), is also needed for the EADD instruction to specify the properties of the added EPC page, such as page type (a TCS page or a REG page), and access permissions (whether the page can be read, written and/or executed). After all enclave pages are loaded, the SGX instruction EINIT will be invoked to finalize the creation of the enclave. And the enclave code could be run then.

TABLE I. 512-BIT BLOCK UPDATED TO MRENCLAVE BY ECREATE.

| Range | Content |
|-----------|---------------------------------|
| [63:0] | 0045544145524345H; // "ECREATE" |
| [95:64] | Size of one SSA frame in pages; |
| [159:96] | Size of enclave in bytes; |
| [511:160] | 0; |

TABLE II.512-bit block updated to mrenclave by eadd.

| Range | Content |
|-----------|--|
| [63:0] | 0000000044444145H; // "EADD" |
| [127:64] | Offset of the added EPC page, relative |
| | to the enclave base; |
| [511:128] | The first 48 bytes of SECINFO; |

B. SGX Enclave Measurements

Intel SGX uses enclave measurements to identify enclaves. Generally, the enclave measurement is the cryptographic hash of the contents of an enclave, including initial code, data, and related data structures such as TCSs and SSAs. In this way, the enclave user could verify the identity of an enclave by checking only its measurement with an expected value.

In the current Intel SGX design, enclave measurements are calculated using SHA-256 [34]. SHA-256 is a Secure Hash Algorithm (SHA) that is used for generating 256-bit digests of messages. The generated digests are used to protect the integrity of the messages. SHA-256 has three algorithms:

- *Initialization algorithm* initialize 8 32-bit words, called intermediate hash, before calculating the digest.
- *Update algorithm* takes a 512-bit block as input at a time, and updates the intermediate hash using pre-defined compression functions.
- *Finalization algorithm* update the intermediate hash with the last 512-bit block which contains the number of all bits that have been updated to the intermediate hash, and produce the final 256-bit digest by concatenating the resulting 8 32-bit words.

Now we describe how Intel SGX leverages SHA-256 to calculate enclave measurements. MRENCLAVE is a 256-bit field located in the SECS page of an enclave. The calculation of MRENCLAVE is performed along with the creation of the enclave, as shown in Fig. 1. When ECREATE is called to load an SECS page, the first page of an enclave, it also initializes the MRENCLAVE field using SHA-256 Initialization algorithm and updates its value using SHA-256 Update algorithm takes as input a 512-bit block, including the metadata of the enclave such as the size of one SSA frame and the size of the enclave memory, as shown in Table I.

When EADD is called each time to create an TCS or REG page, it updates MRENCLAVE with a 512-bit block as shown in Table II. Note that EADD measures only the metadata of the page to be added, *e.g.*, its offset and access permissions. The content of the page is measured by the SGX instruction EEXTEND. EEXTEND measures 256 bytes at one time. As depicted in Table III, For each 256 bytes of an EPC page, EEXTEND performs the SHA-256 Update algorithm 5 times. The first iteration measures a 512-bit block containing the metadata of the 256 bytes (2048 bits) of data including its

| Range | Content |
|-----------|---|
| [63:0] | 00444 <i>E</i> 4554584545H; // "EEXTEND" |
| [127:64] | Offset of the 256 bytes to be measured, relative to the enclave base; |
| [511:128] | 0; |
| | |
| Range | Content |
| [511:0] | data[511 : 0]; |
| | |
| Range | Content |
| [511:0] | data[1023 : 512]; |
| | |
| Range | Content |
| [511:0] | data[1535 : 1024]; |
| | |
| Range | Content |
| [511:0] | data[2047 : 1536]; |

TABLE III. FIVE 512-BIT BLOCKS UPDATED TO MRENCLAVE FOR MEASURING THE 256-BYTE (2048-BIT) DATA OF AN EPC PAGE BY EEXTEND

offset, and the following 4 iterations each measures 512 bits of these bytes. To measure a whole EPC page which consists of 4096 bytes, 16 EEXTEND operations are needed.

The last step of creating an enclave is to call the SGX instruction EINIT to finalize the measurement using the finalization algorithm of SHA-256. The finalization algorithm will update MRENCLAVE the last time with a 512-bit block containing the total count of bits that have been updated into MRENCLAVE. This count is initialized during ECREATE and updated through ECREATE, EADD and EEXTEND.

C. SGX Attestation

For an enclave (attester) to authenticate its identity to another entity (attestee), Intel SGX provides two types of attestation mechanisms: local attestation and remote attestation. Generally, an attestation key will be used to generate a signature of the attester's identity along with a piece of attestation data. When the signature is verified to be valid by the attestee, it is assured that the attestation data is produced by the attester who is an enclave with the claimed identity running on an authentic SGX platform.

1) Local Attestation: Local attestation is introduced to enable an enclave to attest itself to another enclave located on the same platform. That is, both the attester and attestee are enclaves sharing the same processor. Specifically, the attester enclave calls the SGX instruction EREPORT to generate a Hash Message Authentication Code (HMAC) signature of a data structure, called report, which contains its own measurement and attestation data. Note that the calculation of HMAC involves a secret called report key. Each report key is bond to an enclave, as an enclave measurement must be specified during the derivation of a report key. When calling EREPORT, the measurement of the target enclave (attestee) must also be provided. The processor will then derive the report key of the target enclave, to generate the HMAC. Note that this process is completely within the processor, and the report key of the target enclave is not exposed to the enclave memory of the attester during EREPORT. The only way to obtain the report key is to call the SGX instruction EGETKEY within the target enclave. EGETKEY will use the calling enclave's measurement to derive the report key. Hence, the report key is shared only between the target enclave and the SGX implementation. When a report is received and verified by the target enclave, it can be convinced that the report is generated by the SGX implementation on behalf of an attester whose measurement is also specified in the report.

2) Remote Attestation: To enable an enclave to attest itself to a remote entity, remote attestation is introduced. Currently, Intel adopts Enhanced Privacy ID (EPID) scheme for remote attestation. EPID is a digital signature algorithm that could protect the anonymity of SGX platforms [35]. To facilitate EPID based remote attestation, Intel introduces two services, i.e., Intel Provisioning Service (IPS) and Intel Attestation Service (IAS), and provides SGX platforms with two privileged enclaves, Intel-signed Provisioning Enclave (PvE) and Quoting Enclave (QE). Particularly, Intel Provisioning Service and the Provisioning Enclave run an EPID provisioning protocol to provision an EPID private member key (attestation key) to an SGX platform. The EPID private member key could only be accessed by the Provisioning Enclave and the Quoting Enclave, otherwise, any malicious enclave that could access the EPID private member key will be able to forge valid signatures to convince the remote entity. Hence, to get a signature signed by the EPID private member key, the attester enclave needs to firstly attest itself to the Quoting Enclave via local attestation. After the Quoting Enclave verifies the attester's report, it will generate a data structure, called quote, which contains the attester's measurement and attestation data that are copied from the report and sign the quote using the EPID private member key. The attestation enclave could then use the signed quote to attest itself to the remote entity. In the current design, the signed quote is encrypted by the Quoting Enclave, so that the remote entity has to forward the encrypted signed quote to Intel Attestation Service for verification.

In December 2018, Intel introduced an Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (ECDSA) based attestation solution [36]. Particularly, Intel provides a privileged enclave, called Provisioning Certification Enclave (PCE), which could access an ECDSA private key, called *Provisioning Certification Key* (PCK), derived from within the SGX processor. Intel publishes the corresponding public key as an X.509 certificate for each SGX platform that supports ECDSA attestation. Hence, any party with the certificate could verify the ECDSA quote signed by Provisioning Certification Enclave run on the corresponding SGX platform.

III. MOTIVATING SCENARIOS

In this section, we present a few motivating scenarios, where mutual attestation of enclaves without trusted third parties is of great importance.

