

Mitigating Speculation-based Attacks through Configurable Hardware/Software Co-design

Ali Hajiabadi

National University of Singapore

Andreas Diavastos

National University of Singapore

Archit Agarwal

National University of Singapore

Trevor E. Carlson

National University of Singapore

ABSTRACT

New speculation-based attacks that affect large numbers of modern systems are disclosed regularly. Currently, CPU vendors regularly fall back to heavy-handed mitigations like using barriers or enforcing strict programming guidelines resulting in significant performance overhead. What is missing is a solution that allows for efficient mitigation and is flexible enough to address both current and future speculation vulnerabilities, without additional hardware changes.

In this work, we present SPECCONTROL, a novel hardware/software co-design, that enables new levels of security while reducing the performance overhead that has been demonstrated by state-of-the-art methodologies. SPECCONTROL introduces a communication interface that allows compilers and application developers to inform the hardware about true branch dependencies, confidential control-flow instructions, and fine-grained instruction constraints in order to apply restrictions only when necessary. We evaluate SPECCONTROL against known speculative execution attacks and in addition, present a new speculative fetch attack variant on the Pattern History Table (PHT) in branch predictors that shows how similar previously reported vulnerabilities are more dangerous by enabling unprivileged attacks, especially with the state-of-the-art branch predictors. SPECCONTROL provides stronger security guarantees compared to the existing defenses while reducing the performance overhead of two state-of-the-art defenses from 51% and 43% to just 23%.

1 INTRODUCTION

Speculative execution attacks, like Spectre [37], are a major concern in current and future modern processor designs as they exploit the main enabler of their performance, speculative execution [52]. Speculative execution attacks trick the processor into executing unintended paths of the program in a speculative manner and force the victim to access sensitive or secret information. The attacker can then reconstruct the secret data by probing the components containing the footprints of mispredicted and secret dependent paths which have not been rolled back after misspeculation. To mitigate speculative execution attacks, the most comprehensive solutions try to prevent transmitting secret information through any side-channel by restricting the execution of speculative instructions. For example, STT [77] deploys a dynamic taint tracking technique that restricts the execution of instructions that are tainted by speculative loads. Following solutions [20, 47, 63] use the same insight, and propose hardware-only mechanisms to detect and restrict the speculative execution of problematic instructions. These solutions provide secure speculation for *sandboxed* programs that guarantee

their memory accesses are within the authorized address range during the correct execution. However, they fail to provide secure speculation for *constant-time* programs, since these programs might load the secret data non-speculatively. To protect non-speculative secrets, speculative execution of all instructions tainted by secret values must be restricted. Current solutions for constant-time programs either manually specify secret regions of memory [21, 24, 63] or assume all memory regions are secret and declassify them only if they leak during non-speculative execution [20].

Unfortunately, most of these solutions tend to significantly reduce the benefits of speculative execution, as they follow a conservative approach of restricting the execution of the majority of speculative instructions after an unresolved branch. Our study shows that STT and DOLMA incur 43% and 51% performance overhead over an unprotected processor, respectively¹. However, our studies show that many of the restrictions introduced by these mitigations are unnecessary because not all instructions after a branch are truly dependent on the branch outcome. Such independent instructions can safely execute without compromising security. Hardware-only mitigations do not have sufficient information on true branch dependencies and all possible control-flow paths of the program, as the processor only views a small window of instructions at any given moment. Our key insight in this paper is that a hardware/software co-design provides a more efficient solution, where the software informs the hardware about true branch dependencies and the hardware applies restrictions only to truly speculative instructions.

In addition, prior solutions offer a limited scope of protection, as they only protect against current attacks exploiting speculative execution. However, modern processors have several components that hold speculative and confidential information (*e.g.*, the Branch Prediction Unit) that can potentially leak, leading to the frequent discovery of new vulnerabilities. Previous research has shown that the branch predictor can leak secret information through the Pattern History Table (PHT) [22]. However, it was not considered a serious threat due to the limited leakage and attack assumptions. We demonstrate a new variant of the attack that an unprivileged attacker can extract a 19-bit private key of RSA without priming the PHT and we show that this attack becomes even more serious with better branch predictors. We discuss that such attacks need to be categorized as speculation-based vulnerabilities because the secret extraction phase of the attack exploits the speculation operations at the processor’s front-end. We call this class of attack

¹We use modified versions of STT (to protect non-speculative secrets) and DOLMA (disabling Delay-on-Miss optimization to protect against speculative interference attacks [10]).

Speculative Fetch Attacks. Speculatively fetching instructions and redirecting fetch in case of a misprediction creates the timing difference required to recover the control-flow information of the victim.

Defenses for speculative fetch attacks tend to be very challenging and inefficient, and often even impractical. Software-only defenses require the program to remove all the confidential control-flow instructions (*i.e.*, secret dependent branches or branches representing private activities of the users). Such transformation (*e.g.*, if-converting the branches [48]) is challenging for real-world applications, with respect to performance and practicality of removing complex control-flow patterns. On the other hand, hardware-only solutions have no other choice other than disabling the branch predictor since they have no information about the confidentiality of newly fetched branches. We believe that a hardware/software co-design and communication of confidential branches allows high-performance processors to enforce fine-grained front-end restrictions only for sensitive branches.

In this work, we propose SPECCONTROL, a mechanism to provide both comprehensive security and high performance through a configurable hardware/software co-design. To accomplish this, we introduce a software interface for compilers and application developers to communicate true branch dependencies and confidential control-flow instructions to the hardware. Our hardware uses software information to apply restrictions only if necessary, either at the front-end or the back-end of the processor (mitigating both speculative fetch and execution attacks). SPECCONTROL provides secure speculation for both sandboxing and constant-time policies, in addition to a new policy that guarantees the confidentiality of control-flow instructions (called *control-flow confidentiality*). The SPECCONTROL interface is flexible enough to define new secure speculation policies for future attacks and programs that might require additional or fewer restrictions, without additional changes to the hardware in the future.

The main contributions of this work are:

- A novel hardware/software co-design methodology, called SPECCONTROL, that enables configurable and targeted mitigation for speculation-based attacks;
- Our targeted and automated mechanism reduces performance overhead compared to state-of-the-art solutions, DOLMA [47] and STT [77], from 51% and 43% to just 23%, with negligible power and area overheads;
- We demonstrate a new variant of speculative fetch attacks that allows an unprivileged attacker to extract a 19-bit RSA private key from modern branch predictors. Additionally, we show the possibility of the attack on Intel, AMD, and Apple CPUs²;
- Enhanced security against speculative fetch attacks.

2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

In prior work [20, 47, 63, 70, 77], an attack is considered speculative only if the secret is leaked at the processor back-end during speculative execution. In this work, we expand this definition to consider an attack to be speculative if any step of the attack exploits

²We have responsibly disclosed our attack to the affected vendors and received the approval to distribute our findings.

(a) Sandboxed program	(b) Constant-time program
<pre> 1 // Priming B to a known state 2 if (x < A_size){ 3 // speculative secret access 4 secret = A[x]; 5 // speculative secret transmission 6 temp = B[secret * 64]; 7 } 8 // Probing B to extract secret </pre>	<pre> 1 // Priming B to a known state 2 // non-speculative secret access 3 secret = *secret_address; 4 if (condition){ 5 // speculative secret transmission 6 temp = B[secret * 64]; 7 } 8 // Probing B to extract secret </pre>

Figure 1: Victim gadgets for speculative execution attacks.

speculative operations of the core to recover secret information, even if the secret is transmitted to a channel non-speculatively. In this section, we describe two categories of speculation-based attacks: (1) speculative execution, and (2) speculative fetch attacks.

2.1 Speculative Execution Attacks

Speculative execution attacks aim to bypass the address protection mechanisms of sandboxes or speculatively transmit the secret data of constant-time programs (see Figure 1). In these attacks, the attacker (a) mistrains the branch predictor to always take the victim branch even if the condition is not true (line 2 in Figure 1a and line 4 in Figure 1b), and (b) speculatively (loading the secret into the core in a sandboxed program and) transmitting the secret to a primed side-channel (*e.g.*, the cache). The processor then detects the branch misprediction, rolls back the misspeculated state, and resumes the execution from the correct path. However, the transmitted secret leaves behind persistent state that the attacker can use to extract the secret. Spectre-V1 [37] was the first attack exploiting this vulnerability, with several follow-up variants [11, 18, 29, 34, 39, 49, 65].

