

Cryptographically Assured Information Flow: Assured Remote Execution¹

Scott L. Dyer, Christian A. Femrite,
Joshua D. Guttman,² Julian P. Lanson, Moses D. Liskov
The MITRE Corporation

February 7, 2024

¹Copyright © 2024, The MITRE Corporation. All rights reserved.
This work was funded by the MITRE IR&D Program.

²Corresponding author, email address guttman@mitre.org.

Abstract

Assured Remote Execution on a device is the ability of suitably authorized parties to construct secure channels with known processes—i.e. processes executing known code—running on it. Assured Remote Execution requires a hardware basis including cryptographic primitives.

In this paper, we show that a simple hardware-level mechanism called *Cryptographically Assured Information Flow* (CAIF) enables Assured Remote Execution. CAIF is akin to some operations in existing Trusted Execution Environments, but securely implements an ideal functionality defined in terms of *logging* and *confidential escrow*.

We show how to achieve Assured Remote Execution for a wide variety of processes on a CAIF device. Cryptographic protocol analysis demonstrates our security goals are achieved even against a strong adversary that may modify our programs and execute unauthorized programs on the device.

Assured Remote Execution enables useful functionality such as trustworthy remote attestation, and provides some of the support needed for secure remote reprogramming.

Acknowledgment. We are grateful to the MITRE Independent Research and Development Program for support.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
I	CAIF and its Functionality	8
2	An Ideal Functionality for CAIF	9
2.1	The central idea	9
2.2	Services	10
2.3	Ideal Functionality Instructions	11
2.4	Behavioral lemmas about IF	13
3	CAIF Devices	17
3.1	CAIF Services	17
3.2	CAIF instructions	17
3.3	Auxiliary operations	21
3.4	CAIF devices	22
4	Properties of CAIF	24
4.1	Defining the CAIF properties	25
4.2	The cryptographic primitives	27
4.3	Proving the properties	28
4.4	Proving implementation of the ideal functionality	31
II	Assured Remote Execution via CAIF	34
5	Our Strategy	35
5.1	Achieving Assured Remote Execution	35
5.2	The adversary	37
5.3	Formalizing the adversary	38
6	Anchoring a CAIF Device	40
6.1	Anchoring with Shared Secrets	40
6.2	Analyzing symmetric anchoring	41
6.3	Trust chains	42

6.4	The symmetric key distributor service	43
6.5	Analyzing symmetric key distribution	43
7	Delegating Signing Keys	45
7.1	Assumptions for delegating signing keys	46
7.2	Security goal	47
7.3	Delegation over an authenticated channel	47
7.4	Delegation analysis	49
7.5	Adapting delegation to the anchor	50
7.6	Anchoring with digital signatures	52
8	Related Work	53
8.1	Trusted Execution Environments	53
8.2	Ideal functionality methods	54
8.3	Protocol analysis	54
9	Conclusion	56

List of Figures

3.1	Hardware Crypto	18
3.2	CAIF on FPGA: Top level design	21
3.3	CAIF on FPGA: Peripheral structure	23
6.1	Symmetric anchoring	42
6.2	Distributor request	44
7.1	Message signed with delegated key	49
7.2	Anchored delegated key usage	51

Chapter 1

Introduction

Suppose you have control of a device d early in its life, after which d may be physically inaccessible, e.g. on a satellite, or rarely accessible, e.g. one of many devices on ships, or embedded in airplanes, or scattered throughout the electric power system. Long-term, can you deliver messages exclusively to specific, known processes executing on d ? Can you, when receiving certain messages, be sure they were prepared by specific, known processes on d ? Can these processes be executing code written and delivered long after d was initialized?

This is the *Assured Remote Execution* challenge, where we identify the known processes by the hash of their executable code.

Assured remote execution requires hardware support [16], as well as cryptography to protect messages in transit and to ensure authenticity of the endpoint d and active process within d . Good solutions should:

1. Use a simple hardware basis;
2. Rely only on simple, efficient, well-understood crypto primitives;
3. Achieve the assured remote execution even against a strong adversary capable of running its own software on the device, or modifying existing software, including hypervisor software and software running during boot;
4. Yield a verification strategy for using the mechanism, including the assured remote execution protocols.

We define here a hardware basis adapted from existing Trusted Execution Environments. This hardware basis uses cryptography to satisfy an ideal functionality defined in terms of information flow among processes local to d . We call our design CAIF, for *Cryptographically Assured Information Flow*.

Our hardware basis uses only key derivation functions, message authentication codes (MACs), and authenticated symmetric encryption. These form a small collection of deeply understood primitives, meeting the criteria 1–2.

We have designed our mechanisms under the assumption that some processes on our devices may run carefully vetted, trustworthy code, whereas others may

run questionable or even malicious code. We do not assume protected storage to hold executables within a CAIF device, so our conclusions hold even if an adversary modifies our programs in the filesystem, meeting criterion 3. Hence, without circular dependencies, CAIF may assist an operating system in preventing malicious execution.

We formalize CAIF by defining an ideal functionality [17, 10] and proving lemmas showing that the ideal functionality enforces our intended information flow. We then introduce a concrete cryptographic CAIF mechanism, using standard cryptographic proof techniques to show that CAIF simulates the ideal functionality—and thus satisfies the same lemmas—except with negligible probability (Cor. 1).