A. Local Mutual Attestation with Enclave Identity

Consider a case where two SGX enclaves running on the same machine need to establish mutual trust. Existing solutions are mainly based on the sealing identity (MRSIGNER) rather than the enclave identity (MRENCLAVE). Particularly, two mechanisms, *i.e.*, local attestation and sealing, can be leveraged to achieve this:

- *Trust via local attestation:* As explained in Sec. II, local attestation can be used by one enclave to attest itself to another enclave. In the *report* one enclave sends to another enclave via local attestation, both the enclave identity and sealing identity are included. Hence, the enclave that receives the report could compare only the sealing identity of the trusted enclave, which should be hardcoded in its initial data in advance. Such local attestation could be run twice between the two enclaves, once per direction. Both enclaves need to have the other's sealing identity hardcoded in their initial data in advance. Note that this solution works for enclaves developed either by the same developer or different developers.
- *Trust via sealing:* Intel SGX has provided a mechanism called *sealing* for secret sharing between enclaves developed by the same developer that run on the same platform. Particularly, a seal key can be derived within the enclave to encrypt and decrypt secrets. During seal key derivation, the enclave could choose to include the identity of the developer, *i.e.*, MRSIGNER, instead of MRENCLAVE. In this way, all enclaves signed by the same developer could derive the same seal key to decrypt the secret. The secret could be a shared private key used for establishing a secure channel. For SGX platforms that support key separation and sharing [37], a configuration value and extra product IDs are introduced to further identifies enclaves developed by the same developer. Note that such sealing based solutions work only for enclaves developed by the same developer.

However, trusting the enclave developer could dramatically increase the trusted computing base (TCB). This is because any enclave built by the same developer shares the same sealing identity. An outdated, compromised enclave could be exploited to compromise other enclaves and hence the entire applications, if the trust between enclaves that established via their sealing identities. Finer-grain identification provided by key separation and sharing has the potential to reduce the attack surface, but its effectiveness is questionable as it highly relies on the developer's proper management of these configurations. On the other hand, when using the enclave identity during local attestation, only the enclave with the given measurement will be trusted. Hence, exploring solutions that enable local mutual attestation with enclave identity could minimize the TCB that includes only the involved enclaves' code and data.

B. Remote Attestation for Server-Client Applications

Intel SGX can be adopted in server-client applications to enhance the security of both the server and the client. In such scenarios, both the server and the client are equipped with enclaves that conceal sensitive data and code from the rest of the software stack, in order to minimize the TCB to only the SGX hardware and the enclave code. A secure channel established between the enclave on the client side and the enclave on the server side is desired to enable two-way authentication and secret provisioning.

For example, OPERA introduces an attestation service to provide better privacy guarantees to enclaves [30]. The proposed attestation service is based on EPID. It has two types of enclaves: issuing enclaves (IssueE) working as *servers* that are responsible to provision EPID private keys to the other type of enclaves called attestation enclaves (AttestE), which function as *clients*. AttestEs then use the provisioned EPID private key to provide attestation service to local enclaves. One important property of OPERA is its *openness*, *i.e.*, the implementation is completely open, so that its code (and hence behavior) can be publicly verified and thus is trustworthy, while its developer/signer (or sealing identity) can be untrusted. This property enables OPERA to achieve better security without introducing extra trusted parties. As such, an enclave identity based mutual attestation is desired in OPERA.

However, due to the lack of an enclave identity based mutual attestation mechanism between the server enclave and the client enclave, the authors of OPERA provided an alternative design that transfers part of the attestation workload to the user of the system. Particularly, only the server enclave verifies the identity (i.e. the measurement) of the client enclave before provisioning EPID private keys. The client enclave has no means to verify whether the provisioned EPID private keys are from a trusted server enclave or not. The TCB of the serverclient applications includes partial code on the user side that verifies whether the client enclave obtained the EPID private keys from a trusted server enclave or not. While the authors proved the secrecy property of the protocol using ProVerif, they did not discuss other potential threats due to the lack of mutual attestation. For example, the adversary could provision the AttestE with an EPID private key controlled by the adversary and launch co-location attacks on the user of OPERA by monitoring the error message (e.g., "EPID private key is from an untrusted server enclave") of the attestation results. Hence, designing mutual attestation mechanism for serverclient applications could reduce the attack surface and make the applications more self-contained.

C. Remote Attestation for Decentralized Applications

Intel SGX has also been advocated as an enabling technology for privacy-preserving decentralized applications. The security of many decentralized applications, like Bitcoin's blockchain network and Tor's onion routing network, relies on the distributed trust over a large number of participating nodes, the majority of which are out of control of the adversary. SGX provides solutions to removing such trust completely from these participating nodes, protecting both the integrity and confidentiality of the secrets from these untrusted entities. For example, Kim *et al.* proposed SGX-Tor that utilizes SGX to enhance Tor [38]. With SGX's strong confidentiality and integrity guarantees, SGX-Tor addresses some limitations of original Tor networks, *e.g.*, weakening the threat model and mitigating low resource attacks.

Moreover, designs that use SGX to provide privacypreserving smart contracts have been proposed, such as Ekiden [26] and FastKitten [27], with different focuses. Ekiden provides efficient off-chain execution of single-round contracts, while FastKitten targets efficient off-chain execution of reactive multi-round contracts. Hence, it is conceivable for one smart contract to delegate part of its execution to another smart contract that is more efficient in handling it. Establishing secure channels between the enclaves of these smart contracts requires mutual attestation and trusted third parties are undesired. Furthermore, as blockchain interoperability, *i.e.*, the ability to share data across different blockchain networks, is becoming more and more important for applications such as health care and voting, enabling these enclaves to mutually attest each other will be a fundamental problem to solve. Each enclave should be able the attest the other's identity before accepting the transaction executed by that enclave.

IV. OVERVIEW

In this section, we describe the problem we aim to address, the threat model we assume, and the overall workflow of MAGE.

A. Problem Formulation

In this paper, we aim to address the problem of enabling a group of enclaves to mutually attest one another without trusted third parties. These enclaves could be developed by the same developer or multiple different developers, and the interaction between them are also specified by the code. These enclaves could be run on the same SGX platform (*i.e.*, machine) or different SGX platforms; they need to mutually attest each other before they could start to interact and/or collaborate.

Intel SGX provides two types of attestation, *i.e.*, local attestation and remote attestation. Both enable one enclave to verify that it is communicating with an actual enclave whose identity, *i.e.*, the measurement, is in the received report (for local attestation) or quote (for remote attestation).

Hence, the key challenge of mutual attestation is for each enclave to obtain the identities, *i.e.*, measurements of the other trusted enclaves, without the help of trusted third parties. Consider a minimal group of two enclaves, *i.e.*, $Encl_1$ and $Encl_2$. For $Encl_1$ to verify an attester enclave is actually the other enclave $Encl_2$ in the group, $Encl_1$ has to know the measurement of $Encl_2$ in advance. Without a trusted third party to input $Encl_2$'s measurement into $Encl_1$, $Encl_1$ has to derive $Encl_2$'s measurement by itself, *e.g.*, by hard-coding $Encl_2$'s measurement in its enclave memory. For mutual attestation, $Encl_2$ also needs to be able to derive $Encl_1$'s measurement.

Simply hard-coding the other enclave's measurement in the enclave memory is not feasible. If we first hard-code enclave, say $Encl_1$'s measurement into the other enclave $Encl_2$'s initial data. Then we get the measurement of $Encl_2$ and try to hard-code it into $Encl_1$'s initial data. However, this will change $Encl_1$'s measurement. The previously hard-coded $Encl_1$'s measurement in $Encl_2$'s initial data will become incorrect. Observing that the measurement calculation is deterministic and sequential, we consider methods to derive the final measurement from the intermediate states and information required for the subsequent calculation. We now define the problem more formally as follows.

Consider a group of N mutually trusted enclaves, $Encl_1$, $Encl_2$, ..., $Encl_N$. Denote the original content (code and data) of $Encl_1$ (i = 1, ..., N) as C_i . The measurement of an enclave with content C is the cryptographic hash of its content, denoted as $\mathcal{H}(C)$, where \mathcal{H} is a cryptographic hash function.

Definition 1: A mechanism for mutual measurement derivation consists of two functions $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F})$:

- G is called auxiliary content generation function that is used to generate auxiliary content needed for deriving measurements of other enclaves. It takes as input an index i (= 1,..., N) and the original contents of all N enclaves, *i.e.*, C₁, ..., C_N, and output auxiliary content for Encl_i, denoted as A_i = G(i, C₁,..., C_N). The content of Encl_i then becomes the concatenation of C_i and A_i, denoted as C_i||A_i. Its measurement becomes H(C_i||A_i).
- \mathcal{F} is called measurement derivation function that is used for deriving measurements from the auxiliary content. It takes as input the auxiliary content A_i of Encl_i (i = 1, ..., N) and an index j (= 1, ..., N), and output the measurement of Encl_i . Specifically, \mathcal{F} satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}(A_i, j) = \mathcal{H}(C_j || A_j), \forall i, j = 1, \dots, N$$
(1)

Note that in actual enclaves the layout of C_i and A_i might be interleaved instead of simple concatenation, we will discuss how to handle such situations in Sec. VII.

