

virtCCA: Virtualized Arm Confidential Compute Architecture with TrustZone

Xiangyi Xu
Huawei Technologies
xuxiangyi1@huawei.com

Wenhao Wang ✉
Institute of Information Engineering,
Chinese Academy of Sciences
wangwenhao@iie.ac.cn

Yongzheng Wu
Huawei Technologies
wu.yongzheng@huawei.com

Chenyu Wang
Huawei Technologies
wangchenyu11@huawei.com

Huifeng Zhu
Huawei Technologies
zhuhuifeng4@huawei.com

Haocheng Ma
Huawei Technologies
mahaocheng@huawei.com

Zhennan Min
Institute of Information Engineering,
Chinese Academy of Sciences
minzhennan@iie.ac.cn

Zixuan Pang
University of Science and Technology
of China
pzx118000@163.com

Rui Hou
Institute of Information Engineering,
Chinese Academy of Sciences
hourui@iie.ac.cn

Yier Jin ✉
University of Science and Technology
of China
jinyier@ustc.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

ARM recently introduced the Confidential Compute Architecture (CCA) as part of the upcoming ARMv9-A architecture. CCA enables the support of confidential virtual machines (cVMs) within a separate world called the Realm world, providing protection from the untrusted normal world. While CCA offers a promising future for confidential computing, the widespread availability of CCA hardware is not expected in the near future, according to ARM’s roadmap. To address this gap, we present *virtCCA*, an architecture that facilitates virtualized CCA using TrustZone, a mature hardware feature available on existing ARM platforms. Notably, *virtCCA* can be implemented on platforms equipped with the Secure EL2 (S-EL2) extension available from ARMv8.4 onwards, as well as on earlier platforms that lack S-EL2 support. *virtCCA* is fully compatible with the CCA specifications at the API level. We have developed the entire CCA software and firmware stack on top of *virtCCA*, including the enhancements to the normal world’s KVM to support cVMs, and the TrustZone Management Monitor (TMM) that enforces isolation among cVMs and provides cVM lifecycle management. We have implemented *virtCCA* on real ARM servers, with and without S-EL2 support. Our evaluation, conducted on micro-benchmarks and macro-benchmarks, demonstrates that the overhead of running cVMs is acceptable compared to running normal-world VMs. Specifically, in a set of real-world workloads,

the overhead of *virtCCA*-SEL2 is less than 29.5% for I/O intensive workloads, while *virtCCA*-EL3 outperforms the baseline in most cases.

ACM Reference Format:

Xiangyi Xu, Wenhao Wang ✉, Yongzheng Wu, Chenyu Wang, Huifeng Zhu, Haocheng Ma, Zhennan Min, Zixuan Pang, Rui Hou, and Yier Jin ✉. 2024. *virtCCA: Virtualized Arm Confidential Compute Architecture with TrustZone*. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference’17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Confidential computing is rapidly emerging as an indispensable technology in the realm of cloud computing. Its primary objective is to safeguard the sensitive information of tenants from potential risks posed by untrustworthy or improperly configured cloud service providers (CSPs). This paradigm shift towards confidential computing not only enhances data privacy and security but also instills a greater sense of trust in cloud-based services. As a result, it is increasingly becoming an integral part of modern cloud architectures. Recognizing the significance of confidential computing, leading chip companies have stepped forward to offer support for trusted execution environments (TEEs) within their product offerings. For instance, Intel’s SGX [3] and TDX [19], AMD’s SEV [34], and IBM’s PEF [18] are all dedicated features that enables the creation of isolated regions (i.e., enclaves) and confidential virtual machines (i.e., cVMs) exclusively used by tenants.

ARM processors have gained widespread popularity in mobile devices like smartphones due to their energy efficiency and low power consumption. Notably, ARM was one of the pioneers in supporting TEEs, i.e., TrustZone, to ensure the protection of sensitive data like passwords and fingerprints. TrustZone divides the system into two distinct worlds: the normal world and the secure world. While the

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference’17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM... \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

normal world runs the feature-rich operating system (OS), the secure world handles critical operations requiring enhanced security measures. To cater to the specific requirements of the secure world, customized trusted OSes like OPTEE [30] and iTrustee [2] have been developed. These tailored trusted OSes ensure the provision of secure and reliable services within the secure world. However, unlike AMD SEV, TrustZone does not fully support the cloud computing scenario, particularly in supporting a full-featured OS like Linux running inside cVMs, while the lifecycle of cVMs is managed by the host hypervisor (e.g., KVM).

In recent years, ARM has made significant strides in the cloud computing market. To meet the need for confidential cloud computing, ARM has announced the Confidential Computing Architecture (CCA), a series of hardware and software architecture innovations available as part of the ARMv9-A architecture. CCA supports the dynamic creation and management of *Realms* (ARM’s terminology for cVMs), opening confidential computing to all developers and various workloads.

Motivations. As ARM’s latest innovation for confidential computing, CCA points to a convincing future for confidential computing. However, CCA specifications have still been under active evolution recently. Moreover, it usually takes years before the commodity chip is shipped, even after the hardware specifications become stable. It is expected that commercial products with full CCA support will not be widely available in the near future. On the other hand, we spot that the CCA software supports, including the cVM guest kernel, KVM, and *Realm Management Monitor* (RMM), are evolving at a rapid pace [5, 7, 8]. Unfortunately, these tremendous efforts and innovations are unlikely to come in handy until real CCA hardware platforms are available in the market.

Considering the lagging behind of CCA hardware and the urgent confidential computing need, in this paper, we propose virtCCA, a *virtualized CCA* design on existing hardware that provides both strong isolation and good performance, and offers *full compatibility with CCA*. To stimulate real-world deployment, virtCCA is designed to support native OS distributions (such as booting Ubuntu images) *with only minimal or even no modifications* within the cVM, so that existing applications, toolchains and peripheral device drivers (e.g., GPU driver) can run securely with no portable effort.

Notably, virtCCA distinguishes itself by its versatility in deployment on legacy hardware, with or without Secure EL2 (S-EL2) support, unlike the existing design Twinvisor [27], which is constrained to S-EL2 compatible hardware. Also, it is worth mentioning that currently, there are no publicly available hardware options that support S-EL2. Additionally, virtCCA offers full compatibility with CCA, while Twinvisor does not.

Our design. Our approach leverages the TrustZone secure world to serve as the hosting environment for the cVMs. However, the virtCCA model significantly differs from that of TrustZone. Within TrustZone, the trusted OS and trusted applications (TAs) operate in a separate world, managing hardware resources such as secure memory and interrupt controller independently. Conversely, in the virtCCA framework, these resources – along with the lifecycle of cVMs are governed by the hypervisor running in the normal world.