Having justified the CAIF mechanism, we show how to build assured remote execution on top of it. We have formalized the behaviors as protocols in CPSA, a symbolic security protocol analysis tool that supports message passing and also local device state [38]. CPSA helped us eliminate errors, discover some core ideas, and assure that the resulting mechanisms satisfy our security claims. Our CPSA models incorporate a strong adversary that can run any code, subject to the assumption that code that yields the same hash value under a strong hash function will also yield the same computational behavior when run. The ideal functionality proof and symbolic protocol analysis together meet criterion 4.

The quantum resistant transition. CAIF’s long-term guarantees are independent of asymmetric cryptographic primitives such as digital signatures. Motivated by the quantum cryptanalytic threat, new quantum-resistant primitives have recently been standardized in draft [2, 34, 35, 36]. However, the guarantees on long-lived CAIF devices are unaffected if these primitives are broken and revised, or if their key sizes must be adjusted.

New asymmetric algorithms can be installed securely on geographically dispersed CAIF devices. Indeed, CAIF shows that a long-term security architecture can depend only on stable, efficient symmetric cryptographic primitives.

Trusted Execution Environments. Allowing all asymmetric algorithms to evolve motivates a contrast with existing Trusted Execution Environments (TEEs) [12, 22, 23]. Although they use only symmetric cryptography at the hardware level, they rely on public key encryption to protect data being passed from one enclave to another. This was acceptable when the quantum cryptanalysis threat seemed more distant, but is no longer.

CAIF contrasts in two central ways with prior TEEs. First, they construct a device-local secret unique to each enclave, and deliver this to the enclave for actions including local attestations. CAIF constructs such a key but instead itself generates MAC tags to attest to data. This allows us to state a simple ideal functionality of local attestation. Second, CAIF also constructs keys for ordered pairs of enclaves (which we call “services”), and uses those to encrypt data to pass from one to the other. This provides a purely symmetric method for service-to-service information flow on a device (see Section 8.1).

The core idea of CAIF. CAIF provides two central functions. One enables a *service* (certain processes) to *log* itself as the source or authorizer of a data item. Other active parties can subsequently query or *check* whether an expected service has logged a data item. The other central function enables a service to *escrow* a piece of data to be delivered to a particular service as recipient. Only that recipient can then *retrieve* the data value, and only if it specifies the true source service as its expected source.

We define a cryptography-free *ideal functionality* in Chapter 2 to implement these two parts via an *unbounded secure memory*, proving some desirable behavioral properties (Lemmas 1–3). The ideal functionality assumes an unbounded amount of secure memory to hold the logged associations of service and data, and the escrowed associations of data, source, and recipient.

CAIF devices use key derivation, MACs for logging, and authenticated encryption for data escrow to achieve these behavioral properties without unbounded secure memory. A CAIF device requires only a little secure storage, namely a single unshared secret seed or “intrinsic secret” *IS*, as an input to key derivation. CAIF devices are defined in Chapter 3.

Contributions. We make three main contributions.

1. We define CAIF and its ideal functionality.
2. We prove that CAIF, implemented with strong cryptography, is computationally indistinguishable from an instance of the ideal functionality (Chapter 4).
3. We develop a sequence of protocols on top of CAIF. We use symbolic protocol analysis to demonstrate that they achieve assured remote execution despite a strong adversary that can execute code of its own choice on our devices. This is the subject of Chapters 5–7.

Symbolic protocol analysis is reliable here, because we have already proved that the cryptography used in CAIF yields a functionality indistinguishable from logging and escrow. Our symbolic modeling is explicitly based on the crypto-free ideal functionality for these operations. Chapter 5 provides an overview of our strategy for achieving assured remote execution.

Our guarantees are independent of delicate systems-level considerations, such as the precise way software obtains control at boot time.

Chapter 8 discusses related work, and Chapter 9 concludes.

Terminology. We consider several kinds of cryptography. Our devices use hardware-based symmetric mechanisms, which we write $\text{kdf}_h(x)$, $\text{mac}_h(k, v)$, and $\text{enc}_h(v, k)$ for the hardware key derivation function, Message Authentication Code, and authenticated encryption. The corresponding hardware decryption is $\text{dec}_h(v, k)$.

For other kinds of cryptography, we write $\{\{v\}\}_k^s$ for a symmetric encryption of plaintext v with key k , and $\{\{v\}\}_k^a$ for a public key encryption; occasionally

we write $\{v\}_k$ when which it is clear from context. For digital signatures we write $\llbracket v \rrbracket_k$ for a digital signature on message v with signing key k . When we use this notation, we will assume that v is recoverable from $\llbracket v \rrbracket_k$, so that the latter could be implemented by a pair $(v, \text{dsig}(\text{hash}(v), k))$ assuming that dsig is the digital signature algorithm.

We will generally write k^{-1} when (k, k^{-1}) form a key pair in either order. Thus, if k is a signing key, k^{-1} is the corresponding verification key, and conversely. When receiving a message, to verify it as $\llbracket v \rrbracket_k$, one needs k^{-1} , but k is not needed and is typically not known.