B. Threat Model

We assume the hardware implementation of SGX is secure. That is, a malicious operating system cannot breach the confidentiality and integrity of the enclave code and data. At the time of writing, with proper microcode patches, known speculative execution attacks, such as Foreshadow [39], SgxPecture [40] and Microarchitectural Data Sampling (MDS) [41], [42], [43], can no longer compromise the confidentiality of SGX enclaves. Moreover, Intel Attestation Service already provides the enclave users with information of SGX platform's microcode version (*i.e.*, CPUSVN) and whether HyperThreading is disabled (for mitigating Foreshadow and MDS). Therefore, the attestation results could indicate whether the SGX platform is secure against speculative execution attacks.

We assume the code running inside of the enclaves is secure against memory corruption attacks [44], [45], [46] and access-pattern-driven micro-architectural side channel attacks [47], [48], [49], [50], [51], [52], [53], [54], [55]. To securely use SGX, software programs must be thoroughly examined to be free of such vulnerabilities [56], [57].

However, we assume SGX platforms are not trusted and may be controlled by the adversary. Specifically, the adversary controls all software components outside the enclave, including the operating system, the virtual machine manager (if any), the code running in the System Management Mode, *etc*. The adversary is also able to launch any enclave as she wants; however, she cannot create an enclave whose measurement is pre-specified. Moreover, the adversary can perform manin-the-middle attacks against the communication protocols between the enclaves, including but not limited to intercepting, dropping, replaying communications between any two enclaves.

This paper considers a group of trusted enclaves that would like to establish mutual trust between each other before communicating sensitive data among them. These enclaves are trusted by their measurements (MRENCLAVE) rather than their developers (MRSIGNER). The goal of the adversary is to gain the trust of the trusted enclaves via a malicious (enclave) program and earn the sensitive data.

C. Workflow of MAGE

We now describe the workflow of MAGE, a framework enabling mutual attestation for a group of enclaves without trusted third parties, given a mechanism for mutual measurement derivation.

- Develop a system including a group of enclaves that need to interact or collaborate with each other;
- During compilation, derive auxiliary content from these enclaves and update each enclave with the derived auxiliary content;
- During runtime, enclaves derive the measurements to be used in either local attestation or remote attestation.

For the first step, a group of trusted enclaves that need to establish mutual trust are developed, especially when sensitive data needs to be transferred from one enclave to another. These enclaves could be developed by one or multiple developers. The algorithms about how the transferred secrets will be processed are up to the enclave developers, thus out of scope of this paper. The protocols for establishing secure channels include local attestation and/or remote attestation[58], [59]. MAGE will provide application programming interfaces (APIs) that implement a measurement derivation function \mathcal{F} to be included in the attestation flows within the enclaves. The missing components are the auxiliary contents of other enclaves in the group to be used by the measurement derivation function to derive measurements of other enclaves.

Then, during compilation, a tool provided by MAGE, that implements the corresponding auxiliary content generation function \mathcal{G} will be leveraged to extract auxiliary contents from these enclaves, and augment these enclaves with the derived auxiliary contents. After the augmentation, each enclave is ready to be signed by the developers and released.

Lastly, during runtime, whenever the measurement of a particular enclave in the group is needed, the measurement derivation API will be called to derive the measurement from the corresponding auxiliary content inserted earlier.

Note that most part of the workflow could fulfilled using existing SDKs and protocols. The missing and most critical component is the mechanism for mutual measurement derivation, *i.e.*, the auxiliary content generation function \mathcal{G} and the measurement derivation function \mathcal{F} .

V. MAGE DESIGN

In this section, we introduce the mechanisms of MAGE. We will start with a minimal group of two enclaves and describe the necessary modifications needed for the enclave and the way to derive the other enclave's measurement. Then we discuss extension from two enclaves to a group of enclaves.

A. Measurement Derivation from Intermediate Hash

Now, we introduce another method for deriving measurements of enclaves with different contents. The key observation is that a measurement, which is the cryptographic hash of an enclave's code and data, is calculated deterministically and sequentially. Setting aside the initialization and finalization phases, the hash of the concatenation of two messages X and Y, denoted as X||Y, is calculating the hash of X first, and then calculating the hash of the concatenation of the resulting $\mathcal{H}(X)$ and Y. That is

$$\mathcal{H}(X||Y) = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}(X)||Y) \tag{2}$$

When it comes to the enclave $Encl_i$ (i = 1, 2, ..., N) with content $C_i || A_i$. With any value set for the auxiliary content A_i , the calculation of the measurement satisfies the following equation:

$$\mathcal{H}(C_i||A_i) = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}(C_i)||A_i), \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, N$$
(3)

Hence, we propose to include $\mathcal{H}(C_i)$ into the auxiliary content so that the measurement derivation could start from it. Specifically, we define an auxiliary content generation function \mathcal{G} as

$$\mathcal{G}(i, C_1, C_2, \dots, C_N) = \mathcal{H}(C_1) || \mathcal{H}(C_2) || \dots || \mathcal{H}(C_N) \quad (4)$$

Note that the output \mathcal{G} is irrelevant with regards to *i*, so the auxiliary contents of all these *N* enclaves are the same, *i.e.*, $A_i = A_j, i, j = 1, 2, ..., N$. Let $A_{i,j}$ represents the *j*-th hash value in A_i , which is $\mathcal{H}(C_j)$. We now define the measurement derivation function \mathcal{F} as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}(A_i, j) = \mathcal{H}(A_{i,j} || A_i) = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}(C_j) || A_j)$$
$$= \mathcal{H}(C_j || A_j), \forall i, j = 1, \dots, N$$

The above equation abstracted away details of actual SHA-256 algorithms used in SGX. As described in Sec. II-B, for an actual enclave, given any intermediate hash value during the measurement calculation process, when the information of all the remaining enclave pages to be added are provided, the enclave measurement can be derived by carrying out the subsequent SHA-256 update and finalization operations from the intermediate hash value. For example, if both of Encl₁ and Encl₂ know each other's (1) intermediate hash before the last page to be added and the number of bits already updated to that intermediate hash; (2) the content, the offset and the SECINFO of the last page, they could derive each other's measurement.

Note that the content of the last page could be read (assuming that the access permissions allow read operations) by the enclave during runtime, we can calculate the intermediate hash of all pages before the last page in advance, and store the calculated value in the last page. In this way, both pieces of information are available during runtime. We will explain in more details in the following, starting from a group of two enclaves Encl₁ and Encl₂.

Remark. There is no additional security risk to expose the intermediate hash values of these enclaves, as the intermediate hash values can be computed deterministically by any party who knows the enclave's initial code and data.



Fig. 2. The flow of instrumenting the mutual attestation reserved segment MARS with generated auxiliary content for measurement derivation.

TABLE IV. MAINFO: INFORMATION NEEDED FOR MEASUREMENT DERIVATION.

| Component | Description |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| PREMR | The intermediate hash before MARS; |
| COUNT | The number of bytes updated to PREMR; |
| OFFSET | The offset of MARS; |
| SECINFO | The security information of MARS; |

B. Compile-Time Auxiliary Content Derivation and Instrumentation

Auxiliary content that is required for deriving the other enclave's measurement needs to be extracted and hardcoded into the enclave's initial data. It should be done during the enclave development phase. Basically, the Encl₁ and Encl₂ developers could follow the following steps:

- Encl₁ and Encl₂ developers reserve a data segment (called *mutual attestation reserved segment*, denoted as MARS) of the same size (*e.g.*, 4 KB, the size of one EPC page) in the enclave memory, which will be loaded last during the enclave creation. Note that this data segment should be aligned to the page boundaries, so that it will not overlap with other enclave pages during measurement calculation. The SHA-256 intermediate hash value of all pages before this reserved region will be calculated. We call this SHA-256 intermediate hash value *pre-measurement*, denoted as PREMR.
- Encl₁ and Encl₂ developers exchange information needed for derive their own measurements, called *Mutual*

Attestation Information (MAINFO) as depicted in Table IV. Particular, MAINFO contains three fields: (1) the premeasurement PREMR_i of Encl_i, (2) the number of bytes updated to PREMR_i, (3) the offset of the reserved data segment MARS_i, and (4) the security information of MARS_i. The former two are used to reconstruct the state of measurement calculation before updating the reserved data segment MARS_i, and the latter two are needed for updating the MARS_i into the hash value as described in Sec. II-B. Note that SECINFO field can be dropped if the developers agree on the same SECINFO, *e.g.*, assuming MARS contains only read-only data pages. While fixing the offset of MARS could also save the memory space for the OFFSET field, it will add extra workload for enclave developers to adjust the enclave memory layouts, which might not be preferred.