To alleviate trust in the hypervisor and reduce the trusted computing base (TCB), we propose a small and trusted software layer,

referred to as the *TrustZone Management Monitor* (TMM) – an analogy to the Realm Management Monitor (RMM) in CCA – to act as a gatekeeper between the two worlds. The TMM manages CPU state transitions between the untrusted normal world and the cVMs. On ARM v8.4 and later platforms, the TMM operates at S-EL2. However, on earlier platforms without S-EL2 support, the hardware lacks the capability to virtualize memory, interrupts, and devices within the secure world. To enable the cVM model, we position the TMM at EL3 as a component of the ARM Trusted Firmware (ATF), and virtualization is entirely emulated in firmware.

Similar to CCA, the untrusted hypervisor is still responsible for resource management and cVM lifecycle management. Our design provides a TrustZone Management Interface (TMI) for the interactions between the hypervisor and cVM. This interface is implemented as Secure Monitor Calls (SMCs) to the ATF and is compatible with Realm Management Interface (RMI) at the application programming interface (API) level, that is, the input parameters, functionalities, return values, and handling of errors and exceptions are all consistent with the CCA specifications. Thanks to such full compatibility, the software stack built for virtCCA can readily run on CCA with little or no changes.

Furthermore, the TMM assists the hypervisor in managing faults and exceptions originating from cVMs, such as page faults and memory-mapped IO (MMIO) exceptions. The TMM is also responsible for translating interrupts between the two worlds. Specifically, with modern Generic Interrupt Controller (GIC) hardware, interrupts are assigned to different groups depending on the current secure state. To minimize the modification of guest OSes, the TMM converts the interrupt types before switching to the host hypervisor for emulating the interrupts. Currently, virtCCA supports efficient I/O virtualization for cVMs with device emulation by the host under the virtio IO virtualization framework.

Memory isolation between the two worlds. Existing VM-based TEEs adopt the design strategy called *asynchronous management of secure memory* – the hypervisor manages the memory allocated to every cVM, but the allocation and recycling of these secure memory must involve and be approved by trusted components to guarantee memory isolation. As a result of such a strategy, since the hypervisor manages the entire physical memory, the normal and secure memory are *interleaved together with each other*, attaining a high memory utilization rate. To achieve this capability in TrustZone, the secure memory can be configured with TrustZone Address Space Controller (TZASC). However, TZASC only supports configuring the security attributes for up to eight different memory regions, making the memory isolation while maintaining efficient memory utilization a non-trivial task.

To tackle the challenge, we propose a design where each cVM has a reserved contiguous chunk of secure memory with a configurable size. This memory remains static and in a known state for the hypervisor, eliminating the need for memory delegation and reducing the complexity of secure memory management. However, a challenge arises when the cVM needs to share memory with the host, particularly in cases like the virtio framework where the cVM’s frontend must share a vring buffer with the host’s backend. In such scenarios, the host does not have direct access to

the vring buffer. To address this challenge, we introduce a solution using a bounce buffer that is shared between the two worlds. All accesses to the vring buffer from the cVM are redirected to the bounce buffer, achieved by mapping the vring memory to the bounce buffer through a software I/O translation buffer (SWIOTLB). The SWIOTLB maintains the necessary mappings between the actual vring memory and the bounce buffer. Consequently, when accessing the vring buffer, the guest kernel driver automatically synchronizes the bounce buffer with the actual physical memory.

Memory isolation of the cVM. As TrustZone only supports a single secure world, we need to protect the cVM from each other. On ARM v8.4 and later platforms, we use the S-EL2 extension to provide isolation among mutually distrusted cVMs by configuring the stage-2 page tables of the cVMs. On ARM platforms lacking S-EL2 support, we prevent the guest OS from mapping the physical memory of other cVMs into its own address space by configuring write protection on the cVM’s page tables.

Implementations. We implemented virtCCA on real ARM servers, with and without S-EL2 support respectively. With virtCCA, we were able to build a software stack that supports both CCA and virtCCA, including components such as ATF, RMM, QEMU/KVM, and the TEST framework. We conducted micro-benchmarks to evaluate the impact of virtCCA on common hypervisor operations. Additionally, we ported a number of real-world applications, including MySQL, Apache, and Nginx etc. to run on virtCCA. The experimental results demonstrate that the overhead introduced by virtCCA is minimal. Specifically, in a set of real-world workloads, the overhead is below 29.5% for virtCCA-SEL2, while virtCCA-EL3 outperforms the baseline in the majority of workloads. This is likely attributed to the fact that in virtCCA-EL3, cVMs operate in bare-metal mode, thereby eliminating the overhead of CPU and memory virtualization. This showcases the efficiency and effectiveness of virtCCA in practical scenarios.

Contributions. The paper makes the following contributions.

- A virtualized CCA design atop existing TrustZone hardware, providing full compatibility with the CCA specifications. As far as we know, this is the first time that cVM can be supported on ARM TrustZone without S-EL2 support.
- An entire software and firmware stack to support virtCCA, including the ATF, RMM, host hypervisor and the TEST framework.
- Implementations and evaluations. We have implemented our design on real ARM platforms with and without S-EL2 support respectively. The evaluations on real world benchmarks show that the design is practical.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Trusted Execution Environment

In traditional outsourced computation scenario, the privileged software (such as the hypervisor) is allowed to access the client’s computation. TEE is introduced to provide a hardware-based secure partition (such as an SGX enclave or SEV VM) that ensures the integrity and confidentiality of sensitive code and data, where it can only be accessed by authorized entities, even though the untrusted privileged software is still in charge of the management of available resources (such as CPU and memory). TEEs are commonly used

in applications such as cloud computing, mobile payments, digital rights management, and secure browsing, and are supported by all major CPU vendors.

To fulfill the security goals, existing TEE designs mainly deal with the following aspects: ① protection of the CPU states during the transitions between the secure mode and non-secure mode, e.g., during entry to or exit from the secure mode, and during interrupts and exceptions; ② protection of the secure memory used by the secure mode. The secure memory allocated to one client cannot be mapped to other clients or the hypervisor. Optionally, the TEE can provide memory protection against physical attacks with memory encryption; ③ remote verification of the state of all TCB components through remote attestation. During the creation of a secure instance for the client, the trusted components generate a measurement of the loaded code and data, then the measurement is signed with the hardware-backed private key and the signed report is sent to the remote client for verification.

VM-based TEEs. In contrast to Intel SGX, which provides isolated regions (called enclaves) within the application’s address space, most recent TEE designs (such as AMD SEV [25, 34], IBM PEF [18] and ARM CCA [1]) provide the abstraction of a VM for the TEEs. In particular, a fully-fledged guest OS, e.g., common Linux distributions such as Ubuntu can run securely as part of the TEE software, to support unmodified toolchains and applications, such as language runtimes, deep learning frameworks and device drivers. VM-based TEE embraces the cloud computing need and sets a trend for the future of confidential cloud computing. To support the TEE functionalities, the host software (QEMU and KVM) and the guest OS cooperates in a para-virtualization manner for the secure management of VM resources, such as the allocation and recycling of secure memory. Currently, the supports of AMD SEV, Intel TDX and ARM CCA in both Linux and QEMU/KVM are under active development.