We regard a lookup table (e.g. a hash table) as a collection T of index-to-result mappings, and write any one mapping in the form $index \mapsto result$. These tables T satisfy the “partial function” constraint that if $i \mapsto r \in T$ and $i \mapsto r' \in T$, then $r = r'$. We write $\text{dom}(T)$ for its domain, namely $\{i: \exists r. i \mapsto r \in T\}$, and $\text{ran}(T)$ for its range $\{r: \exists i. i \mapsto r \in T\}$. When D is a distribution, we write $\text{supp}(D)$ for its support, i.e. the set $\{x: 0 < \text{Pr}[y \leftarrow D; y = x]\}$.

Part I

CAIF and its Functionality

Chapter 2

An Ideal Functionality for CAIF

In this section, we consider an *ideal functionality* IF, by which we mean a well-defined set of behaviors for controlling information flows that might be difficult to achieve directly in reality. IF would require an unbounded amount of memory under its exclusive control. No observer gains any information about the state of this memory except through IF's official interface, defined below. Lemmas 1–3 prove desirable behavioral properties of the IF.

In Chapter 3 we will introduce CAIF devices using cryptography, and in Chapter 4 we prove that these CAIF devices offer a near approximation to the IF's behavioral properties.

2.1 The central idea

We consider a system as a collection of *active processes* that act by executing instructions. Some active processes are distinguished as *services*. A service has an unchanging executable code segment, and an unshared heap for private computations. Because the code segment is unchanging, its contents serve as a persistent *principal* or *identity* for the service, and also determines its computational behavior.

The instruction set includes two pairs of special instructions besides normal computational steps. The first pair allows a service to *log* itself as source or authority for a piece of data, so other active processes can later make decisions based on provenance:

`iattest` has one parameter, which points to a region of data with some contents v . The logging functionality selects a *tag*, a bitstring τ , and stores a record associating the currently active service identity P_s with v and the tag τ .

The logging functionality returns τ in response.

`icheck` has three parameters, namely a service principal identity P_s , a pointer to a region of data with some contents v , and a tag τ . The logging functionality returns *true* if the named service P_s has previously logged v via `iattest`, and received the tag τ .

Any active process can use `icheck` to observe whether the service P_s has logged itself as an authority for v . However, only a service can execute `iattest`, since only services have a persistent identity P_s . One would implement this functionality using a Message Authentication Code, with τ selected as the MAC tag.

The second pair of instructions also ensures provenance of the source, but also provides data *escrow*, meaning that the source service P_s is making the data v available to one recipient service P_r :

`iprotect` has two parameters, the intended recipient service principal identity P_r and a pointer to a region of data with some contents v . When executed by a currently active service identity P_s , the escrow functionality selects a *handle* η , and stores a record in a lookup table, indexed by (η, P_s, P_r) , pointing to the value v . We write this $(\eta, P_s, P_r) \mapsto v$.

The logging functionality returns η in response.

`iretrieve` has two parameters, the expected source service principal identity P_s and a handle η . When executed by a currently active service identity P_r , the escrow functionality does a lookup in the table for index (η, P_s, P_r) .

If any entry $(\eta, P_s, P_r) \mapsto v$ is present, that v is returned to P_r .

Authenticated symmetric encryption is natural here. The handle η is a ciphertext, and the “authenticated” property ensures that a retrieved v was in fact previously protected by the source P_s for the recipient P_r (see Chapter 3).

2.2 Services

On the IF, certain active processes are designated as *services*. A service has an address space such that:

1. Executable addresses are located only within a non-writable *code segment*;
2. A non-shared *heap segment* is readable and writable by this service, but not by any other active process;
3. Other address space segments may be shared with other active processes.

These segments form disjoint portions of physical memory, so that code is readable and executable but not writable, while heap is readable and writable but not executable. A program must be able to reliably address them, so that secrets (e.g.) are written into unshared heap rather than shared memory.

We make no assumptions about access to the shared address space segments. Data placed there for transfer to a peer process may not have any protection against being read or modified by third parties.

Moreover:

4. The IF controls when a service is active, and maintains its *service identity* or *service principal*. We assume that if two services have code segments with the same contents, then they have the same service principal.

Since the service code is also immutable, the service principal is unalterable. In practice, CAIF will implement the service principal as the *hash* of the service code segment's contents. The hash function generating the service hash must be strong, so there will be a negligible probability that—with feasible effort—two distinct code contents will be found to yield the same principal. In particular, if two services have the same service hash, it is overwhelmingly likely that they will have the same computational properties in response to all sequences of possible inputs, approximating a converse to (4). We write $P \in \text{Prin}$ when P is a service principal; in practice this is the set of bitstrings in the range of the hash function used to hash service code segments.

Some active processes are services, but not all processes need to be services. For instance, the system may also permit non-service processes that would be able to receive and install new executable code in their own code segments, and subsequently execute it, as services cannot, by (1).

The remainder of this chapter specifies this ideal functionality IF in detail, so as to ensure that the concrete CAIF mechanism is indistinguishable from the IF. Some readers may want to skip to Chapter 3 at this point.

2.3 Ideal Functionality Instructions

The IF offers four special instructions to services. These will directly match the four core instructions of the CAIF devices, although we give them different names for clarity. They are *iattest* and *icheck* to assure the provenance of a data value, as generated or authorized by a particular service principal as source; and *iprotect* and *iretrieve* to escrow a data value for a particular recipient principal, and to receive it if authentically supplied by an intended source principal.

In the instructions *iattest* and *iprotect*, the IF generates a *tag value* or ciphertext-like *handle* for the executing service, which the subsequent checking or retrieving process uses to obtain its information.