• After the exchange, Encl₁ and Encl₂ developers organize the MAINFOS of both enclaves in the same order and instrument them into the MARS of their own enclaves so that each enclave knows the MAINFO of the other enclave (from its own MARS) and the content of the other enclave's MARS (same as its own MARS).

C. Runtime Measurement Derivation

As described in Sec. II-B, the calculation of enclave measurements depends on the order the enclave pages are created. Even with exactly the same enclave code and data, when loaded in different orders, different measurements will be generated. Hence, during enclave creation, EPC pages of Encl₁ and Encl₂ have to be in a particular order that can



Fig. 3. Runtime measurement derivation.

be simulated during runtime to derive their measurements, as shown in Fig. 2. Particularly, all enclave pages except MARSs need to be created in the same order that generates the premeasurement, PREMR. The MARS is created and loaded last. The enclave is initialized afterward. We will describe how to adjust the order of loading enclave pages in Sec. VI when needed, and also discuss an alternative design when the loading order cannot be altered. Now we assume the enclave is loaded exactly in the same order as how the PREMR is computed.

After one enclave, *e.g.*, $Encl_1$, is created, it could derive the measurement of the other enclave $(Encl_2)$ as shown in Fig. 3:

- From Encl₁'s reserved data segment MARS₁, Encl₁ retrieves Encl₂'s pre-measurement PREMR₂, the number of bytes updated PREMR₂, the offset of Encl₂'s reserved data segment MARS₂, and the SECINFO of MARS₂.
- Encl₁ simulates Encl₂'s process of loading the reserved data segment MARS₂. Note that the content of MARS₂ is the same as MARS₁ where Encl₁ could access directly. Encl₁ then update the number of bytes contributing to the resulting SHA-256 intermediate hash and perform the finalization operation to obtain the measurement of Encl₂.

For verification, let's recall how $Encl_2$'s measurement is actually generated by the SGX implementation: SHA-256 intermediate hash is updated as $Encl_2$'s pages are created one by one; when it comes to MARS₂ which will be loaded last, the SHA-256 intermediate hash is PREMR₂, assuming the correct loading order; the SHA-256 intermediate hash keeps being updated when loading MARS₂ and gets finalized afterward. Hence, what $Encl_1$ derives is exactly the measurement of $Encl_2$. Similarly, $Encl_2$ could also derive $Encl_1$'s measurement.

D. Supporting Multiple Enclaves

Now we describe how to extend the method presented above to a group of (more than two) enclaves, $Encl_1$, $Encl_2,\ldots$, $Encl_N$. Enclave developers need to extract and exchange the MAINFOs from their own enclaves. Then they organize the MAINFOs of all enclave in the same manner to generate identical MARSs. And the creation of these enclaves

| Algorithm 1: Measurement Derivation Function | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Input: <i>idx</i> | | | |
| Output: mrenclave | | | |
| 1 if $idx \ge total$ number of MAINFO entries in MARS then | | | |
| 2 return NULL; | | | |
| 3 [PREMR, COUNT, OFFSET, SECINFO] $\leftarrow idx$ -th | | | |
| MAINFO in MARS; | | | |
| 4 $sha_handle \leftarrow sgx_sha256_init();$ | | | |
| 5 replace fields of <i>sha_handle</i> with PREMR and COUNT; | | | |
| 6 for page in MARS do | | | |
| 7 sgx_sha256_update(sha_handle, | | | |
| "EADD" OFFSET SECINFO); | | | |
| 8 for every 2048-bit data in page do | | | |
| 9 sgx_sha256_update(sha_handle, | | | |
| "EEXTEND" OFFSET); | | | |
| 10 sgx_sha256_update(<i>sha_handle,data</i> [511:0]); | | | |
| 11 sgx_sha256_update(<i>sha_handle,data</i> [1023:512]); | | | |
| 12 sgx_sha256_update(<i>sha_handle,data</i> [1535:1024]) | | | |
| 13 $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $ | | | |
| 14 OFFSET = OFFSET + $256;$ | | | |
| 15 $mrenclave \leftarrow sgx_sha256_get_hash(sha_handle);$ | | | |
| 16 return mrenclave; | | | |

needs to follow the pre-defined order for calculation PREMRs. After one enclave is created, it could derive the measurement of any enclave by fetching the corresponding MAINFO from its own MARS and simulating the measurement process with the content of its own MARS. The measurement derivation function is shown in Algorithm 1. It takes as input the index *idx* of the enclave measurement to be derived, and outputs the derived enclave measurement. The function retrieves the *idx*-th MAINFO to create an SHA-256 handle, update it with the content of MARS following the process described in Sec. II-B. Note that sgx_sha256_init(), sgx_sha256_update() and sgx_sha256_get_hash() are the implementations of the initialization, update and finalization algorithms inside the enclave.

This solution is more scalable than the first one, as the overhead of adding one enclave is including only its MAINFO in MARS. However, the scalability is still restricted by the maximum size of memory an enclave could have. To support even higher scalability requirements, we will discuss an alternative design when extra untrusted storage is available in Sec. VII.

E. Case Studies

We now give a simple example of mutual attestation for migrating secrets from one enclave $(Encl_1)$ to another enclave $(Encl_2)$. Considering secret migration could happen locally on the client's own computer with SGX support, we take local attestation as example to describe how to leverage MAGE to achieve secure secret migration.

Fig. 4 describes the workflow of establishing a secure channel (deriving a shared Diffie-Hellman key) for secret migration between two enclaves via local attestation:

1) After receiving a secret migration request from the client of both enclaves, $Encl_1$ generates a Diffie-Hellman private/public key pair (a, g^a) and a nonce,

SGX platform



Fig. 4. Establishing a secure channel for secret migration between two enclaves via local attestation.

and sends the public key g^a and the nonce to $Encl_2$ via local attestation. Particularly, $Encl_1$ derives the measurement of $Encl_2$ using the technique described in Sec. V and calls EREPORT to produce a report with the derived measurement as the target enclave measurement and the hash of g^a and the nonce as the report data. g^a , the nonce and the report is sent to $Encl_2$.

- 2) After receiving the public key g^a , the nonce and the associated report, $Encl_2$ first verifies the identity of the sender by deriving the measurement of $Encl_1$ and comparing it with the one in the report structure, and then verifies the integrity of g^a by calculating the hash of the received g^a and the nonce, and comparing it with the hash in the report data. If verified valid, $Encl_2$ also generates a Diffie-Hellman private/public key pair (b, g^b) , and sends the public key g^b to $Encl_1$ via local attestation. Similarly, a report with the hash of both public keys and the nonce as report data and $Encl_1$'s measurement as the target enclave measurement, along with the public key g^b is sent to $Encl_1$.
- 3) Upon receiving g^b and the corresponding report, Encl₁ verifies the identity of the sender and derives shared Diffie-Hellman key as $g^{ab} = (g^a)^b$. Hence, a secure channel between Encl₁ and Encl₂ is created. Encl₁ then encrypts the secrets to be migrated using g^{ab} and sends the encrypted results to Encl₂.
- 4) $Encl_2$ could then decrypt the secrets. Optionally, $Encl_2$ might send back an acknowledgement message encrypted by g^{ab} , telling $Encl_1$ that the secrets are received and the copies on $Encl_1$'s side could now be removed.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

In this section, we describe our prototype implementation of MAGE and evaluate its runtime performance overhead and memory overhead.