2.2 ARM Platforms

In the recent ARM architecture, the different privilege levels are referred to as exception levels (ELs), since the current privilege level (CPL) can only change when the processor takes or returns from an exception. Typically, EL0 and EL1 are used by the user-level applications and by the OS, respectively, while EL2 runs the normal hypervisor such as KVM. The most privileged software runs at EL3, and is referred to as the ATF.

ARM TrustZone. Analogous to the normal world for running the rich OS and applications, TrustZone replicates the system resources in a separated world, known as the secure world. A tailored trusted OS runs at secure EL1 (S-EL1), while trusted applications (TAs) run at secure EL0 (S-EL0). The Non-Secure (NS) bit determines whether the CPU executes in the normal world or in the secure world context to create a separation in memory. The CPU state transitions between the normal world and the secure world can be triggered by the SMC instruction. This causes a trap to the ATF that handles the state transitions.

The separation of the secure and normal worlds protects specific memory ranges and peripherals only accessible by the secure world. The memory partitions between normal and secure worlds are enabled by the TZASC, an AMBA-bus compliant System-on-Chip (SoC) peripheral. With the current TZASC hardware – TZC-400,

it is possible to define up to 8 DRAM regions as secure or non-secure. On the other hand, the TZPC can define the peripheral as either secure or non-secure. These controllers provide a secure I/O to peripherals. For instance, the TZPC routes the SPI access to the secure world and the NS bit secures on-chip peripherals from accessing from the normal world.

In real-world applications, there can be multiple security services that wish to make use of S-EL1. To support the feature, ARM adds the support of running EL2 code in the secure world (known as S-EL2) in the ARMv8.4-A architecture [4]. Together with ATF, this enables multiple security services to exist in the secure world alongside each another, while the Secure Partition Manager (SPM) running at S-EL2 is responsible for managing resource partitions.

2.3 ARM’s Confidential Compute Architecture

In response to the confidential computing need in the cloud, ARM recently introduces the CCA with the Realm Management Extension (RME), which supports a new type of attestable isolation environment called a Realm – a type of cVMs, democratizing confidential computing to all developers for the secure processing of sensitive data. CCA is constituted of both hardware changes and firmware/software supports. In particular, the firmware code in EL3 maintains the GPT to determine the accessibility of physical pages, and the memory management unit (MMU) is augmented with additional Granule Protection Checks (GPC) beyond traditional page table based memory protection mechanisms. A tiny and *trusted* software layer called *Realm Management Monitor (RMM)* running at EL2 in the Realm world is responsible for memory isolation among Realms. The normal world hypervisor still manages the life cycle (allocation/de-allocation) of physical memory for the Realms. However, those memory can be used by Realms for various purposes only after they are explicitly delegated to the Realm through the RMI provided by RMM.

2.4 Threat Model

We focus on the confidential cloud computing scenario, where it is unlikely for the attacker to have physical proximity to the platform and execute physical attacks such as cold boot or bus snooping attacks. We trust the underlying hardware, including the ARM CPU and DRAM, and the code running at S-EL2 (the TMM) and the ATF. We assume the platform is equipped with reliable root of trust (RoT) and provides authentic random sources, e.g., by firmware or hardware Trusted Platform Module (TPM). Similar to existing TEEs, we assume the attackers possess the following capabilities.

- *Software attacks.* The attacker lacks physical access to the platform but may have compromised the privileged system software, namely the hypervisor, and attempts to compromise the confidentiality and integrity of the cVMs. The attacker may attempt to access secure memory by exploiting DMA.
- *Malicious cVMs.* The attacker may construct a malicious cVM, which tries to interfere with the execution of other cVMs, or to break the isolation enforced by the privileged system software [33].

We do not consider the cases that the cVM intentionally leaks secret, or the security risks brought by unsafe cVM code, e.g., vulnerabilities in the guest OS. User applications within the cVM should

implement appropriate security measures for transmitting data across security boundaries, such as encrypting network or disk data by establishing a secure channel through remote attestation. Since no legacy OS is written with a malicious hypervisor in mind, the host hypervisor may leverage existing communication interfaces between the host and the guest for attacks. The TMM could enforce certain security policies similar to Hecate [15], but in general we consider the protection of such attacks, e.g., due to hypervisor injected interrupts or exploit of the device interfaces [16, 28] as orthogonal to our work. Denial-of-Service (DoS) and side channel attacks [12, 23, 29, 31, 37, 38, 41] are also out of scope.

3 VIRTUALIZING ARM CONFIDENTIAL COMPUTE ARCHITECTURE

3.1 Overview

In this section, we provide the overall architecture of virtCCA, a virtualized CCA using existing TrustZone hardware. To stimulate real world deployment of virtCCA on legacy hardware, virtCCA is designed as a drop-in replacement of CCA, providing strong compatibility with respect to hardware, firmware and software, strong security guarantees and high efficiency, which are elaborated below.

- *Hardware compatibility.* virtCCA is constructed utilizing features from the legacy ARM architecture. Specifically, it is designed to work with both the ARM v8.4-A architecture, which includes S-EL2 support, as well as earlier platforms that lack S-EL2 support. Furthermore, virtCCA is compatible with CCA at the API level.
- *Software and firmware compatibility.* On one hand, the virtCCA design requires minimal modification to the host software infrastructure (i.e., the hypervisor), and requires no modification of the application software, which includes the guest VM image and the entire guest software stack. As such, virtCCA supports running legacy VM images as confidential VM with no additional effort. On the other hand, due to the full compatibility with CCA at the API level, the software and firmware stack constructed for virtCCA can be reused for CCA with no changes when CCA hardware is available in the future.
- *Security.* virtCCA aims to provide a similar security guarantee to CCA. virtCCA adopts a similar model to CCA to minimize the TCB, in which the heavy software stack, i.e., the hypervisor runs in the normal world, while the TMM runs as a reference monitor to enforce strong security. In addition, virtCCA supports verification of the integrity of the cVM through remote attestation.
- *Performance.* In contrast to existing designs, a consecutive chunk of secure memory is reserved for each cVM and always in a static and known state from the hypervisor’s perspective. Our design avoids the cost of memory delegation, and also reduces the complexity in managing the secure memory.

Figure 1 illustrates the architecture of virtCCA. The secure monitor in EL3 enforces memory isolation between the normal world and secure world, by configuring the TZASC. The normal VMs and cVMs reside in the normal world and secure world, respectively. virtCCA leave the complexity of task scheduling and resource allocation to the untrusted hypervisor in the normal world, which manages the life cycle of all normal VMs and cVMs. In particular, a




Figure 1: The architecture of virtCCA.

component in the host (named KVM-virtCCA) communicates with the secure world for the management of cVMs.