These tags and handles are chosen in a way that is effectively a parameter of the IF. The tags will be chosen using a function $F_{log}(v, P)$ of the value being logged and the active service principal. The handles will be chosen by sampling from a distribution that may depend on the source principal P_s , the receiving principal P_r , and the length of the value being escrowed, meaning that we have a family of distributions D_{ℓ, P_s, P_r} where $\ell = |v|$.

The choice of a function $F_{log}(v, P)$ and a family of distributions D_{ℓ, P_s, P_r} are parameters that, when chosen, determine a particular version of the IF. Thus, IF is shorthand for the family of functionalities $\{\text{IF}[F_{log}, \{D_{\ell, p, p'}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}, p, p' \in \text{Prin}}]\}$ as the choice of function F_{log} and distribution family $\{D_{\ell, p, p'}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}, p, p' \in \text{Prin}}$ varies.

IF behavior: Logging. IF treats an *iattest*(v) instruction executed by a service principal P as a request to log the connection of P to v . Thus, the IF

maintains a lookup table \mathbf{log} . An entry in \mathbf{log} maps a value v and a service principal P to a tag value τ . The tag values are bitstrings of some fixed length $|\tau|$. An instruction:

$\mathbf{iattest}(v)$ executed by a service with principal P with data value v causes IF to inspect this table \mathbf{log} . If there is an associated tag τ already, it is returned. Otherwise, a new τ is selected as $\tau = F_{\mathbf{log}}(v, P)$, and $(P, v) \mapsto \tau$ is recorded in the table, after which τ is returned.

If no service P is executing, the instruction fails.

$\mathbf{icheck}(P_s, v, \tau)$ presents the expected source P_s , the data value v , and a tag τ . The IF inspects the lookup table \mathbf{log} to see if there is an entry $(P_s, v) \mapsto \tau_0$, and if so whether the associated tag τ_0 equals the presented tag τ .

It returns true if $\tau_0 = \tau$ was found and false if no τ_0 was found or $\tau_0 \neq \tau$.

A service P_s that obtains the attestation and discloses v and τ to another process is thereby authorizing the recipient to know that P_s attested to v , but effectively nothing else. For instance, no information about the ordering of the logging requests is retained.

IF behavior: Protection. We define the $\mathbf{iprotect}$ and $\mathbf{iretrieve}$ instructions in a similar way. However:

- Unlike the fixed-length tags τ , these instructions manipulate variable-length, ciphertext-like bitstrings η . The value η for a given plaintext v will be a little longer than v , so as to accommodate an initialization vector and an authentication tag.
- Instead of recording only the active principal, the look-up table must also record the intended recipient, so that the $\mathbf{iretrieve}$ can fail for other unauthorized services.
- Since η and not v is presented in the $\mathbf{iretrieve}$ instruction, we incorporate η into the lookup index, and let v be the result of the lookup mapping.
- Because η is part of the lookup index, if the same η is chosen for two conflicting lookup mappings, anomalies result that would falsify our behavioral lemma. When this occurs, we re-sample (possibly repeatedly) to avoid conflict. When η is sampled from a reasonable distribution, this is a low-probability event; hence, the probability of this happening n times decreases exponentially as n increases.

$\mathbf{iprotect}(P_r, v)$: IF treats an $\mathbf{iprotect}(P_r, v)$ instruction executed by a service principal P_s as a request to make v available to service principal P_r , as provided by the source principal P_s , upon presentation of a ciphertext-like bitstring or *handle* η .

The IF maintains a lookup table `protstore`. An entry in `protstore` maps a handle η and the pair (P_s, P_r) of service principals to the data value v , thus taking the form $(\eta, P_s, P_r) \mapsto v$.

The value η returned by this instruction is sampled from a distribution $D_{|v|, P_s, P_r}$ that may depend on the length of the data value v as well as the principals P_s, P_r . However, it does not depend on v .

One fine point is that sampling η may occasionally yield a handle for which a mapping

$$(\eta, P_s, P_r) \mapsto v' \in \text{protstore}$$

already exists in the lookup table. If $v' \neq v$, this would cause a dilemma. We eliminate this dilemma with a broad stroke: If sampling yields an η such that $(\eta, P'_s, P'_r) \mapsto v'$ for *any* P'_s, P'_r , and v' , then we resample from $D_{|v|, P_s, P_r}$, possibly repeatedly, until we obtain an η that occurs nowhere in `protstore`. When an acceptable, non-conflicting η is found, $(\eta, P_s, P_r) \mapsto v$ is inserted into `protstore`. This η is returned as the result by being stored into memory.

`iretrieve(P_s, η)`: To carry out a `iretrieve(P_s, η)` instruction executed by a service principal P_r , the IF seeks for an entry in the lookup table `protstore` with index (η, P_s, P_r) . If none is found, the instruction fails. Otherwise, if the mapping $(\eta, P_s, P_r) \mapsto v$ is found, v is returned as result, again by being written into a suitable portion of memory.

2.4 Behavioral lemmas about IF

A strength of the ideal functionality definition is that several behavioral properties follow easily from it. It is about the *behaviors* of an IF. By a *command* c , we mean an instruction together with a choice of its command arguments, v for `iattest`; (P_s, v, τ) for `icheck`; etc. We will use the word *command* to refer to an instruction together with its parameters, such as `iattest(v)`.

