

# Scalable Attestation of Virtualized Execution Environments in Hybrid- and Multi-Cloud

Wojciech Ozga  
*IBM Research Zurich*

Patricia Sagmeister  
*IBM Research Zurich*

Tamás Visegrády\*\*  
*IBM Research Zurich*

Silvio Dragone  
*IBM Research Zurich*

April 4, 2023

## Abstract

Existing attestation mechanisms lack scalability and support for heterogeneous virtual execution environments (VEEs), such as virtual machines and containers executed inside or outside hardware isolation on different vendors' hardware in clouds managed by various organizations. To overcome these limitations, hardware vendors and cloud providers implement proprietary mechanisms (Intel DCAP, Amazon NitroTPM, Google Titan) to support their offerings. However, due to their plurality, the attestation becomes cumbersome because it increases maintenance and integration costs and reduces portability required in hybrid- and multi-cloud deployments.

We introduce WAWEL, a framework that enables scalable attestation of heterogeneous VEEs. WAWEL can be plugged into existing hardware-specific attestation mechanisms, offering a unified interface. WAWEL supports the widely adopted trusted platform module (TPM) attestation standard. We implemented a prototype and integrated it with three different VEEs. It supports runtime integrity attestation with Linux integrity measurement architecture (IMA) and legacy applications requiring zero-code changes. The evaluation demonstrated that the WAWEL prototype achieves very good performance and scalability despite the indirections between the VEE and hardware root of trust.

## 1 Introduction

Cloud providers and tenants attest to the computing environment to ensure its compliance with security requirements. They use attestation protocols to obtain technical assurance

that computations execute on the required operating system running on specific hardware in the cloud. Unfortunately, the existing attestation mechanisms do not scale [15, 25], are limited to particular vendors' hardware [40, 41, 25, 18], or do not support different virtualization technologies [35, 40]. We address these problems with an architecture that offers scalability and portability, properties that are required in hybrid- and multi-cloud deployments. Our approach unifies vendor- and virtualization-specific mechanisms behind an open and standardized attestation interface, leading to decreased maintenance and integration costs.

The virtualization technology enables the economic value of clouds because physical resources are dynamically provisioned and shared among tenants accordingly to their business needs. Logically, a single powerful physical computer creates smaller logical computational units called virtual execution environments (VEEs). Based on the non-functional requirements, such as performance, resource allocation, and isolation level, clouds create VEEs using different virtualization and isolation techniques. These offer different security guarantees. Our architecture, WAWEL, operates under the threat model of the virtualization technology underpinning the VEE. Examples of VEEs are containers [43], virtual machines [6, 3], isolated processes (enclaves) [12, 11], isolated containers [4], or secure virtual machines [23, 26].

Modern computing software stacks, like unified extensible firmware interface (UEFI) [38, 47, 48], Linux kernel [1], and Microsoft Windows, adopted the trusted platform module (TPM) standard [15] that laid the foundations for the integrity attestation of personal computers [49]. Today's firmware and software use TPM-compatible devices to securely store and certify integrity measurements of the boot firmware and operating system. Although widely adopted,

\*\*Tamás Visegrády is now affiliated with Metaco Labs

this technology failed in cloud deployments due to scalability limitations. Specifically, the demand for the secure storage capacity for storing integrity measurements of VEEs grows faster than the physical storage capacity of a resource-constrained discrete TPM device.

To overcome this limitation, cloud providers turn to proprietary hardware to enable attestation at scale [18, 40, 41, 28]. However, proprietary hardware increases infrastructure costs and forces tenants to adapt to the cloud vendor’s application programming interface (API). WAWEL overcomes these limitations. It relies on a limited number of cryptographic coprocessors that handle security-sensitive attestation operations in a high-availability and fault-tolerant way while relying on the state-of-the-art TPM protocol’s API for portability. Unlike TPM devices that are hard linked with a physical computer, WAWEL introduces stateless cryptographic coprocessors that offer TPM-like capabilities to a virtually unlimited number of VEEs. The scalability results from the secure offloading of the VEE-specific state from the cryptographic coprocessor. Conversely, in the case of the TPM, the state never leaves the TPM device’s secure boundary.

WAWEL provides attestation primitives that can be plugged into different virtualization and isolation technologies. The advantage of WAWEL is that it complements existing vendor-specific attestation mechanisms with the support of an open attestation standard. Consequently, tenants can use the standardized protocol [49] and its large software and hardware ecosystem [20, 39, 38, 9, 2, 47, 48] to collect technical assurance of the provisioned VEEs regardless of the virtualization type (virtual machine [6], container [43]), isolation level (confidential computing [19, 23, 26, 11, 8]), or cloud-specific root of trust (Titan [40], NitroTPM [18]).

WAWEL has noteworthy advantages. First, unlike state-of-the-art TPM devices, WAWEL provides scalability because it introduces the concept of stateless cryptographic coprocessors that provide architectural primitives for attestation. Second, it enables portability by implementing the widely adopted TPM protocol’s API, abstracting tenants from the underlying hardware and cloud provider-specific attestation. Third, it suits hybrid- and multi-cloud deployments by offering a unified attestation interface based on the distributed root of trust.

Evaluation of the WAWEL prototype showed that it is practical in terms of portability, performance, and scalability. It provides a drop-in replacement for TPM-based architectures, supporting TPM-based applications with zero-code changes.

We integrated the WAWEL prototype with three different VEEs. Furthermore, the prototype supports runtime integrity measurement and attestation with the help of Linux integrity measurement architecture (IMA) and a custom TPM driver. The WAWEL prototype achieved low latencies for retrieving the signed attestation quote, 5 ms vs 209 ms, and extending integrity measurements, 1 ms vs 9 ms, compared to a hardware TPM, respectively. A prototype equipped in a single stateless cryptographic coprocessor achieved a throughput of 20k integrity measurement extensions per second and 7.5k quotes per second that justifies the economical use of the proposed design in clouds.

In summary, we make the following contributions:

- We introduced a novel approach to scalable attestation by introducing the offloading of integrity measurements from stateless cryptographic coprocessors (§2).
- We analyzed and discussed the security rationale related to the offloaded integrity measurements (§3).
- We designed WAWEL, a scalable attestation architecture of heterogenous VEEs that suits hybrid- and multi-cloud requirements (§2).
- We implemented a prototype of the WAWEL architecture that supports three different VEEs, as well as TPM-based applications and Linux IMA (§4).
- We evaluated the performance and scalability of the WAWEL prototype (§5).