Since the hypervisor has no direct access to the secure world, a component referred to as the TMM acts as a trusted reference monitor, and assists the normal world hypervisor in managing cVMs. On ARM v8.4-A and later architectures, the TMM operates at S-EL2 (Fig. 1a); while on former architecture, the TMM also operates at EL3 (Fig. 1b). The TMM enforces memory isolation among all cVMs either by configuring the stage 2 page tables or by write-protecting the cVM’s page table (Sec. 3.2). For brevity, we use virtCCA-SEL2 and virtCCA-EL3 to represent our systems where TMM operates at S-EL2 and EL3, respectively.

The separation of resource allocation and access control necessitates a communication channel between these two worlds. Therefore, virtCCA offers a set of Trusted Management Interfaces (TMIs) to the normal world, and the KVM-virtCCA communicates with the TMM through TMIs. The TMM receives TMI requests from the normal world, manages the state transitions during TMI calls, and returns to the normal world once the TMIs are completed.

3.2 Memory Isolation

Memory isolation schemes in virtCCA operate at two levels. Firstly, virtCCA utilizes TZASC hardware to facilitate the separation of memory between the secure and normal worlds. Secondly, virtCCA enforces memory isolation among multiple mutually distrustful cVMs. In virtCCA-SEL2, the TMM manages the stage-2 page tables of all cVMs, ensuring that the secure memories utilized by the cVMs do not overlap. In virtCCA-EL3, the system prevents a cVM from accessing the memory of another cVM by designating their page tables as read-only. Consequently, any modifications to the page table made by the cVM are intercepted and audited by the TMM at EL3.

Cross-world isolation. In a standard setting, the hypervisor oversees the system’s physical memory and utilizes the buddy system to allocate free memory to the VMs. Without specific intervention,

the secure memory used by cVMs and the normal memory would be interleaved with each other. However, the TZASC hardware only allows configuration of security properties for up to 8 consecutive memory regions, which makes it difficult to support both cVM and normal VM managed by the host simultaneously. To address this challenge, virtCCA allocates a dedicated, contiguous physical memory region exclusively for hosting secure memory utilized by cVMs. This design effectively overcomes the constraints imposed by the TZASC hardware and allows for the support of an unlimited number of cVMs without requiring dynamic movements and mappings of memory pages.

In virtCCA-SEL2, the hypervisor retains the responsibility of managing the memory allocated to each cVM. However, the allocation and deallocation of secure memory must involve and receive approval from the TMM through a series of TMI calls. It is worth noting that the TMM manages the stage-2 page tables for cVMs, which effectively prevents memory mapping attacks from the host.

In virtCCA-EL3, there is no hardware support for stage-2 page mappings in the secure world. Consequently, virtCCA-EL3 enforces a one-to-one mapping between the Intermediate Physical Address (iPA) and system Physical Address (sPA) of cVMs. To circumvent the need for extensive modifications to the KVM, we initially establish one-to-one mappings between the Host Virtual Address (hVA) and sPA in QEMU. Subsequently, we transfer the mappings between the iPA and hVA to the KVM. Overall, we introduced approximately 100 lines of code in QEMU while leaving the KVM unchanged. With the one-to-one mapping, the cVM effectively manages its own physical memory. Since virtCCA-EL3 only requires a single level of address mapping, this design eliminates the overhead of memory virtualization.

Furthermore, as the physical memory for the cVM is pre-allocated, our approach facilitates efficient support for the virtio framework [24], a crucial element for I/O virtualization. In a conventional virtualization environment, data transfer between the virtio front-end and back-end drivers is implemented using vring, which is a

memory-mapped shared region between the hypervisor and the guest OS. Within the reserved memory for every cVM, we further reserve a pre-allocated bounce buffer to serve as the shared vring buffer. For seamless synchronization between physical memory accessed by the front end and the bounce buffer, we utilize the support of software I/O translation buffer (SWIOTLB) in modern Oses. Specifically, all accesses to the vring buffer by the front end are redirected to the bounce buffer. The SWIOTLB maintains the necessary mappings between the actual vring memory and the bounce buffer. When accessing the vring buffer, the guest OS driver automatically synchronizes the bounce buffer with the actual physical memory.

Cross-cVM memory isolation. On Armv8.4 and subsequent platforms, the isolation of multiple cVMs is achieved by leveraging the stage-2 address translation feature provided by the S-EL2 extension. This enables the TMM to efficiently manage and safeguard the memory resources allocated to each cVM, ensuring that they operate within their designated physical memory spaces.

On platforms that lack the S-EL2 extension, alternative approaches can be employed to support multiple cVMs [9, 13]. Specifically, our design restricts a cVM’s ability to modify the page table base register by removing relevant instructions (`mshr_ttbcrx_el1` and `mshr_tcr_el1`). Additionally, we designate the page tables of each cVM as read-only, preventing the guest OS from mapping the physical memory of other cVMs into its own address space. Any such attempts are intercepted by the TMM, which then verifies the legitimacy of the physical memory. This approach ensures a secure and isolated environment for concurrent cVMs.

3.3 Interrupt and Device Virtualization

According to the RMM specification [6], the host should provide a virtual GIC (vGIC) to the cVM, and is able to inject virtual interrupts using the GIC vCPU interface.

Interrupt translation on virtCCA-SEL2. In virtCCA-SEL2, the vGIC is emulated by the host, while the TMM handles the transitions between different interrupt types of the two worlds. Specifically, Linux’s Generic GIC driver assigns the interrupt into Group 1 with Non-secure state. Group 1 interrupts are signaled as either IRQs or FIQs depending on the current security state and exception level. Usually, interrupts are signaled as IRQs when Linux is running at Non-secure EL0/1. However, FIQs are signaled in cVMs while guest OS is executing at S-EL0/S-EL1, which are intended to be handled by Linux as IRQs.

A straightforward solution is to modify the interrupt group and security setting by modifying the cVM’s GIC driver. To minimize the modification of the guest OS, FIQs captured by TMM will be bounced back to hypervisor which will handle FIQ as IRQ and then inject vIRQ to the cVM. The detailed steps are shown in Figure 2:

- 1 while executing at EL1 or EL0, a Group 1 interrupt for the secure Security state is taken as an FIQ, which will be captured by TMM due to FIQ exit;
- 2 The TMM marks the exit reason as IRQ rather than FIQ, and then acknowledge the KVM to handle physical interrupt as IRQ via SMC;
- 3 The physical interrupt is handled by the KVM which will write one of the list registers to inject vIRQ to the cVM.
- 4 Finally, the guest OS handles the incoming vIRQ, when TMM executes an ERET instruction to enter the cVM. After the




Figure 2: virtCCA-SEL2 interrupt translation.

interrupt is handled, the vCPU restores the execution state before the interrupt occurred.

Interrupt virtualization on virtCCA-EL3. In virtCCA-EL3, there lacks hardware support for interrupt virtualization in the secure world. Specifically, the GIC list registers are not supported, which means that the hardware does not track the interrupt state and we cannot inject vIRQ to cVM by writing these registers.