A. Implementation

MAGE is implemented by extending the Intel SGX SDK (version 2.6.100.51363) [60]. Specifically, it consists of three components: (1) a SDK library that reserves a data segment for MARS and APIs to support derivation of measurements from

MAINFOS located in MARS; (2) a modified enclave loader that loads MARSs last when creating enclaves; (3) modified signing tool that extracts MAINFO from an enclave and fills the MARS of an enclave with a list of extracted MAINFOS.

1) MAGE Library: libsgx_mage is implemented to facilitate enclave developers to use MAGE. When included in an enclave, it reserves a read-only data section, named .sgx_mage, to be used as MARS. The range of the .sgx_mage section is aligned to page boundaries, *i.e.*, 4KB. So its size is a multiple of the page size, *i.e.*, 4KB. Besides reserving the .sgx_mage section, libsgx_mage provides two APIs:

- sgx_mage_size() examines the .sgx_mage section and returns the total number of MAINFOs in it.
- sgx_mage_gen_measurement() takes as input an index of the enclave whose measurement is requested and outputs the resulting measurement. Particularly, it retrieves from the .sgx_mage section the corresponding MAINFO specified by the index and calculates the final measurement following Algorithm 1.

2) Modified Enclave Loader: The original enclave loader in Intel SGX SDK loads enclave code and data pages first and then the TCS pages. Hence, the .sgx_mage section, as a data segment, will not be loaded last by default. To address this, we modified the enclave loader to load the enclave pages in two stages:

- First, the modified enclave loader follows the original loading process except that when an .sgx_mage section is encountered, it skips the .sgx_mage section. Note that libsgx_mage APIs are located in code pages and loaded along with the original enclave code pages.
- Second, when all other pages, including enclave code and data pages and the TCS pages, are loaded, the modified enclave loader checks whether there is an .sgx_mage section, and loads pages in the .sgx_mage section if found.

Note that if no .sgx_mage section is present, the modified enclave loader will load the enclave in the same order as the unmodified enclave loader, producing the same measurement. When there exists an .sgx_mage section, the modified and unmodified enclave loaders will produce different measurements due to the different loading order, as the unmodified enclave loaders will load .sgx_mage section earlier than the modified one. Since our implementation of sgx_mage_gen_measurement() produces the measurement in the same order as the modified enclave loader, platforms running the enclaves developed with MAGE need to use to the modified enclave loader. If using modified loader is undesired, we provide an alternative design that works with unmodified enclave loaders. Details will be discussed in Sec. VII.

3) Modified Signing Tool: The original signing tool is provided by Intel SGX SDK for enclave developers to sign enclaves, so that they can be accepted by the Intel-signed Launch Enclave and thus be launched successfully. The signing tool simulates the loading process of the enclave to calculate



Fig. 5. Workflow of enclave development using MAGE.

the measurement before signing it. We modified the signing tool to provide the following two functionalities:

- Deriving MAINFOS: given an enclave developed with MAGE, the modified signing tool could simulate the first stage of the modified enclave loader, which loads all pages except for the .sgx_mage section, to generate MAINFO, which includes the SHA-256 intermediate hash, *i.e.*, the PREMR, the number of bytes updated to PREMR, and the offset of the .sgx_mage section. The SECINFO is not included as our prototype implementation adopts a constant value of SECINFO with access permissions set to be read-only.
- Filling the .sgx_mage section: given an enclave developed with MAGE and a set of MAINFOs derived from the group of trusted enclaves, the modified signing tool could fill the .sgx_mage section with the list of MAINFOs. The measurement of the instrumented enclave will be re-calculated and signed afterward.

As such, the workflow of enclave development using MAGE (as shown in Fig. 5) can be depicted as follows: **①** the enclave developers independently implement their own enclave with the libsgx_mage library, and then use the modified signing tools to derive the MAINFO of their enclaves. **②** the enclave developers share their enclaves with one another, so that they could validate the trustworthiness of the enclaves from other developers, and then use the modified signing tools to derive the MAINFOs of them. **③** with the same list of MAINFOs, the enclave developers use the modified signing tool to fill the .sgx_mage section of their enclaves, and then sign their enclaves before publishing them.

B. Evaluation

Now we describe the evaluation of our prototype implementation of MAGE. Results are measured on a Lenovo Thinkpad X1 Carbon (4-th Gen) laptop with an Intel Core i5-6200U processor and 8GB memory.

Since the results are highly related to the size of the .sgx_mage section, so we evaluate the metrics with regards to different sizes of the .sgx_mage section.



Fig. 6. Measurement derivation efficiency.

1) The Number of MAINFOs Supported: We first calculate the number of MAINFOs that can be stored in an .sgx_mage section with L bytes (L is a multiple of page size, *i.e.*, 4KB). The content of an .sgx_mage section is organized as a structure as follows: the first 8 bytes hold the total number of MAINFOs and the rest is used to store the content of these MAINFOs. Each MAINFO takes 48 bytes (32-byte PREMR, 8-byte COUNT, and 8-byte OFFSET). SECINFO is not included as we use a constant SECINFO in our prototype implementation. Hence, $\lfloor \frac{L-8}{48} \rfloor$ MAINFOs can be supported. For example, an .sgx_mage section of one page size could support up to 85 MAINFOs. On the other hand, to support N MAINFOs, a total of $\lceil \frac{48N+8}{4096} \rceil$ pages are needed. For example, supporting N = 10,000 MAINFOs requires an .sgx_mage section of = 118 pages (472 KB).

Note that the number of MAINFOS supported can be slightly increased when the ranges of COUNT and OFFSET are restricted. For example, SGX v1 has a limit of maximum enclave memory range for one enclave, which is 128 MB. Hence, any offset within the enclave can be represented using 27 bits. Since the .sgx_mage section is aligned to page boundaries, 27 - 12 = 15 bits are enough to store the offset of an .sgx_mage section. As for COUNT, loading one page could take up to 81 SHA-256 updates including 1 EADD (consists of 1 update) and 16 EEXTEND (each includes 5 updates). Hence, 15 + 7 = 22 bits are enough for COUNT. 5 bytes (40 bits) are enough to hold both OFFSET and COUNT. So one MAINFO can be as small as 32 + 5 = 37 bytes so that an .sgx_mage section of one page size could hold 110 MAINFOS instead of 85.

2) Efficiency of Measurement Derivation: We then measure the time needed for deriving one measurement. From the measurement derivation function described in Algorithm 1, we can see that the time needed for the derivation is independent of the size of the original content of the enclave and the actual number of MAINFOs in the .sgx_mage section. This is because the content is updated into a single MAINFO where the derivation process starts from and all bytes in the .sgx_mage section need to be updated into the final measurement.

So we evaluated the efficiency of measurement derivation using a dummy enclave with only one enclave function that calls sgx_mage_gen_measurement() to derive one measurement from its .sgx_mage section. Also, only

TABLE V. MEMORY OVERHEAD OF MAGE

| <pre># of pages in .sgx_mage</pre> | 1 | 10 | 100 | 1000 | 10000 |
|------------------------------------|----|----|-----|------|-------|
| Size of .sgx_mage (KB) | 4 | 40 | 400 | 4000 | 40000 |
| Memory overhead (KB) | 62 | 98 | 458 | 4058 | 40058 |

one MAINFO from itself is generated and inserted into its .sgx_mage section. As expected, we verified that the derived measurement is the same as its own measurement. We measured the time (averaged from 10000 iterations) needed to run one invocation of sgx_mage_gen_measurement () when the number of pages in the .sgx_mage section ranges from 1 to 10000. The results are shown in Fig. 6. When the .sgx_mage section has a size of a single page, the time for deriving one measurement is around 2.17e-5 seconds or 21.7μ s. The time needed for deriving one measurement increases almost linearly with regards to the number of pages in the .sgx_mage section, because the main operations are updating the intermediate hash value using the content of .sgx_mage section.

3) Memory Overhead: The memory overhead introduced by MAGE includes two components: (1) extra data pages for MARS; (2) extra code pages related to the measurement derivation. The first part is straight forward, which is the size of the .sgx_mage section. To calculate the second part, we created another enclave similar to the dummy enclave we just developed, except that the MAGE-related code and data are removed. We calculated the differences of memory sizes between these two enclaves. The results are presented in Table V. Subtracting the first component from the total extra memory, we got the size of the second component, which is around 58 KB. Since libsgx_mage leverages the SHA-256 implementations provided in the Intel SGX SDK, the second component could be smaller if the original enclave already includes them.