## 2 Overview

### 2.1 High-level Overview

Figure 1 shows the high-level overview of the WAWEL architecture that consists of four components:

- (A) Virtual execution environments (VEEs) that are subject of attestation. For example, virtual machines or containers.
- (B) A measuring agent, a piece of code that collects and records the integrity measurements.
- (C) Stateless cryptographic coprocessors that act as a root of trust (RoT) for attestation, for example, network-accessible hardware security modules (HSMs).
- (D) Virtual secure element (VSE) states, cryptographically protected states containing VEEs’ integrity measurements.




Figure 1: High-level overview of the WAWEL design. To achieve scalability, stateless cryptographic coprocessors securely offload the virtual secure element (VSE) state to virtual execution environment (VEE). A VSE state contains attestation-related VEE-specific information, like integrity measurements.

A tenant trusts cryptographic coprocessors; based on this relation, he establishes trust with the VEE. First, he retrieves a certificate containing the VEE’s integrity measurements. Then, he ensures that the genuine cryptographic coprocessor signed this certificate and the certified measurements reflect the expected VEE.

Cryptographic coprocessors enable attestation of VEEs by providing the necessary architectural primitives. These are secure storage aggregating integrity measurements and a signing mechanism that certifies these measurements. Each VEE (A) has its own VSE instance, which consists of the VSE state (D) and a stateless cryptographic coprocessor (C). For scalability purposes, unlike in the existing attestation designs [35, 40], the VSE state is securely offloaded from the cryptographic coprocessor. Thus, stateless cryptographic coprocessors can handle a virtually unlimited number of VEEs. We discuss the security rationale of the offloaded VSE state in §3.

Cryptographic coprocessors are high-assurance devices optimized for high-throughput, low-latency cryptographic operations. Examples of cryptographic coprocessors are HSMs that build the security foundation of modern clouds and serve as the RoT for safety- and security-critical applications, like banking or governmental systems. HSMs are certified at federal information processing standard (FIPS) 140-2 Level 3 or Level 4 [22] that respond to unauthorized access at software and physical level. Therefore, WAWEL uses them as a RoT component, extending them with the VSE functionality that enables scalable VEEs attestation.




Figure 2: Integrity measurement and quote generation process. Measurement agents collect integrity measurements and record them in the virtual secure element (VSE). Agents execute sequentially. The first one, called core root of trust for measurement (CRTM) initializes the chain of trust and, therefore, is trusted.

## 2.2 Integrity Measurements

Each VEE logically possesses a dedicated VSE instance, which stores integrity measurements and certifies them with a digital signature. Technically, a cryptographic coprocessor creates a VSE on behalf of a trusted process called core root of trust for measurement (CRTM). Figure 2 shows how CRTM starts the measurement chain. Together with subsequent processes (measurement agents), it collects integrity measurements and sends them to the cryptographic coprocessor to persist them in the VSE state attached to the request. Measurement agents always replace the previous state with the latest one to prevent rollbacks to the previous VSE state (see §3.2), similarly to the systems implementing the TCG’s attestation schemes (see §3.1).

## 2.3 Attestation

The verifier, like a tenant owning a VEE or an auditor, attests to the VEE integrity to ensure that the VEE conforms with security requirements imposed by regulators or a security policy. He requests a proof from the cryptographic coprocessor in the form of a digitally signed certificate. This certificate includes a digest over aggregated integrity measurements, a nonce, and a signature issued with the cryptographic coprocessor signing key. The verifier checks that the genuine cryptographic coprocessor signed the certificate, the nonce guarantees the freshness, and the cryptographic hash over aggregated measurements corresponds to a *golden* hash representing the trusted integrity state of the VEE. Each

VSE has a unique random seed that acts as the VEE identity. This seed is embedded in the VSE-specific endorsement key (EK) certificate linked to the cryptographic coprocessor’s manufacturer certificate. The verifier uses the seed to differentiate among VEEs, similarly how hardware TPM’s EK are used.

## 2.4 Unified Attestation Interface

The trusted platform module (TPM) specification [49] is the open standard that defines the attestation protocol. The industry has widely adopted it across the entire firmware and software stack [38, 1, 39, 9, 2]. However, alternative attestation mechanisms emerged for clouds because of the scalability limitation of the TPM architecture that requires each execution environment to have a single hardware TPM device. Standard protocols for cryptographic coprocessors, such as public key cryptography standard #11 (PKCS#11) [31] and Enterprise PKCS#11 (EP11) [50], do not implement the TPM protocol.

To maintain a unified attestation interface and to overcome the scalability limitations, WAWEL extends cryptographic coprocessors with two functionalities. The first one is the support for the minimal subset of the TPM protocol required for attestation: the generation of a signed quote and secure management of integrity measurements. The second functionality is the offloading of the state containing cryptographic measurements to enable scalability by maintaining stateless security coprocessors.

## 3 Security Rationale

### 3.1 Attestation schemes

The WAWEL architecture leverages concepts from the state-of-the-art Trusted Computing Group (TCG)’s attestation schemes, namely the measured boot [49] and the device identifier composition engine (DICE) [16]. Following the measured boot approach, WAWEL requires access to a secure element offering security-relevant features, such as the digital signing and cryptographic aggregation of integrity measurements. Unlike the TPM-based approach, WAWEL requires a stateless secure element for scalability reasons, moving WAWEL toward DICE, where each measuring agent manages the aggregated measurement and moves it to the next measuring agent executing in the subsequent boot level.




Figure 3: Comparison of the WAWEL attestation scheme with the TCG measured boot and DICE. WAWEL benefits from both designs. It relies on an external secure element for security-critical operations while the state is being kept outside the secure element within the measuring agent.

Figure 3 presents the overview of TCG attestation schemes and WAWEL. They all rely on the chain of trust execution that starts with the trusted measuring agent called CRTM. In the TCG’s schemes, CRTM is baked into the read-only memory inside the boot processor in the measured boot and DICE designs. WAWEL instead requires implementing the CRTM inside the trusted computing base (TCB) of the target virtualization technology (see §6).

The measured boot (A) relies on the TPM [15] to securely store and sign measurements. The TPM implements platform configuration registers (PCRs) that can only be cryptographically extended with a new measurement and reset only during the processor’s power-on cycle. Measuring agents, starting with the CRTM, extend PCRs with measurements of the following boot layer before executing it. Therefore, PCRs reflect the integrity state of the executed software because an adversary cannot revert or overwrite the values of PCRs. The TPM stores the EK, which is a cryptographic identity that uniquely identifies the TPM and signs the measurements stored in PCRs.