To address these issues, we emulate the registers entirely in software. To maintain the interrupt state, we store the state of the registers in the TEC for each vCPU and model the state transition of the registers based on the type of interrupts. We also emulate the injection of vIRQ to cVM entirely in the TMM. As shown in Figure 3, we first retrieve the old processor context before the interrupt and construct a new processor state according to the type of interrupts. Then we configure the Exception Link Register (ELR) as the old processor state. Finally we resume the cVM and the vCPU begins execution based on the new processor state. After the guest OS handles the interrupt, it initiates an ERET instruction, which restores the previous process state from the ELR, marking the end of the interrupt handling procedure. Besides, in cases where the guest OS needs to access list registers, we replace them with SMC calls.

MMIO virtualization. In the CCA model, peripheral devices can be assigned to a cVM, and only the assigned cVM has access to the device interface. The cVM may access the assigned peripheral devices through the Memory-mapped Input/Output (MMIO) interface.

On virtCCA-SEL2, MMIO accesses triggers translation faults which are captured by the TMM running at S-EL2. The hardware will set the Exception Syndrome Register (ESR) register to encapsulate the MMIO access information, and the MMIO fault is handled by the hypervisor. On virtCCA-EL3, we modify the guest OS by replacing MMIO accesses with SMC instructions that will trap to the TMM. Without hardware support, the TMM updates the ESR as per the ARM specification.

Besides, the TMM is also responsible for the emulation of Power State Coordination Interface (PSCI) and timer etc. We omit the details here.




Figure 3: virtCCA-EL3 software interrupt injection.

3.4 Measurement and Attestation

Root of trust. We assume the platform has reliable RoT, providing secure key storage and immutable bootloader code. The secure key storage seals the private key of the platform asymmetry key pair, known as the Initial Attestation Key (IAK), and stores the corresponding certificate. The IAK is securely provisioned through a certificate authority (CA) and pre-installed during platform fabrication. Such a unique key pair signs the platform measurement report, cryptographically bonding the measurement and the platform identity. The immutable bootloader code is pre-installed in the system’s read-only memory (ROM) and is the first code executed during system boot-up. This code initiates the measurement process at the start of the boot sequence, ensuring its activation even if the system is compromised.

Measured boot and token generation. The measurement process in virtCCA encompasses platform and cVM measurements, aligning with CCA specifications. At system boot, the bootloader code measures the ATF using a hashing algorithm before loading and executing it. This process also includes measuring platform configurations, such as the lifecycle state and hardware setup. Subsequently, ATF measures the TMM and generates the cVM attestation key (CAK) before loading it and transitioning execution control. The above platform measurements, along with platform identity and lifecycle state, form the platform token that is signed by IAK.

The cVM measurement, conducted by the TMM during the cVM’s creation, meticulously records each configuration leading up to the cVM creation. This includes measuring and cryptographically extending the initial code and data of the cVM into the cVM’s initial measurement (CIM). More specifically, the creation of a cVM initializes the CIM, while the loading of a data page and a TEC

Table 1: LoCs of virtCCA’s software stack.

Component	Description	Line of Code
virtCCA-SEL2 TMM	Manage the execution environment of cVMs	4.0K
virtCCA-EL3 TMM	Manage the execution environment of cVMs	3.2K
KVM-virtCCA	Modified Linux KVM communicating with TMM	1.8K
QEMU	Arm64 emulator and KVM VMM supporting virtCCA	0.4K
TEST	Bare Metal testing framework to test TMM interfaces	5.3K
Total		14.7K

extends the CIM. After the cVM is activated, the CIM is protected by the TMM and remains immutable until the cVM is destroyed. An interface (i.e., TSI_MEASURE_EXTEND) is also provided, enabling OS to measure applications and securely store the results in TMM’s extensible measurement slots. The cVM token, which encapsulates both the initial and extended measurements of the cVM, is then signed using the CAK.

The platform token and cVM token are securely bound together through the inclusion of a hash of the CAK’s public key in the platform measurement performed during the previous stage. This combined data is subsequently signed by the IAK, establishing a secure linkage.

Attestation. Upon initiating a connection with the cVM, a challenge value is transmitted to it. The cVM then incorporates this challenge value into its measurement report to ensure freshness and returns the signed report. The report’s authenticity is verified by checking the measurement against the reference values. During remote attestation, an authenticated key exchange protocol is employed to negotiate a shared secret key, which is then used to secure subsequent communications.

4 SECURITY ANALYSIS

TCB. Our implementation is built upon the SPMD and SPMC framework. In total we made 15.1K lines of code (LoCs) insertions or changes, as shown in Table 1. We stress that most of our code base can be reused by CCA with only a few changes with the help of pre-defined macros. For example, TMM uses Virtualization Secure Translation Table Base Register (VSTTBR_EL2) as the base register for stage 2 of the S-EL1&0 translation regime, while CCA uses the Virtualization Translation Table Base Register (VTTBR) register as the base register.

The TCB of virtCCA includes the TrustZone hardware, the ATF and the TMM. In total, the TMM we added to the ATF is only about 4.0K LoCs for virtCCA-SEL2, and 3.2K LoCs for virtCCA-EL3, which is within the range suitable for security verification.

Untrusted host. The host is not allowed to access the cVM, since the non-secure memory and secure memory (for ATF, TMM and cVMs) are isolated by configuring the TZASC.

Table 2: virtCCA prototyped system’s configurations.

Component	HOST	cVM
OS	Ubuntu 22.04	Ubuntu 20.04
Kernel	5.17	5.17
QEMU	7.0.0	-
TF-A	2.7	-
CPU	Kunpeng 920 (ARM V8.2) Server and ARM V8.4 Server	-

The cVM exit events (such as interrupt and exceptions) are first trapped to the TMM. The TMM decides whether to pass control to the host, after the cVM states are safely saved and sensitive information is cleared. virtCCA is designed to provide the same level of protection as CCA upon interrupts and exceptions. That is, the conditions to pass control and the values passed to the host are exactly the same for virtCCA and CCA. Similar to existing VM-based TEEs, virtCCA does not protect from the attacks that the host hypervisor injects spurious interrupts, which our threat model explicitly permits (see Sec. 2.4).

Untrusted cVM. The memory isolation among cVMs is ensured by configuring the stage-2 page tables of all cVMs. On platforms without S-EL2, the stage-1 page table of the cVM is managed by the TMM to prevent a malicious cVM from accessing physical memory other than its own (Sec. 3.2) Further, we ensure that all cVM memory are cleared when the cVM is destroyed to prevent residue data leakage.

DMA attacks. The DMA controller is used to allow I/O devices to directly access physical memory. An attacker may try to access the secure memory leveraging DMA. TrustZone protects against DMA attacks, such that the DMA controller handles secure and non-secure events simultaneously, and prevents non-secure DMA access of secure memory. Built upon TrustZone, virtCCA is resistant to DMA attacks.

Trusted I/O path. Trusted I/O path can be achieved with *device passthrough*, in which the cVM directly communicate with the devices through the support of TMM, without the involvement of the hypervisor. Device passthrough requires hardware support of protecting the interconnection and exchanged messages with the devices, e.g., through TEE Device Interface Security Protocol (TDISP) [35]. As such, we leave the support of secure device passthrough as our future work and provide some initial discussions in Sec. 6.