2.1.1 Existing Defenses. Many initial defenses for speculative execution attacks [14, 33, 54, 58, 61, 62, 74] focused on solutions to mitigate specific channels, such as caches [35–38, 50]. However, new Spectre variants have demonstrated that other components in the core can act as a side-channel as well, such as the Branch Target Buffer (BTB) [70]. As an attempt to build a more comprehensive set of countermeasures, recent works have focused on mitigating the attack at the source [21, 47, 63, 70, 75–77], by completely restricting speculative execution of instructions that can potentially reveal sensitive information. The focus of these works is to block leaks through any potential channel, but only for speculative execution attacks. However, there are still challenges to be addressed as hardware-only solutions fail to completely solve.

2.2 Speculative Fetch Attacks

Speculative fetch attacks exploit the fact that the branch predictor remembers the decisions originally made by the victim. Figure 2 shows a victim gadget that consists of a confidential branch that is vulnerable to speculative fetch attacks (Branch B1). BranchScope [22] is an example of such attack, where the attacker performs three steps to extract a secret key: (1) the attacker primes one of the PHT entries into a known state (*e.g.*, strongly taken), (2) the victim executes its secret dependent branch (colliding with the primed PHT entry), and (3) the attacker can extract the secret bit by probing the same PHT entry. Unfortunately, BranchScope requires OS control to interrupt the victim exactly at each iteration of the secret dependent branch to extract the secret bit by bit. We consider this attack to be a speculation-based vulnerability as the secret




Figure 2: Events and timing of correct prediction (correct guess) and misprediction (incorrect guess) in a speculative fetch attack. We assume that before executing the attack gadget all instructions and data of the attacker are flushed from the caches. Note that, Not-Taken means executing the fall-through path (A()) and f() in this example).

```

1 void RSA_decode(int c, uint8 *d, int n){
2   int R0 = 1, R1 = c, i;
3   for (i = sizeof(d)-1; i >= 0; i++){
4     if (d[i] == 1){ R0 = R0 * R1 % n; R1 = R1 * R1 % n; }
5     else { R1 = R0 * R1 % n; R0 = R0 * R0 % n; }
6   }
7 }

```

Figure 3: RSA modular exponentiation using Montgomery Ladder Powering [32, 55].

extraction happens through speculative predictions initiated by the branch predictor at the fetch stage.

2.2.1 A New Variant of Speculative Fetch Attacks. We present a new variant of speculative fetch attacks that, unlike previous work [22], allows an *unprivileged* attacker to successfully launch an attack, *without requiring the OS to precisely control the victim execution and without requiring the attacker to prime the branch predictor*. We exploit the fact that state-of-the-art branch predictors can remember branch patterns and therefore can extract the confidential information that has already been learned. Our attack only performs two steps without interfering with the victim’s execution:

Step 1 (victim): Train the PHT with the secret. The victim runs normally and trains the PHT with its secret information and branch decisions;

Step 2 (attacker): Measure the execution time of the attack gadget. After victim execution, the attacker needs to (a) create a PHT collision with the victim branch [16, 36] and (b) make a guess about the secret. The attacker evaluates the correctness of the guess to extract the secret.

Figure 2 shows an example of victim and attack gadgets, along with a timeline of the events during the second step of the attack. If the attacker guesses correctly, the instructions are fetched from the correct path and are not squashed later. However, in the case of an incorrect guess, the incorrectly fetched instructions are squashed and the processor starts fetching and executing instructions from the correct path (speculative execution is disabled in Figure 2). As shown in the figure, the attacker can evaluate the correctness of the guess by measuring the execution time of the attack gadget.

This attack exploits the victim itself to prime and train the PHT state with the secret. Our investigations using gem5 simulation [12] with different branch predictors (Figure 4) show that TAGE-SC-L-64KB [4], the current state-of-the-art branch predictor, is able to




Figure 4: Investigation of different branch predictors in gem5 and their prediction for RSA private key after 1,000 rounds of decryption. The results show that TAGE-SC-L-64KB remembers the entire key. Note, that a Taken decision means that the secret bit is 0 based on the RSA code in Figure 3. The secret is $(10111001011110111111)_2$.

learn all 19 bits of the private exponent in a Montgomery Ladder RSA [32] (Figure 3) after 1,000 rounds of decryption. Older branch predictors fail to remember all the bits. For example, MultiperspectivePerceptron64KB [30, 31] provides incorrect predictions for 4 of the secret bits. In other words, deploying increasingly better branch predictors make speculative fetch attacks more serious than was previously realized. In Section 6.4, we demonstrate the feasibility of our attack on real existing CPUs.

2.2.2 Attack Surface. Any program with control-flow decisions that carry confidential information is vulnerable to speculative fetch attacks. Many existing cryptographic implementations have secret dependent branches, like the RSA modular exponentiation in GnuPG 1.4 [2], OpenSSL v1.01e [55], MbedTLS 3.0.0 [51], LibreSSL 3.3.6 [60], and wNAF algorithm in secp256k1 curve (found in OpenSSL v1.1.0h [23]). In addition, many real-world applications have branches that can leak confidential information (e.g., users’ Bluetooth connections [6] and battery properties [5] in the Linux kernel).

2.2.3 Existing Defenses. To defend against speculative fetch attacks, software-only defenses adopt strict policies like data-oblivious programming [46, 53, 59, 66] (e.g., removing secret dependent branches). Adapting to such guidelines is challenging for real-world and control-flow intensive programs, and even many cryptographic modules still choose to use secret dependent branches. These applications secure non-speculative leaks of the program with lightweight spot defenses based on the adversaries’ capabilities³. On the other hand, hardware-only defenses have no prior information about newly fetched branches at the front-end and their only option is to disable the branch predictor, an extreme measure that significantly reduces performance, especially in highly speculative modern processors. We show that, for example, a secure baseline processor with no branch predictor can introduce up to a 3.72× performance overhead. Note, that clearing the branch predictor after context switches does not solve the problem for hyperthreading-based scenarios and also

³For example, a minor compiler update mitigates the fetch bandwidth misalignments exploited by Frontal attacks [57].

requires the trust of the OS to not exploit the branch predictor’s state before clearing it.

This speculative fetch vulnerability is a microarchitectural leak that software verification tools cannot reason about (as not all of the microarchitectural features of processors are disclosed); they can only analyze the correct execution of the program. In this work, we introduce a new secure speculation policy, called *control-flow confidentiality*, where the hardware guarantees secure speculation for confidential branches.

2.3 Challenges of the State-of-the-Art

In this work, we identify four challenges of state-of-the-art defenses for speculation-based vulnerabilities:

(1) **Hardware-only solutions for speculative execution attacks apply unnecessary restrictions for the instructions that will not leak data due to speculation.** Our analysis shows that not all instructions after unresolved branches are truly dependent on the branch [27].

(2) **Software-only and hardware-only solutions cannot efficiently protect confidential control-flow decisions.** Existing mechanisms are challenging for real-world applications and incur prohibitive performance overheads.

(3) **Future security challenges:** The rapid development of new speculative attacks [9, 10, 42, 72] invalidates many of the existing state-of-the-art (performance-wise and security-wise) defenses, and they are unable to recover from newly discovered attacks. Hence, application developers and CPU vendors currently need to fall back to heavy-handed protections (e.g., fences, or strict programming guidelines). A fine-grained solution providing sufficient protections that limits performance penalties would help to alleviate these issues.

(4) **Future performance challenges:** While new speculation vulnerabilities emerge rapidly, our understanding of the programs and vulnerable workloads can continue to improve. We believe that even a hardware/software co-design, as we propose in this work, needs to be flexible enough to benefit from future compiler and programming enhancements. For example, future compilers might be able to extract more accurate and less conservative instruction dependencies or new efficient programming disciplines that require fewer restrictions from the hardware.

2.4 Our Approach: HW/SW Co-design

Our key insight is that we can enable fine-grained and targeted restriction of speculative fetch and speculative execution only for problematic instructions using targeted hardware/software communication. In this work, we propose a software interface that allows compilers and application developers to communicate confidential branches (to restrict them at the front-end and defend against speculative fetch attacks) and true branch dependencies (to only restrict the execution of the instructions that are truly dependent on unresolved branches and defend against speculative execution attacks). Our proposed microarchitecture only modifies the front-end logic to detect and restrict the fetch of confidential branches and adds a new table at the backend, the Unresolved Branches Table (UBT), that keeps track of the live unresolved branches residing in the ROB and applies execution restrictions to an instruction only if it

depends (as informed by the compiler) on any of the branches in the UBT.

Our hardware/software co-design is flexible enough to allow compilers and developers to apply or relax front-end and back-end restrictions without additional hardware updates to provide (1) a *configurable* methodology to defend against future vulnerable instructions and paths of the programs, and (2) the flexibility to configure the hardware restrictions based on future advancements of programs and compilers, hence, providing a potential for future performance improvements.

3 THREAT MODEL

In this paper, we focus on securing speculation for software following (1) sandboxing policies, (2) constant-time policies [21, 26], as well as (3) control-flow confidentiality, covering all known *speculative fetch*, and *speculative execution* attacks (see Section 5 for the definitions and analysis of our security guarantees).