The DICE architecture (B) originally targeted systems that cannot use the TPM due to cost or size restrictions, like internet of things (IoT). However, DICE’s simplicity brought it popularity, leading to the formally proven imple-






Figure 4: Potential misuse of the cryptographically protected state that leads to attacks discussed in §3.

mentation [46] and dedicated intellectual property (IP) block for system on chip (SoC) [28]. The key idea of the DICE design is that CRTM initializes the aggregated measurements with the unique device secret (UDS) and every subsequent measuring agent measures the next boot layer and aggregates this measurement using the one-way hash function [36]. The result is passed between the measuring agents of subsequent boot layers. The verifier can then establish trust with the software that proves possession of the aggregated measurement derived from the UDS. A more complex DICE variant involves asymmetric cryptography. Consecutive boot layers receive the private key and certificate containing the aggregated measurements from the previous layers. The verifier uses a certificate chain linked to the device manufacturer to verify the genuineness of the device and checks the aggregated measurement inside the leaf certificate.

The WAWEL architecture (C) derives from both concepts. The cryptographic coprocessor implements security-sensitive functionalities, like measurement aggregation using the hash function and digital signing of the quote. However, the state containing integrity measurements and a unique seed used to differentiate among VEEs is offloaded from the cryptographic coprocessor to measuring agents. Like in the DICE design, each measuring agent passes the state to the next boot layer and removes the previous version of the state before passing control to the next boot layer.

### 3.2 Offloaded state

In the WAWEL architecture, cryptographic coprocessors create and manage VSEs. However, because of the limited physical storage, they offload the VEE-specific state. VEEs attach the state to every request they make to cryptographic coprocessors. The offloaded state is protected against tam-

pering with a message authentication code (MAC). A cryptographic coprocessor attaches to the VSE state a cryptographic signature — an hash-based message authentication code (HMAC), which it then verifies before using it [51].

Although the VSE state is protected against tampering, we analyze in this section potential attacks that an adversary could run when having access to legitimate, correctly signed VSE states.

**Shared HMAC key.** Cryptographic coprocessors share the same HMAC key for scalability, high availability, and fault-tolerance reasons. Sharing the same HMAC key allows them to handle requests produced by related cryptographic coprocessors. The administrator increases and decreases the number of cryptographic coprocessors according to high availability and scalability requirements without affecting security.

The HMAC key never leaves cryptographic coprocessors. The administrator requests its creation and then distributes it to cryptographic coprocessors to form the pool of cryptographic coprocessors serving attestation primitives. The administrator never sees the HMAC key in plain text. He uses one cryptographic coprocessor to generate the HMAC key and then offloads it. The offloaded key is wrapped with a master key of another cryptographic coprocessor. The administrator imports then the wrapped key to another cryptographic coprocessor, which unwraps the HMAC key using its master key.

**Replay attacks.** Figure 4a) shows the replay attack. In this attack, an adversary controlling a malicious VEE replays an old VSE state to create a deviating measurement chain that does not include all measurements. There are two different approaches to mitigate this attack. In the first one, the VEE removes old VEE states. In the second one, the cryptographic coprocessor leverages monotonic counters for freshness protection.

The first approach consists of correctly implementing measurement agents inside the VEE. They must destroy the old VSE state immediately after they receive the new one and before they execute the measured code. Otherwise, the malicious code, which was measured, has access to the old VSE state that does not include her measurement. She can vanish the measurement by reusing the old state, effectively hiding her presence from the verifier. It is the same assumption as in the DICE [16].

The second approach leverages monotonic counters [29,

45] that version each VSE state. The cryptographic coprocessor adds the value of the monotonic counter to the VSE state and increments the counter. The next time it receives the VSE state, it compares the monotonic counter value with the value stored in the VSE state. A mismatch indicates the replay attack.

**Relay attacks.** Figure 4b) illustrates the relay attack. The adversary who gained temporal control over the VEE copies the VSE state to another VEE. He can then certify the other VEE’s integrity using the VSE state, even though this state does not reflect the true integrity of the other VEE. This attack is equivalent to relay attacks, like the TPM cuckoo attack [34], in which an adversary responds to attestation queries using the TPM of a legitimate VEE. Please note that the certified integrity measurements in this attack still reflect the VEE integrity. The VEE owner is responsible for protecting the VEE and its state and not exposing the attestation functionality to the untrusted outside world.

**Reset attacks.** An adversary might want to impersonate a legitimate VEE by convincing a tenant that the VEE under her control is legitimate. To achieve it, she could exploit the attestation infrastructure to obtain proof containing *golden measurements* that correspond to the legitimate VEE.

Figure 4c) depicts the attack in which an attacker requests a new VSE that does not contain any measurement yet. Then, simulating the behaviour of legitimate measurement agents, she replays the golden measurements. This attack is equivalent to the TPM reset attack [44, 27], in which an adversary gets rid of unwanted measurements by first resetting the TPM device and then sending arbitrary measurements.

Two alternative solutions exist to mitigate this attack. In the first one, the cryptographic coprocessor initializes the VSE state with a random number measurement. This mitigates the attack because the probability that an adversary finds measurements leading to the desired digest included in the attestation is negligible because of the soundness of the cryptographic hash-function properties [36, 13]. In this approach, however, the random number must be known to the tenant, so he can recalculate the attestation digest. One option is that the cloud provider discloses the random number during the VEE provisioning.

In the second approach, authorizing access to the cryptographic coprocessors’ interface prevents an adversary from creating VSEs. CRTMs are then the only components allowed to create new VSEs. They identify themselves using




Figure 5: High-level overview of the WAWEL prototype.

credentials, like transport layer security (TLS) credentials or pre-shared TLS keys. To differentiate among execution environments with different security assurance, CRTMs possess different credentials. Cryptographic coprocessors sign attestation proofs using keys to differentiate among virtualization technologies.

## 4 Implementation

Figure 5 shows the architecture of the WAWEL prototype implementation, which is compatible with the TPM protocol [15] and supports the Linux integrity measurement architecture (IMA) [39]. The prototype consists of five components:

- (A) Bootloader firmware implementing CRTM and requesting a new VSE,
- (B) Broker service creating new VSEs,
- (C) Client executing inside of a VEE and using the VSE for attestation,
- (D) Shim translating the TPM protocol to the HSM protocol,
- (E) HSMs supporting the VSE extension.

The WAWEL prototype implements the shim because we could not modify the HSM firmware to fully implement the required architectural changes. The shim is a layer of indirection between the client and the HSM that performs security-critical operations that should be otherwise implemented in the HSM. Specifically, it constructs the TPM-compatible quote structure containing expected integrity measurements. It then requests the HSM to sign the quote.