Definition 1 *An event is a triple (command, principal, result) of a command, the executing service principal that causes it (or \perp if the active process is not a service), and the result of executing the instruction.*

A history is a finite sequence $\langle (c_i, p_i, r_i) \rangle_{i < \ell}$ of events.

A behavior of a state machine M equipped with principal identities is a history $\langle (c_i, p_i, r_i) \rangle_{i < \ell}$ such that each command c_i can cause the result r_i when executed by the service principal p_i in some state that could arise from the preceding sequence of events $\langle (c_j, p_j, r_j) \rangle_{j < i}$, starting from an initial state.

An IF behavior is a behavior of the IF starting from an initial state with empty lookup tables.

Properties of IF: Logging. We can summarize the important properties of the attestation instructions in a lemma.

For the instruction `iattest` the result r is a tag τ , and for the instruction `icheck` the result is a truth value *true* or *false*. We assume that at the beginning

of any IF behavior, before any events have occurred, the state is empty, i.e. no principals and values are mapped to tags.

The lemma essentially states that the instruction `icheck` uses `log` as a log of which `iattest` instructions have occurred, although without retaining information on their ordering:

Lemma 1 (Log correctness for `iattest`) *Let $\alpha = \langle (c_i, p_i, r_i) \rangle_i$ be an IF behavior.*

1. *If, for $i < j$, c_i is the command `iattest(v)` and c_j is `icheck(p_i, v, r_i)`, then its result $r_j = \text{true}$.*
2. *If $c_j = \text{icheck}(p, v, \tau)$ and $r_j = \text{true}$, then for some $i < j$, $c_i = \text{iattest}(v)$, $p_i = p$, and $r_i = \tau$.*

Proof sketch: 1. The effect of c_i is to ensure that `log` maps p_i, v to τ . No other instruction removes an entry from `log` or modifies the tag in an existing entry. Thus, at step j , $c_j = \text{icheck}(p_i, v, \tau)$ will return `true`.

2. Since $r_j = \text{true}$, the `logj` contains the mapping $(p, v) \mapsto \tau$ when c_j is executed. Thus, there is an earliest state `logi+1` with $0 \leq i < j$ such that this mapping entry is present. But the mapping is not present in the initial state `log0`, and the mapping is added only if $c_i = \text{iattest}(v)$ and $p_i = p$, yielding result τ .

This lemma will remain true as we define additional instructions on IF as long as those instructions do not modify `log`. It is independent of the algorithm F_{log} for choosing tags.

Properties of IF: Protection. In the definition of `iprotect`, the resampling could in principle go on without end, so that the instruction gets stuck without returning. Thus, a good choice of the distribution $D_{|v|, P_s, P_r}$ should have many more (reasonably probable) elements than will appear in the table `protstore` in the course of any execution. For instance, if the cardinality $|\text{supp}(D_{|v|, P_s, P_r})| \approx 2^k$, where k is a security parameter, and $D_{|v|, P_s, P_r}$ is close to uniform on these, the maximum table size in reasonable executions will be vastly less. In this case, the expected number of samplings per execution of `iprotect` will be much closer to 1 than to 2.

Since our new instructions `iprotect` and `iretrieve` do not affect the other lookup table `log`, the claims in Lemma 1 are unaffected by adding these instructions. Moreover, similar properties hold for `iprotect` and `iretrieve`, for essentially the same reasons, again assuming that the initial state of `protstore` is an empty table:

Lemma 2 (Log correctness for `iprotect`) *Let $\alpha = \langle (c_i, p_i, r_i) \rangle_i$ be an IF behavior.*

1. *If, for $i < j$, $c_i = \text{iprotect}(p_j, v)$ and $c_j = \text{iretrieve}(p_i, r_i)$, then $r_j = v$.*
2. *If $c_j = \text{iretrieve}(p, \eta)$ and $r_j = v$, then for some $i < j$, $c_i = \text{iprotect}(p_j, v)$, $p_i = p$, and $r_i = \eta$.*

Proof sketch: 1. The effect of c_i is to ensure that `protstore` maps $(\eta, p_i, p_j) \mapsto v$. Moreover, no other event removes an entry from `protstore` or, given the resampling provision in the `iprotect` definition, modifies the data value in an existing entry. Thus, at step j , $c_j = \text{iretrieve}(p_i, r_i)$ will return v .

2. Since $r_j = v$, the `protstorej` contains the mapping $(\eta, p, p_j) \mapsto v$ when c_j is executed. Thus, there is an earliest state `protstorei+1` with $0 \leq i < j$ such that this mapping entry is present. But the mapping is added only if $c_i = \text{iprotect}(p_j, v)$ and $p_i = p$, and the result is $r_i = \eta$. ///

The proof here is independent of the distributions $D_{|v|, P_s, P_r}$, and in fact holds even if some behaviors get stuck because the handle values are completely exhausted. That causes there to be a smaller set of behaviors than better choices of $D_{|v|, P_s, P_r}$ provide, but all of them satisfy the two claims in the lemma.