Speculative execution attacks include all Spectre-like attacks [11, 18, 29, 34, 37, 39, 49, 65]. Speculative fetch attacks refer to speculation vulnerabilities introduced at the front-end, like Branch-Scope [22] and our new variant of the attack. The assumptions we make for speculative fetch attacks are: (1) the Pattern History Table (PHT) must be shared between the attacker and the victim. This means that the attacker and the victim must run on the same physical core and share PHT entries, (2) the attacker can trigger or is able to watch for and validate the victim code execution, and (3) the attacker can launch the attack with user-only privileges in the system, without requiring any OS capabilities.

Out of Scope: We do not consider Meltdown-type attacks [15, 45, 64, 67, 68, 71] that exploit the delay between exceptions and when they are handled. New processors patch this class of attacks [1]. In addition, attacks exploiting non-speculative leaks of the programs [19, 25, 41, 44, 57, 69] are out of scope of this work.

4 SPECCONTROL DESIGN

SPECCONTROL design deploys a configurable solution that efficiently applies minimal restrictions to guarantee strong protections. It provides a lightweight software interface (Section 4.1) that allows the compiler and the applications developers to mark true branch dependencies for targeted front-end or back-end restrictions. This information is communicated to the hardware and the processor applies the proper restrictions for marked instructions (Section 4.2). Figure 5 shows the SPECCONTROL design, highlighting the modifications over existing processor designs and compilers. SPECCONTROL has always-on security for sandboxed and constant-time programs, even for legacy binaries not compiled by our compiler. But, if needed, SPECCONTROL protections can be disabled by simply instrumenting the binary and manipulating the restriction bits of the x86 instruction prefix bits. We built and verified the end-to-end and automated design of SPECCONTROL in LLVM compiler [40] and gem5 simulation [12].

4.1 SPECCONTROL Interface

SPECCONTROL interface has two main features: (1) *marking true branch dependencies of the instructions* (Section 4.1.1); this will help




Figure 5: SPECCONTROL design. The highlighted components are added by SPECCONTROL on top of the baseline compiler and processor and the hashed components are modified by SPECCONTROL. UBT is the Unresolved Branches Table that keeps the live unresolved branches in the ROB. Note, that the Speculation Restrictions and Branch Dependencies are set per instruction through prefix bytes of x86 ISA (11 bits required for each instruction). The Load/Store Queue is hashed, similarly to prior work [21, 47, 70, 77], we updated it to prevent store-to-load bypass attacks [29].

the processor to only restrict speculative execution of the instructions that are truly dependent on unresolved branches, (2) *Marking the confidential control-flow instructions* (Section 4.1.2); this informs the processor to restrict the fetch unit upon marked instructions. While these two features mitigate both speculation execution and speculative fetch attacks, SPECCONTROL interface is highly configurable to apply or relax other fine-grained restrictions.

4.1.1 Communicating Branch Dependencies. While the hardware assumes all instructions after an unresolved branch are control dependent, a static compiler analysis shows that not all instructions are truly dependent on the branch’s outcome. Therefore, restricting the execution of all instructions after unresolved branches is not required to provide secure speculation; since independent instructions do not leave unintended persistent changes if a branch is mispredicted. Current hardware designs, however, cannot reason about true branch dependencies, as they do not have information about the entire program and its control flow [27].

Algorithm 1 shows how we detect all the dependent instructions of a conditional branch that performs a traversal search over the data-flow graph (DFG). First, we initialize the `working_set` with the branch control dependent instructions (*i.e.*, all the instructions reachable between the branch and its reconvergence point; line 3). Next, we visit all the direct dependent instructions of the `working_set` (line 9). Direct dependencies are determined through the compiler def-use and alias analysis. If two instructions have a may-alias dependency we consider it as a dependency in order to provide a fully non-speculative and conservative list of dependencies. At the end of this search, all the dependent instructions will be in the `dependents` set of the input branch (line 10). This compiler pass statically considers all possible paths of the program after a branch and conservatively considers all may-alias dependencies as true dependencies, hence, it is sound by design and does not miss any potential dependency.

Marking dependencies. First, we assign a static identifier (BranchID) to each branch (see BranchID in Figure 5). Second, we mark each instruction with the BranchID of the most recent dependent branch detected in the previous step (see Dependent BranchID in Figure 5)⁴. We embed this information in the prefix bytes of the

⁴In the rare case of an instruction depending on multiple independent branches, we either need to communicate multiple branches or conservatively assume that the

Algorithm 1: Branch Dependents Traversal

Input: Branch BR
Output: Determining all the dependents of BR

```

1 working_set.clear()
2 processed_insts.clear()
3 working_set ← BR.control_dependents
4 while  $\neg$ working_set.empty() do
5   inst ← working_set.pop()
6   if inst ∈ processed_insts then
7     continue
8   end
9   foreach dep ∈ inst.direct_dependents do
10    BR.dependents.insert(dep)
11    working_set.push(dep)
12  end
13  processed_insts.insert(inst)
14 end

```

x86 ISA instructions. Note, that other ISAs like RISC-V can define new instructions to communicate the compiler information but at the cost of extra instruction decoding. Our experiments show that 4 bits are enough to represent the BranchID. In addition, we set the BD Informed bit to 1 for the branches that our compiler is providing dependency information. This bit is used to (1) support both legacy binaries and (2) allow disabling protections if desired (see Table 1 for detailed options).

4.1.2 Communicating Speculation Restrictions. The SPECCONTROL interface also allows the developers and the compiler to directly mark instructions that need to be restricted either at the front-end or the back-end of the processor. In our baseline x86 ISA, we use two prefix bits of the instructions to inform the hardware about these marked restrictions: one bit that indicates if the instruction needs to be restricted at the front-end (Front-end restricted in Figure 5) and one bit to restrict the instruction at the back-end (Back-end restricted). Table 1 shows all restriction markings in SPECCONTROL. Res_{FE} refers to front-end restriction and Res_{BE} means restricted at the back-end. Res_{no} also indicates no restriction.

To address speculative fetch attacks, we need to mark secret dependent and confidential branches as Res_{FE} , which restricts the branch at the front-end from accessing/updating the branch predictor. For the evaluation of this work, we deploy a state-of-the-art taint

instruction depends on all prior unresolved branches (similar to state-of-the-art hardware-only solutions [47]), by marking the branch as $BR_{invalid}$.

Tag	Front-end	Back-end	Action	Tag	BD Informed	Dependent BranchID	Action	Tag	BD Informed	BranchID	Action
Res_{no}	0	0	No additional restrictions	$BD_{invalid}$	X	INVALID	The instruction will be dependent on the most recent branch*	$BR_{invalid}$	X	INVALID	The branch will restrict all instructions afterwards*
Res_{FE}	1	0	Restricted at the front-end‡	BD_{no}	0	VALID	No branch dependency restriction	BR_{no}	0	VALID	The branch will not restrict any instruction afterwards
Res_{BE}	0	1	Restricted at the back-end	BD_{valid}	1	VALID	The instruction will be dependent the branch specified by BranchID	BR_{valid}	1	VALID	The branch will restrict the dependent instructions

Table 1: SPECCONTROL options to mark restrictions for an instruction. ‡ Note, that setting both front-end and back-end bits means restricting at both stages, however, it has the same functionality as Res_{FE} ; because if an instruction is restricted at the front-end then the next instructions will be non-speculative at the back-end and no extra restriction will be applied. * This policy ensures secure speculation for legacy binaries (except for control-flow confidentiality).

tracking implementation [13] to mark secret dependent branches in a set of realistic cryptographic modules [13, 46, 59, 73]. However, there are several ways to mark secret dependent branches depending on the application. Either the developer can directly mark them by using OpenMP-like programming directives [17], or the compiler can automatically detect secret dependent branches using compiler analysis, as we used in this work.

4.2 SPECCONTROL Microarchitecture

The requirements for hardware implementation of SPECCONTROL are: (1) to collect the software information communicated by SPECCONTROL interface, (2) to prevent the speculative fetch of the instructions that are marked as confidential (*i.e.*, Res_{FE}), and (3) to prevent speculative execution of the instructions that are dependent on at least one unresolved branch in the ROB or directly marked as back-end restricted (*i.e.*, Res_{BE}). Table 2 shows a detailed event-action description of the SPECCONTROL microarchitecture.

4.2.1 Front-end Restrictions. The fetch unit is modified to check and validate the speculation restriction bits of a fetched instruction. If the restriction bits of a branch are marked as Res_{FE} , the fetch unit does not use the branch predictor to speculatively fetch subsequent instructions and instead stalls. When the branch resolves, the processor resumes fetching instructions from the correct, non-speculative path (step ① in Table 2). This way, unsafe branches will not leave traces in the speculative components of the front-end (*e.g.*, the branch predictor); hence, protecting against speculative fetch attacks.