Figure 6: WAWEL prototype implementation of the virtual execution environment (VEE) bootstrap. The core root of trust for measurement (CRTM) creates a new virtual secure element (VSE) and populates it with early integrity measurements before passing control to untrusted runtime components.

We implemented the majority of the WAWEL components in the memory-safe language Rust [30]. We used the C language to implement the custom Linux kernel driver. We relied on the `m_SetAttributeValue` of the EP11 [50] command set to emulate the PCR functionality in the HSM. The prototype was integrated with three VEEs: Docker containers, QEMU kernel-based virtual machine (KVM) [6], and one hardware-based trusted execution environment (TEE) technology.<sup>1</sup>

#### 4.1 Load-time integrity measurements

Figure 6 shows the creation of a VSE instance and the extension of first integrity measurements during the boot process of the VEE. These security-critical operations must be performed within a trusted environment. Otherwise, an adversary could spawn a new VSE to achieve an equivalent of the TPM reset attack [44, 27], see §3.2. Depending on the final environment, this could be implemented in, for example, a more privileged layer, like `VMPL0` in the AMD Secure Encrypted Virtualization (SEV) guest OS, the encrypted bootloader of IBM Z Secure Execution [8], or trusted hypervisor like in the vTPM design [35]. See §6 for more details.

Creating a new VSE instance requires access to the broker service before the startup of the network stack, *i.e.*, before the VEE becomes accessible to the hostile outside world. In our prototype, the connector utility establishes a mutual TLS

over remote procedure calls (gRPC) to the broker service via the virtio-vsock interface [17]. The vsock interface is available early during the boot process before the network is set up. Packages travel over the vsock (virtualized i/o) to the hypervisor and from there to the broker service running on the well-known host and port.

Access to the broker service is mutually authenticated using TLS credentials. Their distribution depends on the data center infrastructure. A certificate authority (CA) can, for example, distribute credentials statically during the VEE image build, like in the case of the IBM Z Secure Execution technology [8]. Trusted hypervisors, like in the Amazon Web Services (AWS) Nitro architecture [18], could unseal them from the hardware root of trust, *e.g.*, a TPM. TEE, like AMD SEV [26] or Intel Trust Domain eXtensions (TDX) [23], could recover them after the successful attestation of the initial bootloader.

#### 4.2 Runtime Integrity Measurements

Figure 7 shows the use of the prototype WAWEL implementation inside of the VEE. To support legacy TPM ecosystems, WAWEL implements a custom kernel driver. Consequently, TPM clients, such as the TPM software stack (TSS) [20], Keylime [42], and IMA [39], access the VSE as if they were accessing a locally attached hardware TPM. They send TPM commands to the standard TPM interface controlled by a dedicated TPM driver (`/dev/tpm0` device). A userspace application, called proxy, reads the TPM command from the kernel space using a dedicated interface (`/dev/rtpm` device). The proxy component is required because the kernel driver running in the kernel space cannot establish the gRPC network connection.

The TPM driver executes in two modes, asynchronous and synchronous mode. It starts in the asynchronous mode, aggregating TPM commands in the internal kernel buffer while responding with valid but made-up TPM responses. This allows the system to boot correctly despite lack of the link to the real TPM device. The driver switches to the synchronous mode as soon as the proxy utility sends all buffered TPM commands to the HSM. This happens early during the boot process when the HSM becomes reachable over the network. In the synchronous mode, the driver does not buffer commands anymore. It also returns the real TPM responses received from the shim.

The initial TPM commands to which the driver responds

<sup>1</sup>Details omitted due to double-blindness requirements




Figure 7: WAWEL prototype implementation with runtime components. The custom kernel driver and proxy hide the remote nature of the virtual secure element (VSE). Consequently, WAWEL transparently supports TPM clients, like Linux integrity measurement architecture (IMA).

with made-up responses are sent by the Linux kernel to discover the TPM properties, like the number of PCRs, banks, or supported cryptographic algorithms. IMA also sends measurements early during the system’s boot and before the proxy is started. These initial IMA measurements are also buffered and executed in the same order in which the proxy received them. Depending on the implementation, this might be a vulnerability window for the replay attack. One might eliminate or reduce the size of the vulnerability window by starting the proxy before the network setup. Like this, buffered measurements are processed before the adversary gets access to the VEE over the network. The implementation might leverage, for example, the vsock interface to get access to the shim early in the boot process.

## 5 Evaluation

We evaluated WAWEL to answer the following questions:

1. Is WAWEL practical in terms of the execution latency of TPM commands, compared to a hardware TPM?
2. How many VEEs can be handled by a single stateless cryptographic coprocessor?
3. Does the WAWEL architecture scale with the increasing number of VEEs?

**Testbed:** Experiments execute on three machines located in the same data center and connected via 10 Gb Ethernet. Machine A hosts QEMU [6] virtual machines and the WAWEL’s broker service. Machine B runs WAWEL’s shim




Figure 8: Composed latencies of running TPM commands on the WAWEL prototype.

services that have access to the HSM. Machine C generates load during the scalability experiment.

**Machine A** is a Supermicro SYS-610C-TR server equipped with an Intel Xeon Gold 6338 CPU with 128 cores, 512 GiB of RAM, Infineon SLB-9670 TPM. This machine runs Ubuntu 22.04 with Linux kernel 6.1.0.

**Machine B** is Trenton Systems 4U chassis with a HDB8231 backplane and a SEP8253 processor board with two Intel Xeon Silver 4109T @ 2 GHz CPUs each one with 16 logical cores, 16 GiB of RAM, and an IBM CryptoExpress7S. This machine runs CentOS Stream 8 with the Linux kernel 4.18.0.

**Machine C** is equipped with an Intel Xeon CPU E3-1275 v3 with 8 cores, 32 GiB of RAM. CentOS Stream 8 with Linux kernel 4.18.0 run on this machine.

### 5.1 Micro-benchmarks

**What overhead is introduced by different components of WAWEL?** We start the evaluation by profiling the WAWEL prototype to learn how much time is spend in different WAWEL components during the execution of two most frequently used TPM attestation-related commands: PCR Extend and Quote. To achieve that, we instrumented WAWEL prototype to measure the time taken by: *Kernel driver*, *Network*, *Shim*, and *CryptoCard*. The *Kernel driver* represents the total time the TPM TSS tool takes to marshal and send the TPM command to the kernel driver, including the time the proxy takes to retrieve the command from the kernel space and process it. The *Network* represents the total round-trip time taken for the command to travel between the proxy and the shim. The *Shim* represents the execution time of



the shim process, which includes parsing of the TPM command, translating between TPM and EP11 protocols, and generating the TPM response structure. The *CryptoCard* represents the time taken by the IBM CryptoCard to process the request. For each TPM command, we ran the experiment ten times and used a 10% trimmed mean to calculate the average execution latency.