Ideal secrecy for IF. We next formalize a claim that the `iprotect` and `iretrieve` instructions of IF leak “no information” about the values associated with handles that are not retrieved, using the notion of a schematic behavior. A *schematic behavior* α_v in the single variable v results from an actual behavior α by replacing one occurrence of a bitstring in a command or result of α with the variable v . If b is any bitstring, by $\alpha_v[b/v]$ we mean the result of replacing the occurrence of v by b . The result $\alpha_v[b/v]$ may not be a behavior at all, if this choice of b is incompatible with the remainder of the events in α . We say that α is *the original* of α_v , and note that $\alpha = \alpha_v[b_0/v]$ for some choice of b_0 , namely the one that was replaced with the variable v .

We write $\text{supp}(D)$ for the support of the distribution D , namely the set of values with positive probability in D . We can in fact make a strong, Shannon-style perfect secrecy claim about the ideal functionality.

Lemma 3 (Perfect secrecy for iprotect) *Let $\alpha_v = \langle (c_i, p_i, r_i) \rangle_i$ be a schematic behavior in a variable v , where v occurs in an `iprotect` instruction $c_i = \text{iprotect}(P_r, v)$ executed by a service principal P_s . Let the resulting handle be $\eta = r_i$, and let ℓ be a length of plaintexts for which η is a possible result. Per our assumption, there is a unique such ℓ .*

Let D_v be any distribution on bitstrings of length ℓ , i.e. $\text{supp}(D_v) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^\ell$.

Suppose η does not appear as input to any subsequent $c_j = \text{iretrieve}(p_i, \eta)$ with $p_j = P_r$. For every b such that $b \in \text{supp}(S_h(\ell, (P_s, P_r)))$,

1. $\alpha_v[b/v]$ is a behavior.
2. $\Pr[v_0 \leftarrow D_v; v_0 = b \mid \alpha_v[v_0/v]] = \Pr[v_0 \leftarrow D_v; v_0 = b]$.

Proof sketch: 1. We prove by induction on the sequence of events in $\alpha_v[b/v]$ that it is a behavior. All events in $\alpha_v[b/v]$ up to event $n < i$ are identical with the events in the original behavior α , so the state may evolve in the identical way, and each event e_n remains possible. Since $c_i = \text{iprotect}(P_r, v)$ yielded η occurred in α , the state before e_i did not contain any mapping in `protstorei` with

handle η . Hence, the choice of η is compatible with the resampling policy of `iprotect`.

Now when $j > i$, for subsequent occurrences of η in $c_j = \text{iretrieve}(P, \eta)$, by assumption we have $P \neq p_i$ or $p_j \neq P_r$. Hence, we obtain the same result namely failure. All other instructions execute in exactly the same way as in α , as they are independent of this row of the `protstore`.

2. Immediate from item 1.

///

We have now defined the ideal functionality `IF`, with its four special instructions `iattest`, `icheck`, `iprotect`, and `iretrieve`. These manipulate two lookup tables, `log` and `protstore`. The instructions ensure the authentication-like properties in Lemmas 1 and 2, and the secrecy property in Lemma 3. The definition of `IF` is parameterized by a choice of a function F_{log} and a family of distributions D_{ℓ, P_s, P_r} , so that an instance of the `IF` is of the form `IF`[$F_{log}, \{D_{\ell, P_s, P_r}\}$]. The lemmas, however, hold for all values of the parameters.

We turn next to a feasible machine implementing the behavior of `IF` using cryptography. It eliminates the protected state stored in `log` and `protstore`. We call it `CAIF`, as it is an cryptographically achieved `IF`. It uses only a single fixed, unshared secret.

Chapter 3

CAIF Devices

The CAIF mechanism is built around two main ingredients: first, the idea of a CAIF *service*, a computational activity with a known *service hash* that serves as its identity (Section 3.1); and, second, two pairs of *instructions* or basic operations to ensure provenance and control access of data passed among services (Section 3.2). Auxiliary operations are also needed to manage services (Section 3.3). Section 3.4 summarizes what being a CAIF device requires.

3.1 CAIF Services

A CAIF device designates some active processes as *services*. These services satisfy the same address space properties (1)–(3) verbatim as in Section 2.2. Thus, code is readable and executable but not writable, while heap is readable and writable but not executable. A program must be able to reliably address one of these, so that secrets (e.g.) are written into unshared heap rather than shared memory. Moreover, the service principal or service identity is further specified as a (cryptographic) *service hash*:

- 4'. The CAIF device controls when a service is active, and maintains the *hash* of the contents of its *code segment* as its *service identity* or *principal*.

Since the contents of code segment are immutable, the hash does not change, and the CAIF system can regard it as a non-forgable identity. We often speak simply of the service *service hash* when we refer to the principal in the CAIF rather than IF context.

3.2 CAIF instructions

The CAIF device offers two pairs of primitive operations or instructions concerning service-to-service information flow. They correspond to *iattest* and *icheck* for asserting and checking provenance, and *iprotect* and *iretrieve* for escrowing data values and controlling their propagation. These primitive operations use




Figure 3.1: CAIF Hardware Cryptography Components

symmetric cryptography and keys that are derived from a device-local secret unknown to any party called the Intrinsic Secret, combined with one or more service service hashes.

1. An *Intrinsic Secret* within each CAIF device d is shared with no other device or party, and is used exclusively to derive cryptographic keys for the CAIF instructions.