VII. DISCUSSION

In this section, we discuss possible extension of MAGE and its potential application to TEEs other than SGX.

A. Extending MAGE with Untrusted Storage

The basic design of MAGE enables the derivation of measurements from information completely inside the enclave memory. Next, we discuss how MAGE can be extended with untrusted storage outside the enclaves (*e.g.*, unencrypted memory, hard drives, *etc.*).

1) Supporting Unmodified Enclave Loaders: In our basic design, we modified the enclave loaders to rearrange the order of enclave pages to be loaded in a way that the MARS is loaded after all other contents. The libsgx_mage and the signing tool are modified to calculate measurements following the same order. While the libsgx_mage and the signing tool are used by enclave developers, the enclave loader runs on every SGX platform. Therefore, all parties must upgrade their toolchain to support MAGE. While we are discussing with Intel teams to merge MAGE into the official SDK, we next provide a temporary solution to support MAGE without the need of modifying enclave loaders and other SDK packages.



Fig. 7. Alternative design for better scalability.

Consider the content of the enclave C_i is split into two parts: C_i^{pre} is the part loaded before A_i , and C_i^{post} is the part loaded after A_i . The measurement can be calculated as

$$\mathcal{H}(C_i^{pre}||A_i||C_i^{post}) = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}(C_i^{pre})||A_i||C_i^{post})$$

We can still insert the intermediate hash of all pages before A_i , *i.e.*, $\mathcal{H}(C_i^{pre})$ into A_i . As for C_i^{post} , instead of storing all its content within A_i , which introduces too much memory overhead, storing only the hash digest of C_i^{post} within A_i is more affordable. The auxiliary content generation function can be defined as

$$\mathcal{G}(i, (C_1^{pre}, C_1^{post}), \dots, (C_N^{pre}, C_N^{post})) = \mathcal{H}(C_1^{pre}) || \mathcal{H}(C_1^{post}) || \dots || \mathcal{H}(C_N^{pre}) || \mathcal{H}(C_N^{post})$$

During runtime, the enclave issues OCalls to request the host program to provide the content of C_i^{post} for measurement derivation. The hash value $\mathcal{H}(C_i^{post})$ stored in A_i will be used to verify the integrity of C_i^{post} . Then, the measurement derivation function could start from $\mathcal{H}(C_i^{pre})$ and update the content of A_i and C_i^{post} into the intermediate hash to obtain the final measurement. This design requires extra untrusted storage to store C_i^{post} , which unfortunately may take longer time to derive a measurement when C_i^{post} is large.

2) Increasing Scalability: In our basic design, the time cost for measurement derivation and memory overhead grows linearly with regards to the size of the group of trusted enclaves. This would be a problem when the group becomes much larger. Especially, SGX v1 has a limit on the maximum size of enclave memory. To support a large number of enclaves, when untrusted storage outside the enclave is available, all MAINFOS can be moved out of the enclave memory and only the hash of all these MAINFOS is stored within the MARS for integrity protection. During measurement derivation, the target MAINFO will be retrieved from the untrusted storage and authenticated within the enclave. In this way, the memory overhead becomes constant, as only one page of MARS is needed to hold the hash value of all MAINFOS. The time cost for measurement derivation will also become constant as only one page of MARS is required to be updated to the measurement.

However, since MAINFOs are stored in untrusted storage, the overhead for the MAINFO retrieval and integrity verification might still have a linear time complexity when sequential hashing algorithm such as SHA-256 is used. To address this, as shown in Fig. 7, the Merkle tree structure could be adopted to organize MAINFOs outside then enclave memory (only root hash of the Merkle tree is stored within the MARS) for



Fig. 8. Privacy-Preserving Pandemic Tracking System.

efficient retrieval and verification, achieving a logarithmic time complexity instead of a linear time complexity [61].

B. Extensions to Other TEEs

MAGE can be extended to other TEEs that use hash-based measurement mechanisms for attestation. For example, AMD's Secure Encrypted Virtualization (SEV) is a TEE solution that encrypts the memory of virtual machines (VM) without a trusted hypervisor. SEV also uses SHA-256 digest of the guest memory to compute the measurements of guest VMs [62]. Moreover, Sanctum is an open source RISC-V based TEE solution that offers similar promises as Intel SGX, which also adopts a measurement mechanism similar to SGX [63]. These TEEs could be integrated with MAGE to enable mutual attestation without TTP. While ARM TrustZone does not provide integrity measurement inherently, Zhao *et al.* proposed a software-based to provide secure enclaves using TEE such as ARM TrustZone [64]. The proposed scheme also includes a hash-based measurement. Hence, MAGE can also be applied.

Further, MAGE can be extended for different types of TEEs to mutually attest each other. This could benefit applications that integrate different types of TEEs. For example, as shown in Fig. 8, a privacy-preserving pandemic tracking system could be possible when mobile devices with ARM TrustZone are used to collect and transmit users' trajectories to cloud platforms with Intel SGX via a secure channel established through mutual attestation. The collected trajectories could be monitored and analyzed privately within enclaves, and notifications would be returned to those affected mobile users. We expect mutual attestation between SGX and Trustzone would enable many other interesting use cases with cloud/client and edge/client computing models.

C. Supporting Enclave Updates

Although it is possible for the enclave code to be updated after they are deployed, for reasons like fixing bugs or introducing new functionalities, MAGE does not support enclave updates. If the content of any of the enclaves is changed, to continue the use of MAGE, all other enclave binaries need to be updated to reflect the change, before these enclaves are re-deployed in the system.

The lack of support of enclave updates in MAGE is intended. This is because updates of enclave code change not

only the identity of the enclave (MRENCLAVE) but also the trustworthiness of its behavior, especially when the developers are not trusted, which is assumed in our model. Therefore, a new version of an enclave should be inspected again for its trustworthiness. In other words, the trust relationship between these enclaves should be re-evaluated if one has been updated.

We note that enclave applications are similar to dApps built atop smart contracts, which are also difficult to patch once deployed. Therefore, solutions for dApps might also work for enclave applications. We leave the investigation of facilitating enclave updates to future work.

VIII. RELATED WORK

The work that is most related to ours is presented by Greveler et al. [59]. The authors proposed a protocol for two identical Trusted Platform Modules (TPMs) to mutually attest each other for system cloning. The two identical TPMs generate the same value of platform configuration register (PCR), which is cryptographic hash of the software loaded into the TPM, having the same functionality as the measurement in Intel SGX. However, this protocol only works when both entities have the same identity, e.g., PCR or measurement, so that each entity could simply use its own measurement for verification. In contrast, our scheme enables enclaves with different measurements to mutually attest each other, enabling applications beyond system cloning. Shepherd et al. proposed a Bi-directional Trust Protocol (BTP) for establishing mutually trusted channels between two TEEs [58]. But BTP assumed that both TEEs know the identity of the other, while our work answers how this assumption could be realized.

Apache Teaclave, an open source universal secure computing platform, address the mutual attestation problem by relying on third-party auditors [65]. Enclaves will be audited and then signed by these auditors. The public keys of the auditors are hardcoded in these enclaves to support mutual attestation. These auditors are trusted by all involved enclaves and act as trusted third parties. On the contrary, MAGE tackles the mutual attestation problem without trusted third parties.

Also related to our work is a line of research on enclave migration. Park et al. was the first to address this problem by proposing a new SGX hardware instruction to be used to produce a live migration key between two SGX platforms for secure transfer of enclave content [66]. Gu et al. proposed a software-based solution by augmenting enclaves with a thread that could run remote attestation to establish a secure channel with the thread within another identical enclave, and then perform state transfer [67]. Alder et al. proposed an approach to migrate the persistent states of enclaves, e.g., sealed data, which is outside of the enclave memory [68]. And Soriente et al. designed ReplicaTEE for seamless replication of enclaves in clouds [69]. While all these designs address secret migration between enclaves with the same measurement, our technique could complement them by enabling secret migration between enclaves with different measurements.

IX. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we study techniques for a group of enclaves to mutually attest each other without trusted third parties. The main contribution of this paper is the mutual measurement derivation mechanisms, enabling enclaves to derive other trusted enclaves' measurements during runtime. We implement the proposed mechanisms based on Intel SGX SDK and evaluate the performance. We demonstrate through case studies that this technique could facilitate new applications that require mutual trust for interaction and collaboration.