Figure 8 shows the latency of WAWEL components during the execution of the PCR Extend and Quote commands. The PCR Extend command, which is used to aggregate integrity measurements, takes 1.4 ms. The Quote command takes more time 4.8 ms because the shim must create first the complex TPM Quote structure and then the CryptoCard must sign it. The CryptoCard execution is one of the dominant factor in the total execution time. During the PCR Extend operation, the CryptoCard verifies the offloaded state using HMAC and then performs a single hash function, taking 0.3 ms, or 25% of the total command execution time. During the Quote command operation, the CryptoCard first verifies the offloaded state using HMAC and then performs an RSA-2048 signing, taking 1 ms, or 22% of the total command execution time.

The second important component is the shim that implements the TPM protocol structures, taking 0.05 ms and 2.6 ms for PCR Extend and Quote, which corresponds to 3% and 54%, respectively. Network takes roughly a constant time of 1 ms, which becomes 67% and 22% of the total execution time of these commands, respectively. The kernel driver, which enables support for legacy TPM applications via the standardized communication interface, takes 0.06 ms and 0.11 ms for PCR Extend and Quote, respectively. These correspond to 4% and 2% of the total command execution time, respectively. The low overhead of the kernel driver and proxy components is a result of the implementation design choices. The kernel driver implements the poll mechanism to inform the userspace proxy component about the newly arrived TPM command. The proxy component uses gRPC over HTTP2 that maintains a connection to the shim, reducing the need for TLS handshakes when sending TPM commands.

**Does WAWEL has comparable latency to hardware TPM?** To answer the question if WAWEL has an acceptable latency, we calculated the execution latency of TPM attestation-related commands in two variants: 1) a virtual machine equipped with WAWEL and 2) a virtual machine




Figure 9: Latency of individual TPM operations executed on the WAWEL prototype.

equipped with a hardware TPM. We measured the latency of the following TPM commands: *Create*, *Quote*, *PCR Read*, *PCR Extend*. The Create command is used to generate a new cryptographic key that can be used for quote signing. The Quote command retrieves from the TPM a signed attestation report over aggregated measurements. The PCR Read command returns aggregated measurements, while the PCR Extend cryptographically incorporates a measurement into the existing aggregated measurements. For each variant and TPM command, we ran the experiment ten times and calculated 10%-trimmed mean as the resulting average of the TPM command latency. The hypervisor exposed the hardware TPM to the virtual machine via passthrough.

Figure 9 shows latency of TPM commands executed on WAWEL and a hardware TPM. The PCR Read and PCR Extend commands retrieve and store integrity measurements in TPM registers. The extend command is used by the booting firmware and IMA to persist load-time and runtime integrity measurements. Thus, it is important to keep its latency as low as possible because it directly influences the boot time of the operating system and runtime applications. Latency of PCR Read and PCR Extend commands is lower for WAWEL, 1 ms and 1.5 ms, compared to hardware TPM, 8 ms and 9 ms, respectively. That means that despite the extra level of indirection and the network overhead, WAWEL is still faster than a locally attached hardware TPM.

The Quote command triggers the generation and signing of a TPM quote containing the hash of selected PCRs. The hardware TPM requires 209 ms to generate a quote, while the same operation takes less than 5 ms on WAWEL. WAWEL outperforms the hardware TPM because the CryptoCard is optimized for performing low latency cryptographic operations, while hardware TPMs are bounded with the low




Figure 10: Impact of the WAWEL prototype on the virtual machine’s boot time. (\*) The experiment WAWEL *with IMA* shows the time systemd took to boot the operating system. This time does not include the processing time of buffered TPM commands done by the proxy.

price requirement. Quotes are signed with an attestation key created with the Create command. WAWEL is much more performant in executing the Create command because of the underlying hardware cryptographic accelerators and better source of high entropy. WAWEL required 84 ms to execute the Create command while the hardware TPM 6.5× more, 534 ms.

**What is the overhead WAWEL on the boot time of a virtual machine?** We run the experiment to check how much the overhead introduced by the higher PCR Extend execution latency increases the virtual machine boot time. For that, we measured the boot time of a virtual machine in four variants: 1. without a TPM and disabled IMA, 2. with a hardware TPM and enabled IMA, 3. with WAWEL but disabled IMA, 4. with WAWEL and enabled IMA. We used the *systemd-analyze* tool to collect the virtual machine boot time. For each variant, we ran the experiment ten times and then calculated a 10% trimmed mean as the average time spent during the boot in the kernel, initrd, and userspace.

Figure 10 shows the boot time of kernel, initrd, and userspace in each variant. The boot time of virtual machines with enabled IMA is longer because the kernel measures the integrity of files when loading them to memory and extends these measurements to the TPM. WAWEL achieves lower boot times of initrd and userspace because during the boot process it only buffers TPM commands without sending them to the hardware root of trust, *i.e.*, the CryptoCard. This is because the CryptoCard is not accessible early in the boot due to the lack of network connectivity. Once the userspace




Figure 11: Throughput of the WAWEL prototype’s shim executing PCR\_Extend and Quote commands. A single IBM CryptoCard acts as a backend.

is loaded, the proxy daemon sends buffered TPM commands to the CryptoCard. According to our measurements, all commands are processed by the CryptoCard after about 30 sec, depending on the number of measurements. Please note that using the vsock interface could speed up this process because measurements could be processed without waiting for the network. However, it requires the support of the hypervisor that has to configure the vsock redirection to the shim.

## 5.2 Scalability

**What is the WAWEL’s throughput of aggregating integrity measurement and generating quotes?** The previous experiments showed that WAWEL has lower latency than the locally attached TPM. However, a single TPM serves typically a single machine while in the WAWEL design, a limited number of CryptoCards virtualizes TPMs for much larger number of VEEs. To assess whether this approach is economically practical, we need to estimate how many VEEs can be supported by a single CryptoCard.

We ran an experiment in which we measured the throughput of two most frequently used TPM attestation-related commands: PCR Extend and Quote. In this experiment, we used the *ghz* tool to generate desired gRPC throughput using eight connections to shim processes, which executed on the Machine B and had access to the CryptoCard over the PCIe interface. We were increasing the desired throughput until the latency increased over 10 ms. We monitored the network to make sure the increased latency is not caused by the constrained network bandwidth.