We write IS for a device’s intrinsic secret. The intrinsic secret IS is the only secret that the CAIF hardware has to maintain. We expect that implementations will record it as a set of fused wires or as a Physically Unclonable Function. The hardware design of a CAIF device can help provide assurance that IS is not accessible in any way other than for key derivation. The IS may be realized in hardware different ways; SGX implements a similar secret via fused wires, while Sanctum implements an underlying secret via a Physically Unclonable Function [24].

The hardware must also furnish four cryptographic primitives at the hardware level, namely a key derivation function kdf_h , a Message Authentication Code mac_h , and an authenticated mode of symmetric encryption enc_h with the decryption dec_h .

A conceptual view of the cryptographic components at the hardware level is in Fig. 3.1. Triple arrows indicate wires carrying the bits of various secret or random values; it is important that their source and destination are guaranteed in a straightforward way.

The instructions we describe may *fail* or *succeed*, and failing may be implemented by a transfer of control or even a termination of the active process, or

simply by setting a condition code to be checked to determine whether to branch in subsequent instructions. We also regard instructions as possibly returning a boolean value, which again may be implemented by setting a condition code. Instructions may of course also load and store data within the address space of the active service or other process.

Provenance via MACs. One pair of primitive instructions uses Message Authentication Codes (MACs) to identify a service that has generated or endorsed a particular data value v , typically the data occupying a given region of memory defined by a pointer and a length.

In effect, these instructions implement a log of local attestations. Any party obtaining a true result executing `check-attest`(v, sh_s, m) can infer that a service with code hash sh_s previously executed `attest-locally`(v) on this same device, obtaining the result m . So it's as if CAIF maintained a log. We will prove that this holds with overwhelming probability in Chapter 4 in Theorem. 1.

attest-locally(v): Computes a MAC on given data v using a key that is derived from IS and the service hash sh of the currently executing service. If no service is currently executing it fails.

The MAC key is computed¹ via a key derivation function kdf_h as:

$$k = kdf_h(\text{"at"}, IS, sh).$$

The instruction computes the MAC $m = \text{mac}_h(k, v)$ of v with this key k and causes m to be stored into a suitable region of the address space. The MAC tag m may subsequently be copied anywhere.

check-attest(sh_s, v, m): Checks—given a service hash sh_s of the purported source, data v , and a purported MAC m —whether m is correct. It returns true or false depending whether the purported MAC m equals a recomputed MAC. Thus, letting:

$$k = kdf_h(\text{"at"}, IS, sh_s)$$

the result is true iff $m = \text{mac}_h(k, v)$.

In this way, a service may log itself as the origin or approver of the data v ; any recipient of v or a copy of it, if executing on the same device with the same intrinsic secret IS , can subsequently ascertain its provenance. Any more specific “intent” on the part of the source service sh_s may be encoded into the content of v .

Thus, `attest-locally` and `check-attest` provide a device-local mechanism for asserting and confirming provenance.

¹The constant `"at"` ensures that keys derived in this way will be independent of keys for other purposes that do not involve `"at"`. A different constant `"pf"` with a corresponding purpose appears in the `protect-for` instruction below.

Protection and provenance via encryption. The second pair of primitive operations uses authenticated symmetric encryption. It produces an encrypted value that can only be decrypted by a stipulated recipient; even this recipient successfully decrypts it only if it was prepared by the expected source. The encrypted value, being self-protecting, may travel by any means to the intended recipient, and if received intact, may be safely retrieved.

protect-for(sh_r, v): Computes—given an intended recipient’s service hash sh_r and a data value v —an authenticated symmetric encryption of given data v using a key derived from IS , the service hash sh of the currently executing service, and sh_r . If no service is currently executing it fails.

The encryption key is computed via key derivation function kdf_h as:

$$k = kdf_h(\text{"pf"}, IS, sh, sh_r).$$

The service hash sh of the currently executing service is the third component, and its intended recipient sh_r is the last one. The effect of the instruction is to compute the encrypted value:

$$e = enc_h(v, k)$$

which is stored back into a suitable region of memory. The resulting e may subsequently be copied anywhere.

retrieve-from(sh_s, e): Decrypts—given an expected source’s service hash sh_s and a purported encrypted value e —the plaintext resulting from e using a key derived from IS , the service hash sh_s of the expected source, and the code hash sh of the currently executing service. Fails if the decryption fails, or if no service is currently executing.

The encryption key is computed via key derivation function kdf_h as:

$$k = kdf_h(\text{"pf"}, IS, sh_s, sh).$$

Here the service hash sh of the currently executing service is the last component, and the expected source sh_s is the previous one. If $e = enc_h(v, k)$, the plaintext v is stored back into the service’s unshared heap.

These instructions also provide a kind of logging, but with access control since only the intended recipient can check the log entry. Moreover, they also ensure confidentiality, since in the absence of a **retrieve-from** by the intended recipient, no observer can distinguish whether a data value v or any other value v' of the same length was protected. This is like a kind of escrow functionality offered by the CAIF device.

Specifically, it is a *device-local* mechanism for data protection, which asserts provenance to the permitted recipient, but only for a recipient executing on the same device.




Figure 3.2: CAIF on FPGA: Top level design

3.3 Auxiliary operations

We also need some auxiliary operations to handle services:

create-service: Creates a service with the code contained in a buffer of memory, plus some other resources including a newly allocated unshared heap. The service hash is ascertained to be used by the CAIF mechanism.