4.2.2 Back-end Restrictions. For back-end restrictions, we add an extra bit to the ROB, called Backend Restricted (see Figure 6). If an instruction marked by the compiler as Res_{BE} enters the ROB then the execution of the instruction will be restricted (Backend Restricted bit set to 1 in the ROB, step ②). When the instruction becomes safe (*e.g.*, all input operands are non-speculative) and guaranteed to commit (*e.g.*, for loads and stores it means they resolve in Load/Store Unit and their page-table access succeeds) then the Backend Restricted bit is set to 0 and the instruction is allowed to execute and forward its results to the dependent instructions (step ③).

In addition, the Backend Restricted bit is used to restrict the instructions that are not analyzed by our compiler (*e.g.*, instructions marked as $BD_{invalid}$ and branches marked as $BR_{invalid}$). All




Figure 6: New structures used by SPECCONTROL. The Unresolved Branches Table (UBT) stores the speculative (unresolved) branches and maps the compiler-specified BranchID to the dynamic sequence number of the branch. ROB is modified to specify the most recent dependent branch of the instruction and the restriction based on that branch, as well as one bit to indicate if the execution is directly restricted by the Res_{BE} marking.

instructions after a branch marked as $BR_{invalid}$ will be restricted at the back-end until the branch resolves (step ⑦). Hence, we provide always-on security for speculative execution attacks. The developers and the compiler can disable the protections by marking the instructions as BD_{no} and BR_{no} , as explained in Table 1⁵.

4.2.3 Branch Dependency Restrictions. To correctly apply branch dependency restrictions communicated by the compiler, we introduce a new hardware structure, called the Unresolved Branches Table (UBT). The UBT stores all live unresolved branches (see Figure 6). The ROB is also modified to: (1) indicate if the execution of an instruction is restricted due to branch dependency (Restricted bit in Figure 6) and (2) store the Branch ID of the most recent dependent branch (Dependent Branch in Figure 6).

When a branch instruction is decoded it will enter the ROB and update the UBT with its compiler-specified BranchID and unique dynamic sequence number (dynamic identifier of instructions) (step ④). Note, that the branch should have BR_{valid} marking which means it has been analyzed by the compiler. In case of a full UBT, we stall inserting new instructions to ROB (*i.e.*, ROB full) until at least one of the prior branches resolves and then resume decoding and inserting instructions to the ROB (see Section 6.2.2 for the impacts of UBT size). For every decoded instruction entering the ROB, the processor checks if the instruction’s most recent

⁵Legacy binaries can also perform this by instrumentation.

	Event	Action
①	Branch BR (marked as Res_{FE}) fetched	while BR is unresolved: block fetch
②	Instruction $Inst$ (marked as Res_{BE}) enters ROB	$ROB[Inst].BackendRestricted = 1$
③	Instruction $Inst$ (marked as Res_{BE}) resolves	$ROB[Inst].BackendRestricted = 0$
④	Branch BR (marked as BR_{valid}) enters ROB	while UBT is full: stall inserting new instructions to the ROB $UBT[BR.BranchID] = SeqNum$
⑤	Instruction $Inst$ (marked as BD_{valid}) enters ROB	if $UBT[Inst.DependentBranchID]$ exists: $ROB[Inst].Restricted = 1$ $ROB[Inst].DependentBranch = \langle Inst.DependentBranchID, UBT[Inst.DependentBranchID] \rangle$ if an unresolved branch marked as $BR_{invalid}$ or indirect jump not marked as BR_{no} exists in ROB: $ROB[Inst].BackendRestricted = 1$
⑥	Branch BR (marked as BR_{valid}) resolves	for all entries E in ROB: if $ROB[E].DependentBranch == \langle BR.BranchID, BR.SeqNum \rangle$: $ROB[E].Restricted = 0$ Remove BR from UBT
⑦	Branch $Inst$ (marked as $BR_{invalid}$) or indirect jump $Inst$ (marked as BR_{valid} or $BR_{invalid}$) resolves	for all entries E in ROB after $Inst$: if (E is marked as $BR_{invalid}$) or (E is indirect jump and marked as BR_{valid}): <i>break</i> else if E not marked as Res_{BE} : $ROB[E].BackendRestricted = 0$

Table 2: Events and actions in SPECCONTROL. For instruction $Inst$, $Inst.DependentBranchID$ is specified by the compiler in the prefix bits and for branch BR , $BR.BranchID$ is an ID assigned by the compiler and specified in the prefix bits as well (see Figure 5).

dependent branch exists in the UBT. In case of a hit in the UBT, the instruction’s *Restricted* bit is set to 1 in the ROB and the execution of the instruction will be restricted. The ROB is also updated with the *BranchID* and sequence number of the branch that the instruction depends on (step ⑤). Finally, when a branch resolves and the correct path is determined, the *Restricted* bit of all dependent instructions is set to 0 and they can execute (*i.e.*, they are guaranteed to commit and not squash due to branch misprediction) (step ⑥). Note, that an instruction is allowed to execute only if both *Restricted* and *Backend Restricted* bits are 0.

For indirect jumps (*e.g.*, function calls), all instructions after the jump need to be restricted at the back-end (step ⑤) and execute only if the jump resolves and becomes non-speculative (step ⑦), to address attacks like Spectre-BTB (V2) and its successors. In SPECCONTROL, we restrict all instructions after an indirect jump unless it is marked as BR_{no} (protection disabled by the applications).

Similarly to prior work [47, 77], we prevent speculative fetch redirections to mitigate the attacks that exploit port contention in simultaneously multi-threaded (SMT) processors [11]. Also, similar to prior solutions [47, 70, 77] we prevent speculative store bypass attacks [29] by always sending requests for loads even if they match with an older, unresolved store (Load/Store Queue is hashed in Figure 5).

5 SECURITY ANALYSIS

A processor with secure speculation guarantees the absence of additional vulnerabilities on top of the non-speculative leaks of a given program (*i.e.*, the leaks during the correct execution). Two main programming policies (also known as *software contracts* [26]) are (1) *sandboxing*, and (2) *constant-time* execution that a processor

requires to protect them with secure speculation. These policies are defined as followed:

Definition 5.1 (Sandboxing policy). The sandboxing policy requires the program to ensure that all memory accesses are not outside the authorized address range.

Definition 5.2 (Constant-time policy). The constant-time policy requires that all non-speculative observations of the program (*e.g.*, program counter and memory addresses) are independent and not affected by secret values.

SPECCONTROL secure speculation for sandboxing and constant time policies: To provide secure speculation for the sandboxing policy, the hardware should restrict the execution of speculative memory accesses and their dependent instructions. However, secure speculation for constant-time programs (commonly used for cryptographic algorithms) requires the hardware to avoid speculative execution of the instructions that are tainted by secret values, even if the secret itself has been loaded non-speculatively. SPECCONTROL supports secure speculation for both sandboxed and constant-time programs since it restricts the execution of *all* speculative instructions. The performance benefits of SPECCONTROL come from allowing the execution of the instructions that are guaranteed to be independent of the speculation sources and speculative instructions. In other words, SPECCONTROL assumes that all instructions after speculation sources (*e.g.*, conditional branches and indirect jumps) are secret dependent, unless the compiler declassifies the instructions that are independent of the speculation sources (*i.e.*, they will leak during the non-speculative execution as well). While

Design	Description
Unprotected Baseline	Normal out-of-order core with no protection
SPECCONTROL	Our proposed design
STT	STT and DOLMA implementations adopted from [47] to support secure speculation for sandboxing and constant-time ⁶ (as defined
DOLMA	STT-Spectre (M+R) and DOLMA-Default (M+R))
Secure Baseline	Disabling speculation (no branch predictor)

Table 3: Evaluated designs in our studies.

our static compiler analysis might over-approximate the dependencies, it is sound by design and will not declassify any true branch dependency.

In addition to previous software contracts, we introduce a new policy, called *control-flow confidentiality*:

Definition 5.3 (control-flow confidentiality policy). Control-flow confidentiality policy requires the program to mark confidential control-flow instructions and guarantee that the correct execution of the program will not leak confidential information based on the adversaries’ capabilities.

SPECCONTROL secure speculation for control-flow confidentiality: To provide such a guarantee, SPECCONTROL avoids any speculative activity (including the front-end) for confidential control-flow instructions. SPECCONTROL is the first solution that supports secure speculation for control-flow confidentiality through its software interface. SPECCONTROL provides the liberty for the software-level defenses to explore lightweight mitigations for non-speculative leaks based on the adversaries’ capabilities without additional vulnerabilities due to the microarchitectural level speculations.