Figure 11 shows the latency/throughput ratio of the PCR Extend and Quote commands. WAWEL achieved the through-




Figure 12: Scalability of spawning new VSE in the WAWEL prototype. A single VSE corresponds to a one VEE.

put of 20k PCR extensions per second before reaching the saturation point. Considering that Linux IMA takes around 11 ms to load and extend a single file of size lower than 100 KiB [33], a single CryptoCard could handle around 222 parallel VEEs with enabled Linux IMA that constantly open, measure, and extend files measurement. In practice, Linux IMA extends the measurements of a file only the first time it reads it, remeasuring it only when it changes. The peak happens during the startup of the system when files are loaded to the memory for the first time. On Fedora 36, we collected around 2000 measurements using the *ima\_tcb* policy that measures all files and executable owned by root. That means that a single CryptoCard could support up to 222 VEEs booting up at the same time for 22 sec.

WAWEL achieved a throughput of 7.5k quotes per second before reaching the saturation point. The existing integrity monitoring systems [24, 32, 21] collect TPM quotes from monitored systems at regular configurable intervals at the resolution changing from seconds to hours. Depending on the interval configuration, a single CryptoCard could serve from 7.5k to 27k VEEs that are under constant integrity monitoring, assuming that quotes are collected every second or hour, respectively. For use cases where the attestation happens at specific point of time, for example during the establishment of an ssh [33] or VPN [2] connection, a single CryptoCard could handle up to 7.5k connections to/from a VEE per second.

**How effectively WAWEL handles increasing number of spawned VEEs?** The cloud may spawn many VEEs simultaneously and each VEE might request its own VSE. In this experiment, we focused on verifying that WAWEL can effectively create new VSEs with the increasing number of clients.

To check it, we ran an experiment in which we simulated VEEs that request the broker service for a new VSEs. The broker was then spawning a dedicated shim process that initialized the VSE state with the help of the CryptoCard. We simulated load using synchronous gRPC requests generated with the *ghz* tool. The request was terminating successfully when the broker spawned a new shim process and the shim created a set of PCRs via the CryptoCard.

Figure 12 shows that the latency of spawning new VSEs grows linearly with the number of requested VSE instances. We hit the limit of available computing resources when we spawned about 25k VSEs. This result indicates that WAWEL scales well for spawning new VSEs because WAWEL could handle more requests by adding more physical resources, like machines running shim instances and CryptoCards.

## 6 Support for Heterogeneous VEEs and Related Work

WAWEL complements existing attestation and virtualization technologies, simplifying attestation in hybrid- and multi-clouds. The resulting threat models depend on the underneath technology. For example, enhancing Trust Domain eXtensions (TDX) [23] with WAWEL provides a unified TPM-based attestation protocol under the TDX threat model with an untrusted hypervisor. Enhancing the legacy virtual machines with the TPM attestation supported by WAWEL requires placing trust in the hypervisor, like in the virtual TPM (vTPM) design [35].

Tenants must differentiate among underlying virtualization technologies because these offer different security guarantees and trust assumptions. Thus, cryptographic coprocessors must certify the VEEs integrity with different attestation keys. This is possible by provisioning different CRTMs with access keys specific to the virtualization and isolation technology. Cryptographic coprocessors detect the virtualization technology when a CRTM establishes a mutual transport layer security (mTLS) connection to spawn a new VSE. In §6.1, §6.2, and §6.3, we discuss WAWEL integration with various attestation and virtualization mechanisms used in modern clouds.




Figure 13: Integration of WAWEL with different virtualization and isolation technologies. Core root of trust for measurement (CRTM) is the trusted component that spawns new virtual secure elements (VSEs). However, to spawn VSEs it authenticates itself with credentials, which it retrieves from key management systems or secure elements. The latter components ensure that they share credentials only with trusted, legitimate CRTMs.

## 6.1 Legacy Virtual Machines and Containers

Figure 13a) shows the integration of WAWEL with designs relying on trusted hypervisor whose integrity is measured by a hardware root of trust provided by a CPU-local secure element, like NitroTPM [18], Titan [40], and TPM. The secure element aggregates and certifies the host operating system’s integrity in these designs. The host operating system exposes then software TPMs [7] to virtual machines to enable them with attestation primitives. The TCB of this design includes the entire hypervisor and its operator.

WAWEL complements this design by reducing the management effort of hosting software TPMs on the hypervisor. Each virtual machine manages its VSE state, so there is no need for running emulated TPM processes on the hypervisor. The hypervisor, which is still part of the TCB, implements the CRTM that creates dedicated VSEs for each VEE, such as legacy virtual machines and containers. Only the legitimate hypervisor can retrieve credentials enabling access to the VSE creation interface. There are two ways for the hypervisor to retrieve credentials. In the first one, similarly to LUKS [9] or BitLocker, the hypervisor retrieves them from the secure element via the unseal mechanism (see, Section ‘PCRs for Authorization’ in Chapter 12 in [5]). In the second one, it retrieves it from a key management system after proving its own identity and integrity using the hardware-specific secure element, like a hardware TPM.

Figure 13b) shows a variant of this design that applies to hardware-isolated containers, such as Kata [37] or confidential containers [10]. The trusted component, like a hypervisor

in the Kata container, implements the CRTM. It spawns a dedicated VSE instance for each virtual machine and extends it with the corresponding integrity measurements. Because all containers running inside a virtual machine share the same kernel, the virtual machine clones a VSE for each container and extends it further with container-specific measurements. Like this, each container gets its own VSE state derived from the parent’s state representing its own and the underlying host integrity. The plurality of VSEs enables tracking of individual containers’ runtime integrity via IMA [39].

## 6.2 Trusted Execution Environments

WAWEL complements trusted execution environments (TEEs), which are technologies that enable confidential computing by isolating VEEs from the hypervisor and operator. They offer attestation capabilities by measuring the load-time integrity of a VEE and then certifying these measurements to the tenant. Unlike WAWEL, however, the TEE attestation mechanism is limited to vendor-specific hardware because hardware-specific keys sign the attestation certificate, and the hardware manufacturer controls these keys. WAWEL integration differs for TEEs supporting local or remote attestation.