5 EVALUATIONS

5.1 Experimental Setup

We evaluated virtCCA on real ARM servers. Specifically, for virtCCA-SEL2, we used an early version of ARM V8.4 server from our partner, which is equipped with S-EL2 support and 64 GB RAM. For virtCCA-EL3, we used an ARM server with Kunpeng 920 CPU and 256 GB RAM without S-EL2 support. The software stack of the host is shown in Table 2. We modified the Linux KVM hypervisor to work with TMM, and the changes are quite modest. We decoupled vanilla KVM and cVM KVM in our implementation, which

Table 3: Descriptions of application benchmarks. For each benchmark, we use default parameters except for those specified in the description.

Item	Description
MongoDB	MongoDB (v3.6.8) is a document-oriented database program, which is handling request from a remote client (YCSB v0.17.0 workload A) with default parameters.
Redis	Redis (v5.0.7) is Remote Dictionary Server, which is handling requests from a remote redis benchmark client (redis-tools) with parameters (requests: 100000, parallel connections: 20, and pipeline requests: 12).
Memcached	Memcached (v1.5.22) is a distributed memory-caching system, which is handling requests from a remote memtier (v1.4.0) client with parameters (threads=2).
HackBench	Hackbench is both a benchmark and a stress test for the Linux kernel scheduler, which is running with parameters (loops: 50 and groups: 10).
Apache	Apache HTTP Server (v2.4.41) is a web server software, which is handling requests from a remote ApacheBench (v2.3) client with parameters (concurrency: 10 and requests: 100).
MySQL	MySQL (v8.0.31) is a relational database management system, which is running sysbench (v1.0.18) with parameters (threads=2, tables=2, and table_size=1000000).

Table 4: A comparison of basic context switches between vanilla KVM and virtCCA KVM.

Operation	vanilla SEL2 KVM	virtCCA-SEL2 KVM	vanilla EL3 KVM	virtCCA-EL3 KVM
IPI	4.0 us	43.83 us	2.65 us	12.02 us
I/O	42.33 us	272.38 us	22.08 us	39.67 us

supports normal VMs and confidential VMs on the same platform. Each cVM was allocated 2 vCPUs and 512 MB RAM, and ran Ubuntu 20.04 with kernel version 5.17. ARM VHE mode was enabled for all measurements to reduce the virtualization overhead.

5.2 Sanity Check of TMM Interfaces

We implemented the TEST framework to ensure that virtCCA is consistent with the CCA specifications. The TEST framework runs in normal world bare metal EL2 and invokes TMI to interact with the TMM. There are 18 test cases covering all TMIs. Test areas include multi-core handling, race condition, input sanity checks, various levels of cVM page tables, inter-world memory sharing and isolation, inter-cVM isolation, timer and interrupt handling. The TEST framework can be used to test both virtCCA and CCA implementations as their interfaces are compatible.

5.3 Micro-benchmarks

We designed the micro-benchmarks to evaluate the cost of frequently-used hypervisor operations, including hypercall (HVC), virtual inter-processor interrupt (IPI) and I/O request for vanilla KVM and virtCCA KVM. We collected the average results over 1,000,000 measurements, as shown in Table 4.

For virtual IPI, we issue an IPI from vCPU0 to vCPU1, which triggers a remote callback function on vCPU1. vCPU0 thread waits

until the function returns and counts the elapsed time. The entire process involves two round trips of interrupt emulation, as the physical IPI will cause another VM exit from target vCPU1 to the TMM, while vanilla KVM only involves transitions between the guest VMs at EL-1 and the hypervisor at EL-2. As such, we observe that IPI for cVM takes more than twice of that for vanilla KVM. The additional cost comes from the switches between the normal world and secure world.

For the I/O benchmark, we measured the time needed to get the MAC address from the cVM through the virtio-net interface, which gets the MAC information from the QEMU virtio-net device model in the host. The entire process includes the similar HVC cost (i.e., the round trip from cVM to KVM), and additional vring synchronization cost within the virtio framework.

5.4 Macro-benchmarks

Linux/Unix nbench. Linux/Unix nbench is a benchmark suite designed to evaluate the performance of a computer system’s CPU, FPU, and memory system. It specifically excludes measurements related to I/O operations and system calls. In our evaluation, we utilized nbench to assess the performance of the CPU, FPU, and memory system within the cVM. The results, shown in Figure 4a, indicate that virtCCA introduces an average overhead of approximately 1.2% for virtCCA-SEL2 and <1% for virtCCA-EL3.

Real-world Applications. We performed the application benchmark as described in Table 3. The Y-axis of Figure 4b represents performance normalization relative to running in the vanilla KVM. The overhead observed in real-world applications is notably lower compared to that of micro-benchmarks. This discrepancy arises from the fact that state transitions account for only a small portion of the overall execution time.

In virtCCA-SEL2, the overhead for Redis and MongoDB remains below 10% compared to the vanilla KVM. However, for I/O-intensive workloads like Apache, the average overhead reaches approximately 29.5%. These workloads necessitate frequent MMIO and interrupt emulations, leading to a higher number of cVM exits and world switches. Furthermore, they involve frequent interactions with external devices, such as networking, which are implemented using the virtio framework. It is expected that the overhead for I/O-intensive workloads could be notably reduced in the future through the implementation of secure device passthrough.

In virtCCA-EL3, the overhead for Apache experiences a 16.57% increase compared to the vanilla KVM. However, surprisingly, virtCCA outperforms the baseline in other application benchmarks. For example, Hackbench and Redis exhibit improvements of 31.9% and 14.94%, respectively, compared to the baseline. This can be attributed to the fact that in virtCCA-EL3, cVMs operate in bare-metal mode, eliminating the overhead of CPU and memory virtualization.

To further evaluate performance in scenarios involving both memory and I/O intensiveness, we conducted a Redis latency test with varying throughputs. In this test, we loaded 10MB of data using YCSB workload A and executed 10,000 operations from 10 concurrent clients over the local loopback. We progressively increased the request frequency and measured the corresponding latency at different throughputs. Figure 4c and Figure 4d illustrate

the observed latency at different achieved throughputs by increasing the request frequency. The results indicate that, in most cases, the increased latency remains within 55% of the baseline latency. Notably the latency of virtCCA-EL3 even surpasses the baseline when the throughput increases.

6 FUTURE WORKS

Device passthrough and heterogeneous TEEs. virtCCA can be extended to support secure device passthrough of xPUs, such as GPU, FPGA and other accelerators, to the cVM, which requires hardware and software coordination. The hardware needs to support protecting the interconnection and exchanged messages with the devices, e.g., through TEE Device Interface Security Protocol (TDISP) [35]. On the software side, we plan to introduce the Trust-IO Manager module for MMIO access and SMMU configuration in TMM, which exposes the TMI_MMIO and TMI_SMMU TMIs to the host (Figure 5). SMMU should be programmed to support secure DMA transactions with the TMI_SMMU TMI. The PCIe physical function (PF) as primary function of the device advertises the device’s SR-IOV capabilities, which is managed by the host with the TMI_MMIO TMI. PCIe virtual functions (VFs) could also be assigned to different cVMs by the host.