6 EVALUATION

We evaluate SPECCONTROL compared to an unprotected baseline out-of-order core, and a secure baseline with the same protection scope as SPECCONTROL (addressing both speculative fetch and execution attacks). Additionally, we compare the modified version of DOLMA [47] and STT [77] which are still vulnerable to speculative fetch attacks. Table 3 shows more details of our evaluated designs⁷.

6.1 Experimental Setup

Simulation Environment. We implemented SPECCONTROL on top of the gem5 [12] DerivO3CPU and run simulations in syscall emulation (SE) mode. For power analysis, we modify McPAT [43] version 1.3 to support our microarchitecture. We used a Golden-Cove-like microarchitecture [3] used in Intel Alder Lake processors as our baseline processor design (see Table 4 for the details of gem5 configuration).

Compiler Implementation. We implemented our compiler pass in LLVM 10.0 [40] to detect and mark branch dependencies. Our pass is built at the machine level for x86 architecture, but

⁶We disable the delay-on-miss optimization of DOLMA as it is shown to be vulnerable to speculative interference attacks [10].

⁷Note, that the STT and DOLMA designs referred to in the Related Work section and Table 7 are the original designs, and are different from the versions we use for the evaluation.

L1d Cache	32KB, 8-way	Branch Predictor	TAGE-SC-L-64KB
L1i Cache	32KB, 8-way	LQ/SQ size	192/114 entries
L2 Cache	256KB, 8-way	ROB size	512 entries
L3 Cache	1MB, 16-way	IQ size	97 entries
F/D/I/C width	8/8/8/8	RF (INT/FP) size	280/332 entries
Data Prefetcher	Stride	UBT size	16 entries

Table 4: System configuration for simulation (Intel Golden-Cove-like processor).




Figure 7: Performance results of SPEC CPU2006 [28]. SPECCONTROL protects all known speculative fetch and speculative execution attacks, while DOLMA and STT (hashed bars) only protect against speculative execution attacks.

it is not architecture-specific and can be easily ported to other architectures. In addition, we integrated a taint tracking mechanism in our compiler to mark secret dependent branches for crypto modules [13].

Benchmarks. We use C/C++ applications from SPEC CPU2006 [28] benchmark suite and the ELFie [56] methodology to generate representative (SimPoint) executables with a region size of 1 billion instructions. Also, we investigate a set of realistic crypto modules and standard microbenchmarks for constant-time enforcements [13, 46, 59, 73].

6.2 Performance Results

6.2.1 Performance of SPEC CPU2006 Workloads. Figure 7 shows the performance results for SPEC CPU2006 applications for five different designs. DOLMA and STT show an average performance overhead of 51% and 43% compared to the Unprotected Baseline, respectively. SPECCONTROL’s performance overhead is just 23% on average. This means that the SPECCONTROL methodology reduces the performance loss by 2.22× over DOLMA and 1.87× over STT designs on average. In some cases STT shows better performance compared to SPECCONTROL (e.g., 464.h264ref). The reason is that STT assumes that secret transmissions only happen through loads and does not restrict the execution of tainted stores, hence, restricting fewer instructions compared to SPECCONTROL and DOLMA in some cases. However, prior work [47] demonstrates the vulnerability of STT against Spectre attacks transmitting data via stores. Note, that none of the branches in SPEC CPU2006 applications are marked as *ResFE* since they do not process confidential information.

Using a naive implementation (Secure Baseline) to protect the system against all speculation-based attacks will incur a significant performance degradation of 2.26× on average compared to the




Figure 8: Commit cycle breakdown for different designs. Bars are normalized to the total commit cycles of the Unprotected Baseline. The LoadStall is the main reason for blocking the head of ROB.




Figure 9: Committed instructions breakdown in SPECCONTROL based on their restrictions: (1) Relaxed: SPECCONTROL relaxed the restrictions based on compiler information, (2) RemainedRestricted: remained restricted until they resolved, (3) NotRestricted: the remaining instructions that executed normally. Note, that the instruction counts do not equate to performance.

Unprotected Baseline. SPECCONTROL provides the same protections while showing only 23% overhead.

Figure 8 depicts the commit cycles breakdown (*i.e.*, the cycles that at least on instruction is committed) of different designs (bars are normalized to the total commit cycles of the Unprotected Baseline). *LoadStall* is the main reason for blocking the head of the ROB as a result of speculation restrictions. This occurs because restricting the execution of instructions will delay memory requests and lead to more cycles waiting for the data. SPECCONTROL is able to bring down the 81% and 77% of *LoadStall* in DOLMA and STT to 63%, due to relaxing unnecessary restrictions informed by the compiler. Figure 9 shows the percentage of committed instructions in SPECCONTROL for different applications that were initially restricted (dependent on an unresolved branch) but SPECCONTROL was able to relax the restriction later (when the true dependent branches resolved). SPECCONTROL relaxes the restriction of 20% of committed instructions on average based on the compiler information. Some applications benefit from the compiler information significantly. For example, in 483. xalancbmk 61% of the restricted instructions are relaxed and SPECCONTROL shows only 18% performance overhead, compared to 110% overhead in DOLMA and STT.

6.2.2 Impacts of UBT Size. Figure 10 shows the performance impacts for different UBT sizes. The expectation is higher overhead for smaller UBT sizes since it will block inserting instructions to the ROB more frequently (like 429. mcf, and 450. soplex). However, we observe that in some cases the SPECCONTROL overhead decreases




Figure 10: Execution time of SPECCONTROL over the Unprotected Baseline with different UBT sizes.




Figure 11: Breakdown of SPECCONTROL commit cycles for 458. sjeng with UBT sizes of 2 and 16 (normalized to UBT=2). The main difference is the number of cycles spent on squashing due to branch misprediction.

when using a smaller UBT (*e.g.*, 458. sjeng). More in-depth investigation shows that limiting the number of unresolved branches in some applications reduces the number of squashing cycles and the number of dynamic instructions that the core decodes and re-executes. Figure 11 depicts the breakdown of the commit cycles for 458. sjeng with UBT sizes of 2 and 16. The number of squashing cycles due to branch misprediction reduces by 1.9 \times for a UBT size of 2 compared to a UBT size of 16. A potential future work can deploy a performance-aware and dynamic control of speculation level to limit the squashing cycles for problematic branches. To have a balanced trade-off for the performance, power, and area, we use a UBT size of 16 entries (as a direct-mapped memory). SPECCONTROL consumes only 1.72% more power over the Unprotected Baseline core with an area overhead of 1.42%.

6.2.3 Performance of Cryptographic Workloads. Figure 12 shows the performance results for our cryptographic benchmarks. We mark all sensitive branches of these applications via secret taint tracking and restrict them at the front-end (*ResFE*). These applications are much smaller than SPEC CPU2006 with less intense control-flow leading to fewer opportunities to improve performance. However, the results show that SPECCONTROL is still able to benefit from the compiler informed branch dependencies and improve the performance of these applications compared to STT and DOLMA, which only mitigate speculative execution attacks. For example, SPECCONTROL shows 10% performance overhead for *dijkstra*, while STT and DOLMA incur 30% overhead. For the same reason we explained for SPEC CPU2006, STT shows better performance for two applications as it does not restrict the execution of tainted stores.

6.2.4 Performance of Synthetic Workloads. To better understand the effects of different configurations of SPECCONTROL in a real




Figure 12: Performance results of cryptographic workloads. SPECCONTROL protects all known speculative fetch and speculative execution attacks, while DOLMA and STT (hashed bars) only protect speculative execution attacks. The x-axis shows the number of branches and sensitive (*i.e.*, secret dependent) branches for each application (*sensitive/total*).

```

1 void benchmark (int S, int C){
2   for (i = 0; i < S; i++)
3     work(); //client work with Spectre gadget
4   for (i = 0; i < C; i++)
5     communicate(); //RSA encryption/decryption
6 }

```

Figure 13: Pseudo code of our synthetic benchmark; S and C parameters specify the workloads' configuration.




Figure 15: Speculative fetch attack results on gem5.




Figure 14: Performance of different synthetic workloads. SPECCONTROL-(s:tainted) marks the secret dependent branch in RSA as *ResFE*, SPECCONTROL-(s:all) marks all branches in RSA-related functions, and SPECCONTROL-(s:none) marks no branches (vulnerable to speculative fetch attacks).

scenario, we analyze a synthetic workload (Figure 13) that mimics the behavior of a runtime application (*e.g.*, JavaScript engine in a browser) that runs a (S)andboxed application as a client workload and a (C)rypto module for background communications [21, 24]. *work()* contains sandboxes and Spectre gadgets, and *communicate()* is a Montgomery Ladder implementation of RSA. The S and C parameters specify the size of each workload.