References

- [1] I. Anati, S. Gueron, S. P. Johnson, and V. R. Scarlata, "Innovative technology for cpu based attestation and sealing," in *2nd HASP*, 2013.
- [2] F. McKeen, I. Alexandrovich, A. Berenzon, C. Rozas, H. Shafi, V. Shanbhogue, and U. Savagaonkar, "Innovative instructions and software model for isolated execution," in *2nd HASP*, 2013.
- [3] M. Hoekstra, R. Lal, P. Pappachan, V. Phegade, and J. Del Cuvillo, "Using innovative instructions to create trustworthy software solutions," in *2nd HASP*, 2013.
- [4] F. Schuster, M. Costa, C. Fournet, C. Gkantsidis, M. Peinado, G. Mainar-Ruiz, and M. Russinovich, "VC3: Trustworthy data analytics in the cloud using SGX," in *36th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2015.
- [5] F. Zhang, E. Cecchetti, K. Croman, A. Juels, and E. Shi, "Town crier: An authenticated data feed for smart contracts," in 23rd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security. ACM, 2016.
- [6] F. Tramer, F. Zhang, H. Lin, J.-P. Hubaux, A. Juels, and E. Shi, "Sealedglass proofs: Using transparent enclaves to prove and sell knowledge," Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2016/635, 2016.
- [7] O. Ohrimenko, F. Schuster, C. Fournet, A. Mehta, S. Nowozin, K. Vaswani, and M. Costa, "Oblivious multi-party machine learning on trusted processors," in 25th USENIX Security Symposium, 2016.
- [8] S. Tamrakar, J. Liu, A. Paverd, J.-E. Ekberg, B. Pinkas, and N. Asokan, "The circle game: Scalable private membership test using trusted hardware," in ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security. ACM, 2017.
- [9] W. Zheng, A. Dave, J. G. Beekman, R. A. Popa, J. E. Gonzalez, and I. Stoica, "Opaque: An oblivious and encrypted distributed analytics platform," in *14th USENIX NSDI*, 2017.
- [10] F. Zhang, I. Eyal, R. Escriva, A. Juels, and R. V. Renesse, "REM: Resource-Efficient Mining for Blockchains," in 26th USENIX Security Symposium. USENIX Association, 2017.
- [11] A. Baumann, M. Peinado, and G. Hunt, "Shielding applications from an untrusted cloud with Haven," *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, vol. 33, no. 3, Aug. 2015.
- [12] S. Arnautov, B. Trach, F. Gregor, T. Knauth, A. Martin, C. Priebe, J. Lind, D. Muthukumaran, D. O'Keeffe, M. L. Stillwell, D. Goltzsche, D. Eyers, R. Kapitza, P. Pietzuch, and C. Fetzer, "Scone: Secure linux containers with intel SGX," in *12th USENIX OSDI*, 2016.
- [13] R. Strackx and F. Piessens, "Ariadne: A minimal approach to state continuity," in 25th USENIX Security Symposium, 2016.
- [14] T. Hunt, Z. Zhu, Y. Xu, S. Peter, and E. Witchel, "Ryoan: A distributed sandbox for untrusted computation on secret data," in *12th USENIX* OSDI, 2016.
- [15] C.-C. Tsai, D. E. Porter, and M. Vij, "Graphene-SGX: A practical library OS for unmodified applications on SGX," in USENIX ATC, 2017.
- [16] D. Kuvaiskii, O. Oleksenko, S. Arnautov, B. Trach, P. Bhatotia, P. Felber, and C. Fetzer, "Sgxbounds: Memory safety for shielded execution," in *12th European Conference on Computer Systems*. ACM, 2017.
- [17] S. Weiser and M. Werner, "SGXIO: Generic trusted i/o path for Intel SGX," arXiv preprint, arXiv:1701.01061, 2017.
- [18] D. Tychalas, N. G. Tsoutsos, and M. Maniatakos, "SGXCrypter: IP protection for portable executables using intel's SGX technology," in 22nd Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference, 2017.
- [19] S. Shinde, D. L. Tien, S. Tople, and P. Saxena, "Panoply: Low-TCB linux applications with SGX enclaves," in *The Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*, 2017.
- [20] J. Seo, B. Lee, S. Kim, M.-W. Shih, I. Shin, D. Han, and T. Kim, "SGX-Shield: Enabling address space layout randomization for SGX programs," in *The Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*, 2017.

- [21] S. Matetic, K. Kostiainen, A. Dhar, D. Sommer, M. Ahmed, A. Gervais, A. Juels, and S. Capkun, "Rote: Rollback protection for trusted execution," Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2017/048, 2017.
- [22] M. Russinovich, "Introducing azure confidential computing," https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/blog/ introducing-azure-confidential-computing/, 2017.
- [23] Alicloud, "ECS bare metal instance," 2018, https://www.alibabacloud. com/product/ebm.
- [24] Fortanix, "Runtime Encryption with Intel SGX," 2018, https://fortanix. com/.
- [25] Intel, "Attestation Service for Intel Software Guard Extensions (Intel SGX): API Documentation," https://software.intel.com/sites/default/ files/managed/7e/3b/ias-api-spec.pdf, 2018.
- [26] R. Cheng, F. Zhang, J. Kos, W. He, N. Hynes, N. Johnson, A. Juels, A. Miller, and D. Song, "Ekiden: A platform for confidentialitypreserving, trustworthy, and performant smart contracts," in 2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS P), 2019, pp. 185–200.
- [27] P. Das, L. Eckey, T. Frassetto, D. Gens, K. Hostáková, P. Jauernig, S. Faust, and A.-R. Sadeghi, "Fastkitten: Practical smart contracts on bitcoin," in 28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19). Santa Clara, CA: USENIX Association, Aug. 2019, pp. 801–818. [Online]. Available: https://www.usenix.org/conference/ usenixsecurity19/presentation/das
- [28] F. Alder, N. Asokan, A. Kurnikov, A. Paverd, and M. Steiner, "S-faas: Trustworthy and accountable function-as-a-service using intel sgx," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Cloud Computing Security Workshop*, ser. CCSW'19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 185–199. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/3338466.3358916
- [29] B. Fisch, D. Vinayagamurthy, D. Boneh, and S. Gorbunov, "Iron: Functional encryption using intel sgx," in *Proceedings of the 2017* ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, ser. CCS '17. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 765–782. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10. 1145/3133956.3134106
- [30] G. Chen, Y. Zhang, and T.-H. Lai, "Opera: Open remote attestation for intel's secure enclaves," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 2317–2331. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/3319535. 3354220
- [31] T. Knauth, M. Steiner, S. Chakrabarti, L. Lei, C. Xing, and M. Vij, "Integrating Remote Attestation with Transport Layer Security," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1801.05863, 2018. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/ 1801.05863
- [32] E. Cecchetti, F. Zhang, Y. Ji, A. Kosba, A. Juels, and E. Shi, "Solidus: Confidential distributed ledger transactions via pvorm," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer* and Communications Security, ser. CCS '17. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 701–717. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/3133956.3134010
- [33] J. Lind, O. Naor, I. Eyal, F. Kelbert, E. G. Sirer, and P. Pietzuch, "Teechain: A secure payment network with asynchronous blockchain access," in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, ser. SOSP '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 63–79. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/3341301.3359627
- [34] E. Barker, W. Barker, W. Burr, W. Polk, and M. Smid, "Secure hash standard (shs)," *Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) Publications (PUBS)*, Aug 2015.
- [35] S. Johnson, V. Scarlata, C. Rozas, E. Brickell, and F. Mckeen, "Intel Software Guard Extensions: EPID Provisioning and Attestation Services," Intel, Tech. Rep., Tech. Rep., 2016.
- [36] Intel, "Intel Software Guard Extensions (Intel SGX) Data Center Attestation Primitives: ECDSA Quote Library API," https://download. 01.org/intel-sgx/dcap-1.0/docs/SGX_ECDSA_QuoteGenReference_ DCAP_API_Linux_1.0.pdf, 2018.