Security policies enforced by the TMM. The legacy OSes are not written with a malicious hypervisor in mind and may be vulnerable to various attacks. The TMM, acting as the gatekeeper, can enforce certain security policies, e.g., data encryption, detecting deliberate virtual interrupts to prevent race conditions and deadlocks, network filtering and firewall policies. However, enforcing these security policies in the TMM enlarges the TCB. To address this issue, the TMM can create an additional cVM for handling security services, isolated from other cVMs and the TMM. This cVM only provides limited security-related interfaces and only communicates with the TMM to minimize the attack surface. We leave the exploration in this direction as future work.

7 RELATED WORKS

TEE architectures. All major processor manufacturers announced the support of VM-based TEEs in their production roadmap, including AMD SEV [25], Intel TDX [19], IBM PEF [18] and ARM CCA [1]. Lee et al. propose Keystone [26], an open and modular framework for building customizable TEEs. Similarly, CURE [10] provides a TEE architecture with strongly-isolated and highly customizable enclaves, which supports a various types of enclave, ranging from enclaves in user space, over sub-space enclaves, to self-contained (multi-core) enclaves which include privileged software levels secure enclave-to-peripheral binding. HyperEnclave [21] is an open and cross-platform TEE, which provides security isolation based on the widely-available hardware virtualization technology, without relying on specific hardware features.

Re-purposing existing TEEs. In addition to hardware-based TEE proposals, efforts have been made to create extensible TEE frameworks by leveraging existing TEE solutions available on commodity CPUs. Examples of such frameworks include vTZ [17], SecTEE [40], Sanctuary [11], vSGX [39], and Twinvisor [27].




Figure 4: Macro-benchmarks between virtCCA and vanilla KVM. The absolute values for application benchmarks (Fig. 4b) in the format [vanilla-SEL2, virtCCA-SEL2, vanilla-SEL2-EL3, virtCCA-EL3] are listed as follows: ① MySQL in events/s [1390.2, 1276.0, 1063.09, 1276.0]; ② Apache requests/s [9856.6, 6930.6, 13788.7, 11504.6]; ③ Hackbench in total times (s) [0.292, 0.3606, 0.1922, 0.1458]; ④ Memcached in Ops/s [109573, 86426.5, 151610, 168999]; ⑤ Redis in SET requests/s [827905, 866243, 730004, 839077]; ⑥ MongoDB in throughput (Ops/s) [1390.2, 1276.0, 1063.09, 1157.01].

Among these frameworks, Twinvisor is most closely related to our work. However, virtCCA distinguishes itself from Twinvisor through several key design decisions. Specifically, virtCCA supports the CCA interface at the API level, enabling the construction of a CCA software stack on top of virtCCA. Additionally, we have developed the entire software stack to support both virtCCA and CCA. In contrast, Twinvisor can only operate with S-EL2 support, while virtCCA offers compatibility with legacy hardware, irrespective of whether it supports S-EL2 or not.

Heterogeneous TEEs. A line of research has been conducted to extend confidential computing to devices such as GPUs, including Graviton [36], HIX [20], HETEE [42], Strongbox [14], and Cronus [22]. In particular, GPU TEE is currently available on the commercial Nvidia H100 GPU [32]. However, these solutions either require hardware changes (HETEE, HIX, Graviton and Nvidia H100), or make extensive changes to the GPU driver (Strongbox,

Cronus). virtCCA could support confidential computing on devices after device passthrough is enabled in the future. Since virtCCA runs unmodified guest OS within the cVM, device drivers can run in cVM without any changes.

8 CONCLUSION

ARM CCA enables the support of confidential virtual machines within a separate world, providing protection from the untrusted normal world. To enable the CCA model on legacy hardware, this paper presents virtCCA, a virtualized CCA platform built upon existing TrustZone infrastructure. virtCCA can be instantiated with the Secure EL2 (S-EL2) extension introduced in ARMv8.4, as well as on earlier platforms without S-EL2 support. Moreover, virtCCA maintains full compatibility with CCA at the API level, and we provide the necessary firmware and software stack to support virtCCA, including the ATF, TMM, and the host hypervisor. This firmware




Figure 5: Device passthrough.

and software stack can be easily adapted for future CCA hardware with minimal modifications. We have implemented virtCCA on real ARM servers with and without S-EL2 support. Evaluations conducted on a range of micro-benchmarks and real-world applications demonstrate that virtCCA introduces minimal overhead.

REFERENCES

- [1] [n. d.]. Arm confidential compute architecture. <https://developer.arm.com/documentation/den0125/0200/?lang=en>. Referenced December 2022..
- [2] [n. d.]. Huawei iTrustee V3.0 on Kirin 980 Security Target. https://www.ssi.gouv.fr/uploads/2020/08/anssi-cible-cc-2020_67en.pdf. Referenced December 2022..
- [3] [n. d.]. Intel software guard extensions overview. <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/developer/tools/software-guard-extensions/overview.html>. Referenced December 2022..
- [4] [n. d.]. Secure virtualization. <https://developer.arm.com/documentation/102142/0100/Secure-virtualization>. Referenced December 2022..
- [5] 2023. ISLET: An on-device confidential computing framework. <https://github.com/Samsung/islet>.
- [6] 2023. Realm Management Monitor specification. <https://developer.arm.com/documentation/den0137/latest>.
- [7] 2023. [RFC PATCH 00/28] arm64: Support for Arm CCA in KVM. <https://lkml.org/lkml/2023/1/27/450/>.
- [8] 2023. Support for Arm CCA VMs on Linux. <https://lwn.net/Articles/921482/>.
- [9] Ahmed M Azab, Peng Ning, Jitesh Shah, Quan Chen, Rohan Bhutkar, Guruprasad Ganesh, Jia Ma, and Wenbo Shen. 2014. Hypervision across worlds: Real-time kernel protection from the arm trustzone secure world. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 90–102.
- [10] Raad Bahmani, Ferdinand Brasser, Ghada Dessouky, Patrick Jauernig, Matthias Klimmek, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Emmanuel Stempf. 2021. CURE: A Security Architecture with Customizable and Resilient Enclaves. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. USENIX Association. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity21/presentation/bahmani>
- [11] Ferdinand Brasser, David Gens, Patrick Jauernig, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Emmanuel Stempf. 2019. SANCTUARY: ARMing TrustZone with User-space Enclaves.. In *NDS*.
- [12] Guoxing Chen, Sanchuan Chen, Yuan Xiao, Yinqian Zhang, Zhiqiang Lin, and Ten H Lai. 2019. Sgxpctre: Stealing intel secrets from sgx enclaves via speculative execution. In *2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE, 142–157.
- [13] Nathan Dautenhahn, Theodoros Kasampalis, Will Dietz, John Criswell, and Vikram Adve. 2015. Nested kernel: An operating system architecture for intra-kernel privilege separation. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. 191–206.
- [14] Yunjie Deng, Chenxu Wang, Shunchang Yu, Shiqing Liu, Zhenyu Ning, Kevin Leach, Jin Li, Shoumeng Yan, Zhengyu He, Jiannong Cao, et al. 2022. StrongBox: A GPU TEE on Arm Endpoints. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference*