Figure 14 depicts the performance of different synthetic workloads. We evaluate three versions of SPECCONTROL: (1) SPECCONTROL-(s:tainted) restricts only the secret dependent branch of RSA at the front-end (line 4 in Figure 3), (2) SPECCONTROL-(s:all) adopts a more coarse-grained approach and marks all branches in RSA-related functions, and (3) SPECCONTROL-(s:none) that adds no front-end restriction and have the same protection of DOLMA and STT. As you can see, by decreasing the size of (C)rypto part (as a regular application with less benefit from speculative execution) and

increasing the size of (S)andboxed part (more benefits from speculation) the performance overhead of SPECCONTROL increases, from 30% in S25/C75 to 57% in S90/C10 (STT and DOLMA show the same trend, from 45% overhead to 64%). In addition, for RSA we cannot observe a significant improvement by precisely marking front-end restrictions and a conservative approach is also sufficient to gain the most benefits of SPECCONTROL. Interestingly, we observe that SPECCONTROL-(s:none) shows a bit more performance loss compared to SPECCONTROL-(s:tainted) (about 4% for S25/C75 workload). This means that not using branch prediction for the tainted branch improves the performance and our simulation results show that the number of squashed instructions drop by 36% compared to the Unprotected Baseline.

6.3 Penetration Tests

Figure 15 shows the penetration tests of our new variant of speculative fetch attacks on gem5. The figure shows the execution time of the attack gadget when the attacker chooses a correct or incorrect guess. A higher timing difference for the incorrect guess means that the attacker can recover the secret. The results confirm that all other designs (the Unprotected Baseline, DOLMA, and STT) leak the secret bit through an observable timing difference, while SPECCONTROL can successfully protect the secret bit by restricting the fetch and front-end updates for the marked branch.

⁸Since there is no native implementation of `_rdtsc()` on Apple processors, we implemented a timer function by incrementing a shared variable with the `OSAtomicIncrement64()` function.

	Intel	AMD	Apple
Model Name	Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-4770 CPU @ 3.40GHz	AMD EPYC 7532 32-Core Processor	MacBook Pro (Apple M1 Pro chip)
CPU Cores	4	32	10 (8 performance and 2 efficiency)
CPU MHz	849.410	1499.479	2064 - 3220
Cache Size	8192KB	512KB	L1: 128KB (perf.) 64KB (eff.), L2: 4MB
Operating System	Ubuntu 18.04	Ubuntu 20.04	macOS Ventura 13.0
Compiler	gcc (Ubuntu 7.5.0-3ubuntu1 18.04) 7.5.0, -O0	GCC 9.4.0, -O0	Apple clang version 14.0.0, -O0

Table 5: Experimental setup for speculative fetch attack on three different CPUs.

CPU	Average Timing for		Min. Difference
	Correct Guess	Incorrect Guess	
Intel	2726.65	6233.10	1657
AMD	2101.20	2478.00	24
Apple ^s	185.45	823.30	23

Table 6: Speculative fetch attack results on real CPUs.

In addition, we confirm that SPECCONTROL passes the Spectre penetration tests for both speculative secrets (sandboxing case) and non-speculative secrets (constant-time case)⁹.

6.4 Speculative Fetch Attack on existing CPUs

To demonstrate the feasibility of the attack on real existing CPUs, we run our attack on three different real CPUs, specified in Table 5: (1) Intel, (2) AMD, and (3) Apple. Table 6 shows the average execution time of the attack gadget (running 10K NOPs) for 20 trials on these three CPUs with both correct and incorrect guesses. We observe that the execution time in the case of an incorrect guess is always higher than the case the attacker has a correct guess. For example for the Intel CPU, we observe at least 1657 cycles of timing difference for incorrect guesses and correct guesses which can be used as a threshold to evaluate the correctness of the guess.

7 RELATED WORK

Channel-specific mitigations. Early defenses for speculative execution attacks aimed to secure individual channels, like data caches [14, 33, 58, 61, 62, 74]. Most of these solutions either implement invisible speculation of memory accesses or undo the speculation effects on the cache. Both of these two strategies are shown to be ineffective against newer versions of speculative execution attacks [10, 42]. In addition, Weisse et al. [70] show that the attacker can exploit other channels as well to leak secret data, like BTB. InvarSpec [78] is a performance optimization for invisible speculation techniques that uses program analysis to lift the restrictions for speculatively invariant instructions. Besides that InvarSpec inherits the security flaws of the underlying defenses, it also introduces new vulnerabilities [7].

Secure speculation for sandboxing. STT [77] and NDA [70] are the first defenses that introduced taint tracking methodologies to restrict the execution of instructions tainted by speculative memory accesses. While STT restricts the *execution* of tainted memory accesses, NDA prevents the *propagation* of the data from tainted instructions. STT does not restrict the execution of tainted stores which has been shown to be vulnerable [47]. Following mitigations

⁹We used the gem5 attacks provided by [47].

Defense	Secure Speculation			Security for legacy software‡	Flexibility for future policies
	sandboxing	constant-time	control-flow confidentiality		
STT [77]	●	○	○	✓	✗
NDA [70]	●	○	○	✓	✗
DOLMA [47]	●	●	○	✓	✗
ConTeXT [63]	●	●	○	✗	✗
ProSpeCT [21]	●	●	○	✗	✗
SPT [20]	●	●	○	✓	✗
SPECCONTROL	●	●	●	✓	✓

○ : no protection, ● : partial protection, ● : full protection

Table 7: Comparison of existing channel-agnostic methods for secure speculation. ‡ Regarding the provided protection scope (except for control-flow confidentiality).

adopted the same insights of speculative taint tracking while improving the performance with the same security guarantees [8, 76]. DOLMA [47] attempts to protect non-speculative secrets, but their performance benefits come from allowing the execution of some speculative instructions (under certain conditions) that might lead to exploits through resource contention [10].

Secure speculation for constant-time. Some works [21, 24, 63] adopt a dynamic secrecy tracking methodology by manually labeling the secret regions of the memory; speculative execution of the instructions tainted by secret data will be blocked in the processor. However, these defenses cannot provide security for legacy software without labeling the secret regions. SPT [20] is a hardware-only defense supporting secure speculation for constant-time workloads that assumes all memory regions are secret and declassifies a region only if it is leaked non-speculatively as well.

Table 7 shows a summary of existing defenses with respect to the secure speculations they offer. SPECCONTROL offers secure speculation for sandboxing and constant-time policies and is the only one to offer secure speculation for control-flow confidentiality. In addition, SPECCONTROL provides the flexibility to define new software contracts and restrict additional or fewer instructions through its interface based on future speculative attacks and programming policies.

8 CONCLUSION

In this work, we present SPECCONTROL, a configurable methodology that implements a hardware/software co-design to efficiently protect against current and future speculation-based attacks. SPECCONTROL proposes a communication interface that allows compilers and application developers to inform the hardware of the true branch dependencies, confidential instructions, and additional fine-grained

constraints in order to apply restrictions only when necessary. SPECCONTROL minimizes performance overheads while allowing for configurable secure speculation policies. Apart from known speculative execution attacks, we also evaluate SPECCONTROL on a new variant of speculative fetch attacks that exploit the Pattern History Table (PHT) in branch predictors to extract the control-flow decisions of the victim. We show that this attack variant is more dangerous than previously reported. With SPECCONTROL we provide stronger security guarantees for speculation-based attacks compared to the state-of-the-art while reducing the performance overhead from 51% and 43% to just 23%.