Figure 13c) shows how WAWEL integrates with TEEs that support remote attestation, for example, Intel TDX [23], Intel Software Guard eXtensions (SGX) [11], Sanctum [12]. The design integrating WAWEL with these technologies consists of three elements: the TEE image containing the CRTM and the tenant’s application, the TEE-capable hardware, and



the key management system containing credentials for accessing the VSE creation interface. The key management system, like Palaemon [14] or a key broker service in the confidential container design [10], guards credentials and distributes them only to CRTMs after attesting to their integrity and identity using the TEE-specific remote attestation. The TEE-capable hardware certifies that the CRTM executes inside the TEE via the TEE-specific remote attestation, *e.g.*, [41, 25]. Consequently, the CRTM obtains credentials, which it first uses to spawn a new VSE. Then, it extends VSE with TEE- and application-specific measurements. It vanishes credentials before executing the tenant’s application to prevent a malicious application from launching the reset attack discussed in §3.2. The CRTM could be implemented as the init routine of a process-based TEE (*e.g.*, Palaemon [14]) or a part of the VM-based TEE’s bootloader (*e.g.*, confidential containers [10]).

Figure 13d) illustrates how WAWEL integrates with TEEs that support local attestation, for example, IBM Z Secure Execution [8] or IBM Protected Execution Facility (PEF) [19]. The local attestation differs from the remote attestation because the hardware verifies the TEE image during launch. In such TEEs, the tenant encrypts the VEE image, or part of it, with a public key. The corresponding private key is known only to the hardware. The hardware TEE engine executes only VEE encrypted with the public key corresponding to its private key. WAWEL integrates with this design by embedding the CRTM and credentials in the encrypted part of the VEE image. The CRTM executes then as a first component of the VEE inside the TEE. It creates a new VSE by authenticating itself to the cryptographic coprocessor using the embedded credentials. Then, it extends the measurement of the VEE image, removes the credentials, and executes the rest of the VEE.

### 6.3 Hardware TPM

A hardware TPM chip offers attestation primitives according to the TPM specification [15]. However, the TPM chip is a single device with limited storage that does not support virtualization. There were attempts to use it for attestation of virtual machines by emulating software TPMs [35] or running emulated TPMs inside of the TEE [33]. However, these technologies fit only specific use cases and do not apply for heterogeneous environments.

Hardware secure elements, like hardware TPMs, Titan

[40], or Caliptra [28], apply to bare metal systems because they are available to boot firmware just after the processor is powered on. However, unlike WAWEL, they target only virtual execution environments (VEEs). Like in the legacy systems relying on trusted hypervisors, see Figure 13a) and Figure 13b), WAWEL might reuse the boot integrity measurements of the bare metal. WAWEL can use the hardware TPM to attest to the bare metal integrity to unlock the CRTM access to credentials required for accessing the VSE creation interface. The CRTM could then extend hardware TPM measurements into the VSE, providing the continuity of the chain of trust to virtual environments.

## 7 Conclusion

This paper introduced WAWEL, a scalable attestation framework for virtual execution environments (VEEs), *e.g.*, virtual machines and containers running on heterogeneous hardware and virtualization technologies. WAWEL reduces management effort because each VEE provisions and maintains a virtual secure element (VSE) with the help of a limited number of high-performant stateless cryptographic coprocessors. WAWEL scalability is achieved by offloading the cryptographic coprocessor state containing VEE measurements securely, with the help of cryptography.

Our prototype WAWEL implementation is compatible with the trusted platform module (TPM) protocol and supports the Linux integrity measurement architecture (IMA), making it a drop-in replacement for existing virtual TPM designs in the cloud. The evaluation results prove the scalability and practicality of the design for cloud deployments.

## References

- [1] Linux Kernel. <https://www.kernel.org>, accessed on February 2023.
- [2] StrongSwan. <https://www.strongswan.org>, accessed on February 2023.
- [3] AGACHE, A., BROOKER, M., IORDACHE, A., LIGUORI, A., NEUGEBAUER, R., PIWONKA, P., AND POPA, D.-M. Firecracker: Lightweight virtualization for serverless applications. In *NSDI* (2020), vol. 20, pp. 419–434.

- [4] ARNAUTOV, S., TRACH, B., GREGOR, F., KNAUTH, T., MARTIN, A., PRIEBE, C., LIND, J., MUTHUKUMARAN, D., O'KEEFFE, D., STILLWELL, M., GOLTZSCHE, D., EYERS, D., KAPITZA, R., PIETZUCH, P., AND FETZER, C. SCONE: Secure linux containers with Intel SGX. In *USENIX OSDI* (2016).
- [5] ARTHUR, W., AND CHALLENGER, D. *A practical guide to TPM 2.0: Using the new trusted platform module in the new age of security*. Springer Nature, 2015.
- [6] BELLARD, F. Qemu, a fast and portable dynamic translator. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on USENIX Annual Technical Conference* (2005), ATEC '05.
- [7] BERGER, S. Libtpms: software emulation of a Trusted Platform Module. <https://github.com/stefanberger/libtpms>, accessed on February 2023.
- [8] BORNTRÄGER, C., BRADBURY, J. D., BÜNDGEN, R., BUSABA, F., HELLER, L. C., AND MIHAJLOVSKI, V. Secure your cloud workloads with ibm secure execution for linux on ibm z15 and linuxone iii. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 64, 5/6 (2020), 2:1–2:11.
- [9] BROZ, M. LUKS2 On-Disk Format Specification, Version 1.0.0. In *LUKS documentation* (2018).
- [10] CLOUD NATIVE COMPUTING FOUNDATION. Confidential Containers. <https://github.com/confidential-containers>, accessed on February 2023.
- [11] COSTAN, V., AND DEVADAS, S. Intel SGX Explained. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.* (2016).
- [12] COSTAN, V., LEBEDEV, I., AND DEVADAS, S. Sanctum: Minimal hardware extensions for strong software isolation. In *Proceedings of the 25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security '16)* (2016).
- [13] DIFFIE, W., AND HELLMAN, M. E. New directions in cryptography. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 22, 6 (November 1976), 644–654.
- [14] GREGOR, F., OZGA, W., VAUCHER, S., PIRES, R., LE QUOC, D., ARNAUTOV, S., MARTIN, A., SCHIAVONI, V., FELBER, P., AND FETZER, C. Trust management as a service: Enabling trusted execution in the face of byzantine stakeholders. In *The 50th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN '20)* (2020).
- [15] GROUP, T. C. TPM Library Specification, family "2.0", level 00, revision 01.38. In *TCG Resources, TPM 2.0 Library* (2016).
- [16] GROUP, T. C. DICE attestation architecture. In *TCG Resources* (2020).
- [17] HAJNOCZI, S. virtio-vsock: Zero-configuration host/guest communication. In *KVM Forum* (2015).
- [18] HAMILTON, J. AWS Nitro System. <https://perspectives.mvdirona.com/2019/02/aws-nitro-system/>, accessed on February 2023.
- [19] HUNT, G. D., PAI, R., LE, M. V., JAMJOOM, H., BHATTIPROLU, S., BOIVIE, R., DUFOUR, L., FREY, B., KAPUR, M., GOLDMAN, K. A., ET AL. Confidential computing for openpower. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth European Conference on Computer Systems* (2021), pp. 294–310.
- [20] IBM. IBM's TPM 2.0 TSS. <https://sourceforge.net/projects/ibmtpm20tss/>, accessed on February 2023.
- [21] IBM. IBM TPM Attestation Client Server. <https://sourceforge.net/projects/ibmtpm20acs/>, accessed on October 2021.
- [22] INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY. Security requirements for cryptographic modules. Federal Information Processing Standards Publication, 2001.
- [23] INTEL. Intel trust domain extensions.
- [24] INTEL. Intel Security Libraries for Data Center. <https://01.org/intel-secl>, accessed on October 2021.
- [25] INTEL CORPORATION. Intel SGX: Intel EPID Provisioning and Attestation Services. <https://software.intel.com/content/www/us/en/develop/>