- on *Computer and Communications Security*. 769–783.
- [15] Xinyang Ge, Hsuan-Chi Kuo, and Weidong Cui. 2022. Hecate: Lifting and Shifting On-Premises Workloads to an Untrusted Cloud. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 1231–1242.
- [16] Felicitas Hetzelt, Martin Radev, Robert Buhren, Mathias Morbitzer, and Jean-Pierre Seifert. 2021. VIA: Analyzing Device Interfaces of Protected Virtual Machines. In *Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*. 273–284.
- [17] Zhichao Hua, Jinyu Gu, Yubin Xia, Haibo Chen, Binyu Zang, and Haibing Guan. 2017. vTZ: Virtualizing ARM TrustZone. In *26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 17)*. 541–556.
- [18] Guerny DH Hunt, Ramachandra Pai, Michael V Le, Hani Jamjoom, Sukadev Bhattachipolu, Rick Boivie, Laurent Dufour, Brad Frey, Mohit Kapur, Kenneth A Goldman, et al. 2021. Confidential computing for OpenPOWER. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*. 294–310.
- [19] Intel. 2020. Intel Trust Domain Extensions. <https://software.intel.com/content/dam/develop/external/us/en/documents/tdxwhitepaper-v4.pdf>.
- [20] Insu Jang, Adrian Tang, Taehoon Kim, Simha Sethumadhavan, and Jaehyuk Huh. 2019. Heterogeneous isolated execution for commodity gpus. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. 455–468.
- [21] Yuekai Jia, Shuang Liu, Wenhao Wang, Yu Chen, Zhengde Zhai, Shoumeng Yan, and Zhengyu He. 2022. HyperEnclave: An Open and Cross-platform Trusted Execution Environment. In *2022 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 22)*. 437–454.
- [22] Jianyu Jiang, Ji Qi, Tianxiang Shen, Xusheng Chen, Shixiong Zhao, Sen Wang, Li Chen, Gong Zhang, Xiapu Luo, and Heming Cui. 2022. CRONUS: Fault-isolated, Secure and High-performance Heterogeneous Computing for Trusted Execution Environment. In *2022 55th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. IEEE, 124–143.
- [23] Yichen Jiang, Huifeng Zhu, Dean Sullivan, Xiaolong Guo, Xuan Zhang, and Yier Jin. 2021. Quantifying rowhammer vulnerability for dram security. In *2021 58th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC)*. IEEE, 73–78.
- [24] M Tim Jones. 2010. Virtio: An I/O virtualization framework for Linux. *IBM White Paper 29* (2010).
- [25] David Kaplan, Jeremy Powell, and Tom Woller. 2016. AMD memory encryption. *White paper* (2016).
- [26] Dayeol Lee, David Kohlbrenner, Shweta Shinde, Krste Asanović, and Dawn Song. 2020. Keystone: An open framework for architecting trusted execution environments. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*. 1–16.
- [27] Dingji Li, Zeyu Mi, Yubin Xia, Binyu Zang, Haibo Chen, and Haibing Guan. 2021. TwinVisor: Hardware-isolated Confidential Virtual Machines for ARM. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 28th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 638–654.
- [28] Mengyuan Li and Yinqian Zhang. 2019. Exploiting unprotected I/O operations in AMD’s secure encrypted virtualization. In *Proceedings of the 2019 USENIX Security Symposium*.
- [29] Mengyuan Li, Yinqian Zhang, Huibo Wang, Kang Li, and Yueqiang Cheng. 2021. CIPHERLEAKS: Breaking Constant-time Cryptography on AMD SEV via the Ciphertext Side Channel. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 717–732.
- [30] Linaro Limited. [n. d.]. Open Portable Trusted Execution Environment. <https://www.op-tee.org/>. Referenced December 2022.
- [31] Moritz Lipp, Andreas Kogler, David Oswald, Michael Schwarz, Catherine Easdon, Claudio Canella, and Daniel Gruss. 2021. PLATYPUS: Software-based power side-channel attacks on x86. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 355–371.
- [32] Nvidia. 2022. NVIDIA H100 Tensor Core GPU Architecture. https://www.hptech.co.jp/catalog/gtc22-whitepaper-hopper_v1.01.pdf.
- [33] Michael Schwarz, Samuel Weiser, Daniel Gruss, Clémentine Maurice, and Stefan Mangard. 2017. Malware guard extension: Using SGX to conceal cache attacks. In *International Conference on Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment*. Springer, 3–24.
- [34] AMD SEV-SNP. 2020. Strengthening VM isolation with integrity protection and more. *White Paper, January* (2020).
- [35] PCI SIG. 2022. PCI TEE Device Interface Security Protocol. <https://pcisig.com/specifications>.
- [36] Stavros Volos, Kapil Vaswani, and Rodrigo Bruno. 2018. Graviton: Trusted Execution Environments on {GPUs}. In *13th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 18)*. 681–696.
- [37] Wenhao Wang, Guoxing Chen, Xiaorui Pan, Yinqian Zhang, XiaoFeng Wang, Vincent Bindschaedler, Haixu Tang, and Carl A Gunter. 2017. 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*. 2421–2434.
- [38] Yuanzhong Xu, Weidong Cui, and Marcus Peinado. 2015. Controlled-channel attacks: Deterministic side channels for untrusted operating systems. In *2015 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. IEEE, 640–656.

- [39] Shixuan Zhao, Mengyuan Li, Yinqian Zhang, and Zhiqiang Lin. 2022. vSGX: Virtualizing SGX Enclaves on AMD SEV. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE.
- [40] Shijun Zhao, Qianying Zhang, Yu Qin, Wei Feng, and Dengguo Feng. 2019. Sectee: A software-based approach to secure enclave architecture using tee. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 1723–1740.
- [41] Huifeng Zhu, Xiaolong Guo, Yier Jin, and Xuan Zhang. 2020. PowerScout: A security-oriented power delivery network modeling framework for cross-domain side-channel analysis. In *2020 Asian Hardware Oriented Security and Trust Symposium (AsianHOST)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [42] Jianping Zhu, Rui Hou, Xiaofeng Wang, Wenhao Wang, Jiangfeng Cao, Boyan Zhao, Zhongpu Wang, Yuhui Zhang, Jiameng Ying, Lixin Zhang, et al. 2020. Enabling rack-scale confidential computing using heterogeneous trusted execution environment. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 1450–1465.