- [37] —, "Intel 64 and IA-32 architectures software developer's manual, combined volumes:1,2A,2B,2C,3A,3B,3C and 3D," https://software.intel.com/sites/default/files/managed/39/c5/ 325462-sdm-vol-1-2abcd-3abcd.pdf, 2017.
- [38] S. Kim, J. Han, J. Ha, T. Kim, and D. Han, "Enhancing security and privacy of tor's ecosystem by using trusted execution environments," in 14th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 17). Boston, MA: USENIX Association, Mar. 2017, pp. 145–161. [Online]. Available: https://www.usenix.org/ conference/nsdi17/technical-sessions/presentation/kim-seongmin
- [39] J. Van Bulck, M. Minkin, O. Weisse, D. Genkin, B. Kasikci, F. Piessens, M. Silberstein, T. F. Wenisch, Y. Yarom, and R. Strackx, "Foreshadow: Extracting the keys to the intel SGX kingdom with transient out-oforder execution," in 27th USENIX Security Symposium, 2018.
- [40] G. Chen, S. Chen, Y. Xiao, Y. Zhang, Z. Lin, and T. H. Lai, "Stealing intel secrets from sgx enclaves via speculative execution," in *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy*, June 2019.
- [41] S. van Schaik, A. Milburn, S. sterlund, P. Frigo, G. Maisuradze, K. Razavi, H. Bos, and C. Giuffrida, "RIDL: Rogue in-flight data load," in *Security and Privacy (SP)*, 2019 IEEE Symposium on, May 2019.
- [42] M. Schwarz, M. Lipp, D. Moghimi, J. Van Bulck, J. Stecklina, T. Prescher, and D. Gruss, "ZombieLoad: Cross-privilege-boundary data sampling," in ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security, 2019.
- [43] M. Minkin, D. Moghimi, M. Lipp, M. Schwarz, J. V. Bulck, D. Genkin, D. Gruss, F. Piessens, B. Sunar, and Y. Yarom, "Fallout: Reading kernel writes from user space," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12701*, 2019.
- [44] J. Van Bulck, D. Oswald, E. Marin, A. Aldoseri, F. D. Garcia, and F. Piessens, "A tale of two worlds: Assessing the vulnerability of enclave shielding runtimes," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 1741–1758. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/3319535. 3363206
- [45] A. Biondo, M. Conti, L. Davi, T. Frassetto, and A.-R. Sadeghi, "The guard's dilemma: Efficient code-reuse attacks against intel SGX," in 27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18). Baltimore, MD: USENIX Association, Aug. 2018, pp. 1213–1227. [Online]. Available: https://www.usenix.org/conference/ usenixsecurity18/presentation/biondo
- [46] J. Lee, J. Jang, Y. Jang, N. Kwak, Y. Choi, C. Choi, T. Kim, M. Peinado, and B. B. Kang, "Hacking in darkness: Returnoriented programming against secure enclaves," in 26th USENIX Security Symposium. Vancouver, BC: USENIX Association, 2017, pp. 523–539. [Online]. Available: https://www.usenix.org/conference/ usenixsecurity17/technical-sessions/presentation/lee-jaehyuk
- [47] W. Wang, G. Chen, X. Pan, Y. Zhang, X. Wang, V. Bindschaedler, H. Tang, and C. A. Gunter, "Leaky cauldron on the dark land: Understanding memory side-channel hazards in SGX," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2017.
- [48] M. Schwarz, S. Weiser, D. Gruss, C. Maurice, and S. Mangard, "Malware guard extension: Using SGX to conceal cache attacks," in Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment: 14th International Conference, DIMVA 2017, Bonn, Germany, July 6-7, 2017, Proceedings. Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- [49] F. Brasser, U. Müller, A. Dmitrienko, K. Kostiainen, S. Capkun, and A.-R. Sadeghi, "Software grand exposure: SGX cache attacks are practical," in 11th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies, 2017.
- [50] M. Hähnel, W. Cui, and M. Peinado, "High-resolution side channels for untrusted operating systems," in USENIX ATC, 2017.
- [51] J. Götzfried, M. Eckert, S. Schinzel, and T. Müller, "Cache attacks on Intel SGX," in *EUROSEC*, 2017.
- [52] S. Lee, M.-W. Shih, P. Gera, T. Kim, H. Kim, and M. Peinado, "Inferring fine-grained control flow inside SGX enclaves with branch shadowing," in 26th USENIX Security Symposium, 2017, pp. 557–574.
- [53] J. Van Bulck, N. Weichbrodt, R. Kapitza, F. Piessens, and R. Strackx,

"Telling your secrets without page faults: Stealthy page table-based attacks on enclaved execution," in *Proceedings of the 26th USENIX Security Symposium*. USENIX Association, 2017.

- [54] Y. Xu, W. Cui, and M. Peinado, "Controlled-channel attacks: Deterministic side channels for untrusted operating systems," in *Security and Privacy (SP), 2015 IEEE Symposium on.* IEEE, 2015, pp. 640–656.
- [55] S. Shinde, Z. L. Chua, V. Narayanan, and P. Saxena, "Preventing page faults from telling your secrets," in *Proceedings of the 11th ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2016.
- [56] W. Wang, Y. Zhang, and Z. Lin, "Time and order: Towards automatically identifying side-channel vulnerabilities in enclave binaries," in 22nd International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses (RAID 2019). Chaoyang District, Beijing: USENIX Association, Sep. 2019, pp. 443–457. [Online]. Available: https://www.usenix.org/conference/raid2019/presentation/wang-wubing
- [57] Y. Xiao, M. Li, S. Chen, and Y. Zhang, "Stacco: Differentially analyzing side-channel traces for detecting ssl/tls vulnerabilities in secure enclaves," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference* on Computer and Communications Security, ser. CCS '17. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 859–874. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/3133956.3134016
- [58] C. Shepherd, R. N. Akram, and K. Markantonakis, "Establishing mutually trusted channels for remote sensing devices with trusted execution environments," in *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security*, ser. ARES '17. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/3098954.3098971
- [59] U. Greveler, B. Justus, and D. Löhr, "Mutual remote attestation: Enabling system cloning for tpm based platforms," in *Security and Trust Management*, C. Meadows and C. Fernandez-Gago, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012, pp. 193–206.
- [60] Intel, "Intel SGX SDK," https://github.com/intel/linux-sgx, 2019.
- [61] R. C. Merkle, "A digital signature based on a conventional encryption function," in A Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques on Advances in Cryptology, ser. CRYPTO '87. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1987, pp. 369–378.
- [62] D. Kaplan, J. Powell, and T. Woller, "Amd memory encryption," White paper, 2016, https://developer.amd.com/wordpress/media/2013/ 12/AMD_Memory_Encryption_Whitepaper_v7-Public.pdf.
- [63] V. Costan, I. Lebedev, and S. Devadas, "Sanctum: Minimal hardware extensions for strong software isolation," in 25th USENIX Security Symposium, 2016.
- [64] S. Zhao, Q. Zhang, Y. Qin, W. Feng, and D. Feng, "Sectee: A software-based approach to secure enclave architecture using tee," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer* and Communications Security, ser. CCS '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 1723–1740. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/3319535.3363205
- [65] A. Teaclave, "Mutual Attestation: Why and How," 2019, https:// teaclave.apache.org/docs/mutual-attestation/.
- [66] J. Park, S. Park, J. Oh, and J. Won, "Toward live migration of sgxenabled virtual machines," in 2016 IEEE World Congress on Services (SERVICES), 2016, pp. 111–112.
- [67] J. Gu, Z. Hua, Y. Xia, H. Chen, B. Zang, H. Guan, and J. Li, "Secure live migration of sgx enclaves on untrusted cloud," in 2017 47th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN), 2017, pp. 225–236.
- [68] F. Alder, A. Kurnikov, A. Paverd, and N. Asokan, "Migrating SGX enclaves with persistent state," in 48th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks, DSN 2018, Luxembourg City, Luxembourg, June 25-28, 2018. IEEE Computer Society, 2018, pp. 195–206. [Online]. Available: https://doi. org/10.1109/DSN.2018.00031
- [69] C. Soriente, G. Karame, W. Li, and S. Fedorov, "Replicatee: Enabling seamless replication of SGX enclaves in the cloud," in *IEEE European* Symposium on Security and Privacy, EuroS&P 2019, Stockholm, Sweden, June 17-19, 2019. IEEE, 2019, pp. 158–171. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSP.2019.00021