REFERENCES

- [1] [n. d.]. Deep Dive: CPUID Enumeration and Architectural MSRs. <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/developer/topic-technology/software-security-guidance/overview.html#MDS-CPUID>.
- [2] [n. d.]. GNU Privacy Guard. <https://gnupg.org/>.
- [3] [n. d.]. Popping the Hood on Golden Cove. <https://chipsandcheese.com/2021/12/02/popping-the-hood-on-golden-cove/>.
- [4] 2016. CBP-5 Kit. In *Proceedings 5th Championship on Branch Prediction*.
- [5] 2021. Battery properties management. <https://git.kernel.org/pub/scm/bluetooth/bluetooth-next.git/tree/drivers/hid/hid-input.c#n247>.
- [6] 2021. Bluetooth connection activity management. <https://git.kernel.org/pub/scm/bluetooth/bluetooth-next.git/tree/drivers/hid/hid-input.c#n383>.
- [7] Pavlos Aimoniotis, Christos Sakalis, Magnus Sjalander, and Stefanos Kaxiras. 2021. "It's a Trap!"-How Speculation Invariance Can Be Abused with Forward Speculative Interference. *arXiv:2109.10774 [cs.CR]*
- [8] Kristin Barber, Anys Bacha, Li Zhou, Yinqian Zhang, and Radu Teodorescu. 2019. Specshield: Shielding speculative data from microarchitectural covert channels. In *2019 28th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT)*. IEEE, 151–164.
- [9] Enrico Barberis, Pietro Frigo, Marius Muench, Herbert Bos, and Cristiano Giuffrida. 2022. Branch History Injection: On the Effectiveness of Hardware Mitigations Against {Cross-Privilege} Spectre-v2 Attacks. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*. 971–988.
- [10] Mohammad Behnia, Prateek Sahu, Riccardo Paccagnella, Jiyong Yu, Zirui Neil Zhao, Xiang Zou, Thomas Unterluggauer, Josep Torrellas, Carlos Rozas, Adam Morrison, et al. 2021. Speculative interference attacks: Breaking invisible speculation schemes. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. 1046–1060.
- [11] Atri Bhattacharyya, Alexandra Sandulescu, Matthias Neugschwandtner, Alessandro Sorniotti, Babak Falsafi, Mathias Payer, and Anil Kurmus. 2019. SMOther-Spectre. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3319535.3363194>
- [12] Nathan Binkert, Bradford Beckmann, Gabriel Black, Steven K Reinhardt, Ali Sadi, Arkaprava Basu, Joel Hestness, Derek R Hower, Tushar Krishna, Somayeh Sardashti, et al. 2011. The gem5 simulator. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News* 39, 2 (2011), 1–7.
- [13] Pietro Borrello, Daniele Cono D'Elia, Leonardo Querzoni, and Cristiano Giuffrida. 2021. Constantine: Automatic Side-Channel Resistance Using Efficient Control and Data Flow Linearization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.10749* (2021).
- [14] Thomas Bourgeat, Ilija Lebedev, Andrew Wright, Sizhuo Zhang, Arvind, and Srinivas Devadas. 2019. MI6: Secure Enclaves in a Speculative Out-of-Order Processor. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO '52)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 42–56. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3352460.3358310>
- [15] Claudio Canella, Daniel Genkin, Lukas Giner, Daniel Gruss, Moritz Lipp, Marina Minkin, Daniel Moghimi, Frank Piessens, Michael Schwarz, Berk Sunar, et al. 2019. Fallout: Leaking data on meltdown-resistant cpus. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 769–784.
- [16] Claudio Canella, Jo Van Bulck, Michael Schwarz, Moritz Lipp, Benjamin Von Berg, Philipp Ortner, Frank Piessens, Dmitry Evtvushkin, and Daniel Gruss. 2019. A systematic evaluation of transient execution attacks and defenses. In *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*. 249–266.
- [17] Rohit Chandra, Leo Dagum, David Kohr, Ramesh Menon, Dror Maydan, and Jeff McDonald. 2001. *Parallel programming in OpenMP*. Morgan kaufmann.
- [18] Guoxing Chen, Sanchuan Chen, Yuan Xiao, Yinqian Zhang, Zhiqiang Lin, and Ten H Lai. 2019. Sgxpectre: Stealing intel secrets from sgx enclaves via speculative execution. In *2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE, 142–157.
- [19] Yun Chen, Lingfeng Pei, and Trevor E Carlson. 2023. AfterImage: Leaking Control Flow Data and Tracking Load Operations via the Hardware Prefetcher. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support*
- [20] for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS), Volume 2. 16–32. Rutvik Choudhary, Jiyong Yu, Christopher Fletcher, and Adam Morrison. 2021. Speculative Privacy Tracking (SPT): Leaking Information From Speculative Execution Without Compromising Privacy. In *MICRO-54: 54th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*. 607–622.
- [21] Lesly-Ann Daniel, Marton Bognar, Job Noorman, Sébastien Bardin, Tamara Rezk, and Frank Piessens. 2023. ProSpeCT: Provably Secure Speculation for the Constant-Time Policy (Extended version). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12108* (2023).
- [22] Dmitry Evtvushkin, Ryan Riley, Nael CSE Abu-Ghazaleh, ECE, and Dmitry Ponomarev. 2018. Branchscope: A new side-channel attack on directional branch predictor. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 53, 2 (2018), 693–707.
- [23] Shuqin Fan, Wenbo Wang, and Qingfeng Cheng. 2016. Attacking OpenSSL implementation of ECDSA with a few signatures. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 1505–1515.
- [24] Jacob Fustos, Farzad Farshchi, and Heechul Yun. 2019. Spectreguard: An efficient data-centric defense mechanism against spectre attacks. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Design Automation Conference 2019*. 1–6.
- [25] Daniel Gruss, Clémentine Maurice, Anders Fogh, Moritz Lipp, and Stefan Mangard. 2016. Prefetch side-channel attacks: Bypassing SMAP and kernel ASLR. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 368–379.
- [26] Marco Guarnieri, Boris Köpf, Jan Reineke, and Pepe Vila. 2021. Hardware-software contracts for secure speculation. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 1868–1883.
- [27] Ali Hajiabadi, Andreas Diavastos, and Trevor E Carlson. 2021. NOREBA: a compiler-informed non-speculative out-of-order commit processor. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. 182–193.
- [28] John L Henning. 2006. SPEC CPU2006 benchmark descriptions. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News* 34, 4 (2006), 1–17.
- [29] Jann Horn. 2018. speculative execution, variant 4: speculative store bypass.
- [30] Daniel A Jiménez. 2003. Fast path-based neural branch prediction. In *Proceedings. 36th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture, 2003. MICRO-36*. IEEE, 243–252.
- [31] Daniel A Jiménez and Calvin Lin. 2001. Dynamic branch prediction with perceptrons. In *Proceedings HPCA Seventh International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture*. IEEE, 197–206.
- [32] Marc Joye and Sung-Ming Yen. 2002. The Montgomery powering ladder. In *International workshop on cryptographic hardware and embedded systems*. Springer, 291–302.
- [33] Khaled N Khasawneh, Esmail Mohammadian Koruyeh, Chengyu Song, Dmitry Evtvushkin, Dmitry Ponomarev, and Nael Abu-Ghazaleh. 2019. Safespec: Banning the spectre of a meltdown with leakage-free speculation. In *2019 56th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [34] Vladimir Kiriansky and Carl Waldspurger. 2018. Speculative buffer overflows: Attacks and defenses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03757* (2018).
- [35] Vladimir Kiriansky and Carl A. Waldspurger. 2018. Speculative Buffer Overflows: Attacks and Defenses. *CoRR abs/1807.03757* (2018). [arXiv:1807.03757](http://arxiv.org/abs/1807.03757) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1807.03757>
- [36] Ofek Kirzner and Adam Morrison. 2021. An analysis of speculative type confusion vulnerabilities in the wild. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 2399–2416.
- [37] Paul Kocher, Jann Horn, Anders Fogh, Daniel Genkin, Daniel Gruss, Werner Haas, Mike Hamburg, Moritz Lipp, Stefan Mangard, Thomas Prescher, Michael Schwarz, and Yuval Yarom. 2019. Spectre Attacks: Exploiting Speculative Execution. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/sp.2019.00002>
- [38] Esmail Mohammadian Koruyeh, Khaled N. Khasawneh, Chengyu Song, and Nael Abu-Ghazaleh. 2018. Spectre Returns! Speculation Attacks using the Return Stack Buffer. In *12th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies (WOOT 18)*. USENIX Association, Baltimore, MD. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/woot18/presentation/koruyeh>
- [39] Esmail Mohammadian Koruyeh, Khaled N Khasawneh, Chengyu Song, and Nael B Abu-Ghazaleh. 2018. Spectre Returns! Speculation Attacks using the Return Stack Buffer. In *WOOT@ USENIX Security Symposium*.
- [40] Chris Lattner and Vikram Adve. 2004. LLVM: A compilation framework for lifelong program analysis & transformation. In *International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO '04)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CGO.2004.1281665>
- [41] Sangho Lee, Ming-Wei Shih, Prasun Gera, Taesoo Kim, Hyesoon Kim, and Marcus Peinado. 2017. Inferring fine-grained control flow inside {SGX} enclaves with branch shadowing. In *26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 17)*. 557–574.
- [42] Mengming Li, Chenlu Miao, Yilong Yang, and Kai Bu. 2022. unXpec: Breaking Undo-based Safe Speculation. In *2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*. IEEE, 98–112.