- <download/intel-sgx-intel-epid-provisioning-and-attestation-services.html>, accessed on February 2023.
- [26] KAPLAN, D. Protecting VM register State with SEV-ES. AMD White Paper, AMD, 2017.
- [27] KAUER, B. OSLO: Improving the security of Trusted Computing. *USENIX* (2007).
- [28] LAGAR-CAVILLA, A., JAYANNA, P., AND KELLY, B. Caliptra: An open source, reusable silicon IP block for a Root of Trust for Measurement (RTM). *Open Compute Platform Global Summit'22* (2022).
- [29] MATETIC, S., SOMMER, D., AHMED, M., GERVAIS, A., KOSTIAINEN, K., DHAR, A., JUELS, A., AND CAPKUN, S. ROTE: Rollback Protection for Trusted Execution. *26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security '17)* (2017).
- [30] MATSAKIS, N. D., AND KLOCK, F. S. The Rust language. *ACM SIGAda Ada Letters* (2014), 103–104.
- [31] OASIS. PKCS#11 specification. <http://docs.oasis-open.org/pkcs11/pkcs11-base/v2.40/os/pkcs11-base-v2.40-os.html>, accessed on February 2023.
- [32] OZGA, W., FAQEH, R., LE QUOC, D., GREGOR, F., DRAGONE, S., AND FETZER, C. Chors: Hardening high-assurance security systems with trusted computing. *Proceedings of the 37th ACM Symposium On Applied Computing (SAC '22)* (2022).
- [33] OZGA, W., LE QUOC, D., AND FETZER, C. TRIGLAV: Remote Attestation of the Virtual Machine's Runtime Integrity in Public Clouds. In *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE 14th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)* (2021).
- [34] PARNO, B. Bootstrapping Trust in a Trusted Platform. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Conference on Hot Topics in Security* (2008).
- [35] PEREZ, R., SAILER, R., VAN DOORN, L., ET AL. vtpm: virtualizing the trusted platform module. In *Proc. 15th Conf. on USENIX Security Symposium* (2006), pp. 305–320.
- [36] PRENEEL, B. The state of cryptographic hash functions. In *Lectures on Data Security, Modern Cryptology in Theory and Practice, Summer School, Aarhus, Denmark, July 1998* (London, UK, UK, 1999), Springer-Verlag, pp. 158–182.
- [37] RANDAZZO, A., AND TINNIRELLO, I. Kata containers: An emerging architecture for enabling mec services in fast and secure way. In *2019 Sixth International Conference on Internet of Things: Systems, Management and Security (IOTSMS)* (2019), IEEE, pp. 209–214.
- [38] RICHARD WILKINS, B. R. UEFI Secure Boot in modern computer security solutions. In *Unified Extensible Firmware Interface Forum (UEFI)* (2013).
- [39] SAILER, R., ZHANG, X., JAEGER, T., AND VAN DOORN, L. Design and Implementation of a TCG-based Integrity Measurement Architecture. In *USENIX Security symposium* (2004).
- [40] SAVAGAONKAR, U., PORTER, N., TAHA, N., SEREBRIN, B., AND MUELLER, N. Titan in depth: Security in plaintext. *Google Cloud Identity and Security Blog* (2017).
- [41] SCARLATA, V., JOHNSON, S., BEANEY, J., AND ZMIJEWSKI, P. Supporting third party attestation for intel sgx with intel data center attestation primitives. *White paper* (2018).
- [42] SCHEAR, N., CABLE, P. T., MOYER, T. M., RICHARD, B., AND RUDD, R. Bootstrapping and maintaining trust in the cloud. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Conference on Computer Security Applications (ACSAC '16)* (2016).
- [43] SOLTESZ, S., PÖTZL, H., FIUCZYNSKI, M. E., BAVIER, A., AND PETERSON, L. Container-based operating system virtualization: A scalable, high-performance alternative to hypervisors. *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.* (2007).
- [44] SPARKS, E. R. A Security Assessment of Trusted Platform Modules. *Computer Science Technical Report TR2007-597* (2007).

- [45] STRACKX, R., AND PIESENS, F. Ariadne: A Minimal Approach to State Continuity. *25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security '16)* (2016).
- [46] TAO, Z., RASTOGI, A., GUPTA, N., VASWANI, K., AND THAKUR, A. V. DICE\*: A formally verified implementation of DICE measured boot. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)* (Aug. 2021), USENIX Association, pp. 1091–1107.
- [47] TRUSTED COMPUTING GROUP. TCG PC Client Specific Implementation Specification for Conventional BIOS, Specification Version 1.21, Revision 1.00, 2012.
- [48] TRUSTED COMPUTING GROUP. TCG PC Client Platform Firmware Profile Specification, Family 2.0, Level 00, Revision 1.04, 2019.
- [49] TRUSTED COMPUTING GROUP. TCG Trusted Attestation Protocol (TAP) Information Model for TPM Families 1.2 and 2.0 and DICE Family 1.0. Version 1.0, Revision 0.36. <https://trustedcomputinggroup.org/resource/tcg-tap-information-model/>, accessed on February 2023.
- [50] VISEGRADY, T. IBM Enterprise PKCS#11. [https://www.commoncriteriaportal.org/files/epfiles/1002b\\_pdf.pdf](https://www.commoncriteriaportal.org/files/epfiles/1002b_pdf.pdf), accessed on February 2023.
- [51] VISEGRADY, T., DRAGONE, S., AND OSBORNE, M. Stateless cryptography for virtual environments. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* (2014).