- [43] Sheng Li, Jung Ho Ahn, Richard D Strong, Jay B Brockman, Dean M Tullsen, and Norman P Jouppi. 2013. The McPAT framework for multicore and many-core architectures: Simultaneously modeling power, area, and timing. *ACM Transactions on Architecture and Code Optimization (TACO)* 10, 1 (2013), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2445572.2445577>
- [44] Moritz Lipp, Daniel Gruss, and Michael Schwarz. 2022. {AMD} Prefetch Attacks through Power and Time. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*. 643–660.
- [45] Moritz Lipp, Michael Schwarz, Daniel Gruss, Thomas Prescher, Werner Haas, Anders Fogh, Jann Horn, Stefan Mangard, Paul Kocher, Daniel Genkin, Yuval Yarom, and Mike Hamburg. 2018. Meltdown: Reading Kernel Memory from User Space. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*.
- [46] Chang Liu, Austin Harris, Martin Maas, Michael Hicks, Mohit Tiwari, and Elaine Shi. 2015. GhostRider: A hardware-software system for memory trace oblivious computation. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 50, 4 (2015), 87–101.
- [47] Kevin Loughlin, Ian Neal, Jiacheng Ma, Elisa Tsai, Ofir Weisse, Satish Narayanasamy, and Baris Kasikci. 2021. {DOLMA}: Securing Speculation with the Principle of Transient {Non-Observability}. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 1397–1414.
- [48] Scott A Mahlke, David C Lin, William Y Chen, Richard E Hank, and Roger A Bringmann. 1992. Effective compiler support for predicated execution using the hyperblock. *ACM SIGMICRO Newsletter* 23, 1-2 (1992), 45–54.
- [49] Giorgi Maisuradze and Christian Rossow. 2018. ret2spec: Speculative execution using return stack buffers. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 2109–2122.
- [50] Andrea Mambretti, Alexandra Sandulescu, Matthias Neugschwandtner, Alessandro Sorniotti, and Anil Kurmus. 2019. Two methods for exploiting speculative control flow hijacks. In *13th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies (WOOT 19)*. USENIX Association, Santa Clara, CA. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/woot19/presentation/mambretti>
- [51] Arm Mbed. 2019. MbedTLS: An open source, portable, easy to use, readable and flexible SSL library. *ARM Holdings plc* (2019).
- [52] Daniel S McFarlin, Charles Tucker, and Craig Zilles. 2013. Discerning the dominant out-of-order performance advantage: Is it speculation or dynamism? *ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)* (2013).
- [53] David Molnar, Matt Piotrowski, David Schultz, and David Wagner. 2006. The program counter security model: Automatic detection and removal of control-flow side channel attacks. In *Information Security and Cryptology-ICISC 2005: 8th International Conference, Seoul, Korea, December 1-2, 2005, Revised Selected Papers* 8. Springer, 156–168.
- [54] Hamza Omar and Omer Khan. 2020. IRONHIDE: A Secure Multicore that Efficiently Mitigates Microarchitecture State Attacks for Interactive Applications. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*. 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPCA47549.2020.00019>
- [55] OpenSSL Ladder RSA 2011. OpenSSL 1.01 Montgomery-Ladder RSA. https://github.com/openssl/openssl/blob/46ebd9e3bb623d3c15ef2203038956f3f7213620/crypto/ec/ec2_mult.c.
- [56] Harish Patil, Alexander Isaev, Wim Heirman, Alen Sabu, Ali Hajiabadi, and Trevor E Carlson. 2021. ELFies: Executable region checkpoints for performance analysis and simulation. In *2021 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO)*. IEEE, 126–136.
- [57] Ivan Puddu, Moritz Schneider, Miro Haller, and Srdjan Čapkun. 2021. Frontal Attack: Leaking {Control-Flow} in {SGX} via the {CPU} Frontend. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 663–680.
- [58] Moinuddin K Qureshi. 2018. CEASER: Mitigating conflict-based cache attacks via encrypted-address and remapping. In *2018 51st Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. IEEE, 775–787.
- [59] Ashay Rane, Calvin Lin, and Mohit Tiwari. 2015. Raccoon: Closing digital side-channels through obfuscated execution. In *24th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 15)*. 431–446.
- [60] RSA LibreSSL accessed 9 April 2023. RSA LibreSSL 3.3.6. https://github.com/PowerShell/LibreSSL/blob/edfc7eb366aa242e8966332e6d98a16cd4264d6c/crypto/bn/bn_exp.c#L481.
- [61] Gururaj Saileshwar and Moinuddin K Qureshi. 2019. Cleanupspec: An “undo” approach to safe speculation. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*. 73–86.
- [62] Christos Sakalis, Stefanos Kaxiras, Alberto Ros, Alexandra Jimborean, and Magnus Sjölander. 2019. Efficient invisible speculative execution through selective delay and value prediction. In *2019 ACM/IEEE 46th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. IEEE, 723–735.
- [63] Michael Schwarz, Moritz Lipp, Claudio Canella, Robert Schilling, Florian Kargl, and Daniel Gruss. 2020. ConTEXT: A Generic Approach for Mitigating Spectre.. In *NDSS*.
- [64] Michael Schwarz, Moritz Lipp, Daniel Moghimi, Jo Van Bulck, Julian Stecklina, Thomas Prescher, and Daniel Gruss. 2019. ZombieLoad: Cross-privilege-boundary data sampling. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 753–768.
- [65] Michael Schwarz, Martin Schwarzl, Moritz Lipp, and Daniel Gruss. 2018. NetSpectre: Read Arbitrary Memory over Network. *CoRR* abs/1807.10535 (2018). [arXiv:1807.10535](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.10535) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1807.10535>
- [66] Martin Schwarzl, Claudio Canella, Daniel Gruss, and Michael Schwarz. 2021. Specfuscator: Evaluating Branch Removal as a Spectre Mitigation. *Financial Cryptography and Data Security 2021* (2021).
- [67] Jo Van Bulck, Marina Minkin, Ofir Weisse, Daniel Genkin, Baris Kasikci, Frank Piessens, Mark Silberstein, Thomas F Wenisch, Yuval Yarom, and Raoul Strackx. 2018. Foreshadow: Extracting the keys to the Intel SGX kingdom with transient out-of-order execution. In *Proceedings fo the 27th USENIX Security Symposium*. USENIX Association.
- [68] Stephan Van Schaik, Alyssa Milburn, Sebastian Österlund, Pietro Frigo, Giorgi Maisuradze, Kaveh Razavi, Herbert Bos, and Cristiano Giuffrida. 2019. RIDL: Rogue in-flight data load. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 88–105.
- [69] Jose Rodrigo Sanchez Vicarte, Michael Flanders, Riccardo Paccagnella, Grant Garrett-Grossman, Adam Morrison, Christopher W Fletcher, and David Kohlbrenner. 2022. Augury: Using data memory-dependent prefetchers to leak data at rest. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 1491–1505.
- [70] Ofir Weisse, Ian Neal, Kevin Loughlin, Thomas F Wenisch, and Baris Kasikci. 2019. NDA: Preventing speculative execution attacks at their source. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*. 572–586.
- [71] Ofir Weisse, Jo Van Bulck, Marina Minkin, Daniel Genkin, Baris Kasikci, Frank Piessens, Mark Silberstein, Raoul Strackx, Thomas F Wenisch, and Yuval Yarom. 2018. Foreshadow-NG: Breaking the virtual memory abstraction with transient out-of-order execution. (2018).
- [72] Johannes Wikner and Kaveh Razavi. 2022. {RETBLEED}: Arbitrary Speculative Code Execution with Return Instructions. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*. 3825–3842.
- [73] Meng Wu, Shengjian Guo, Patrick Schaumont, and Chao Wang. 2018. Eliminating timing side-channel leaks using program repair. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 15–26.
- [74] Mengjia Yan, Jiho Choi, Dimitrios Skarlatos, Adam Morrison, Christopher Fletcher, and Josep Torrellas. 2018. Invisispec: Making speculative execution invisible in the cache hierarchy. In *2018 51st Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. IEEE, 428–441.
- [75] Jiyong Yu, Lucas Hsiung, Mohamad El'Hajj, and Christopher W Fletcher. 2019. Data Oblivious ISA Extensions for Side Channel-Resistant and High Performance Computing. In *The Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*.
- [76] Jiyong Yu, Namrata Mantri, Josep Torrellas, Adam Morrison, and Christopher W Fletcher. 2020. Speculative Data-Oblivious Execution: Mobilizing Safe Prediction for Safe and Efficient Speculative Execution. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 47th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (Virtual Event) (ISCA '20)*. IEEE Press, 707–720. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA45697.2020.00064>
- [77] Jiyong Yu, Mengjia Yan, Artem Khyzha, Adam Morrison, Josep Torrellas, and Christopher W Fletcher. 2019. Speculative taint tracking (stt) a comprehensive protection for speculatively accessed data. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*. 954–968.
- [78] Zirui Neil Zhao, Houxiang Ji, Mengjia Yan, Jiyong Yu, Christopher W Fletcher, Adam Morrison, Darko Marinov, and Josep Torrellas. 2020. Speculation Invariance (InvarSpec): Faster Safe Execution Through Program Analysis. In *2020 53rd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. 1138–1152. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MICRO50266.2020.00094>