The resulting service does not execute immediately, but is placed on a list of runnable services.

start-service: Given an argument specifying a runnable service, start that service executing with access to the values of any additional parameters.

yield: When executed by a service, stop executing the current service and store its state so that a future **start-service** can occur.

exit-service: Zero the non-shared heap segment of the current service and eliminate it from the list of runnable services.

A service may be created from any executable, even executables that do not use the special instructions; whatever executable it is will, however, be indelibly associated with it through the service hash. Thus, its identity is always correctly reflected when it uses the four core CAIF instructions.

CAIF allows different versions of these auxiliary instructions.

3.4 CAIF devices

By a *CAIF device* we mean a hardware device that enables the CAIF instructions in Section 3.2 to be performed by services of the kind given in Section 3.1; the auxiliary operations in Section 3.3 may be carried out using a combination of software and hardware.

The `check-attest` and `retrieve-from` instructions provide evidence of provenance in some sense, and the `protect-for` instruction controls what service can immediately extract the plaintext of the encryption it generates.

Definition 2 *A CAIF state consists of a value for the intrinsic secret IS . No CAIF command modifies the CAIF state.*

A CAIF behavior $((c_j, p_j, r_j))_{j < i}$ is a behavior containing CAIF commands c_j , active principals—i.e. code hashes— p_j and command results r_j .

Cryptographic choices. CAIF devices should be equipped with strong cryptographic primitives. In particular, implementors should endeavor to ensure:

Pseudo-random key derivation: The key derivation function kdf_h is indistinguishable from a random function.

Collision resistant hashing: The `attest-locally` and `check-attest` primitives use a Hashing Message Authenticated Codes mac_h based on a hash function with the collision resistance property. The code hashing algorithm is also collision resistant.

IND-CCA2 encryption: The `protect-for` and `retrieve-from` primitives use an enc_h offering symmetric encryption and decryption secure against chosen ciphertext attacks. [30]

These being asymptotic properties, we are in effect recommending a family of CAIF devices, parameterized by a security parameter k . When we make the claim in Chapter 2 that a CAIF device is indistinguishable from a particular ideal functionality, we mean that as k increases, the devices of that component of the family are correspondingly hard to distinguish from the ideal functionality.

Hardware implementation. Work is going on to develop a simple hardware implementation of CAIF. As a development strategy, we work with FPGAs, though ASICs make a more secure mechanism (Figs. 3.2–3.3).

The CAIF “special instructions” are in fact not implemented as instructions, but with stores to a memory-mapped peripheral region of the FPGA followed by loads from it. FIFOs ensure that the service’s view of the process has the atomicity we expect, i.e. that none of the ciphertext for `protect-for` can be observed until all of the plaintext has been committed.

We are working with an existing Risc-V implementation to provide a concrete instruction set for the remainder of the processor functionality. Keystone is thus useful for a provisional way to enforce the memory protection in Section 3.1, items 1–3. A more complete CAIF implementation will provide memory




Figure 3.3: CAIF on FPGA: Peripheral structure

protection assurance directly in hardware, assuming a simple association of services to physical memory.

Chapter 4

Properties of CAIF

In this section, we prove that a CAIF device is close in behavior to the ideal functionality IF, where *close* is quantified by the cryptographic properties of the primitives kdf_h , mac_h , $(\text{enc}_h, \text{dec}_h)$ used in the construction.

In particular, we first prove that it is hard for an adversary (or distinguisher) to interact with a CAIF device to find counterexamples to the claims in Lemma 1 and the claims in 2.

We then reformulate Lemma 3 as a chosen ciphertext secrecy property, and prove that it is hard to distinguish the plaintext of a `protect-for` without successfully executing a corresponding `retrieve-from`. This is Lemma 8.

Oracles. A computational process $A^{\mathcal{F}}$ may make queries to a state-based process \mathcal{F} written as its exponent, receiving responses from it. We refer to the latter as an *oracle*.

In any *state* any *query* determines a distribution \mathcal{D} on $(\text{next-state}, \text{result})$ pairs. A *behavior* or *history* is a sequence of *query-result* pairs, such that there is a sequence of states where the first state is an *initial state* and, for each successive state s , that state and the result are in the \mathcal{D} -support for the previous state and the current query. More formally:

Definition 3 An oracle is a tuple $\mathcal{O} = \langle \Sigma, Q, I, R, \delta \rangle$ such that $I \subseteq \Sigma$, $\perp \in R$, and $\delta: \Sigma \times Q \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\Sigma \times R)$.

Σ is the set of states, I being the initial subset. Q is the space of possible queries. The function δ is the probabilistic transition relation. An alternating finite sequence

$$\langle (\sigma_0, \perp), q_0, (\sigma_1, r_1), q_1, \dots, q_i(\sigma_{i+1}, r_{i+1}) \rangle \quad (4.1)$$

is a trace of \mathcal{O} iff $\sigma_0 \in I$, and for all $j < i$,

1. $q_j \in Q$, $\sigma_{j+1} \in \Sigma$, and $r_{j+1} \in R$; and
2. $(\sigma_{j+1}, r_{j+1}) \in \text{supp}(\delta(\sigma_j, q_j))$.

The probability of any trace of \mathcal{O} is determined by the Markov chain condition, i.e. the (non-zero) product of the probabilities of (σ_{j+1}, r_{j+1}) in $\delta(\sigma_j, q_j)$.

A behavior or history of \mathcal{O} is a finite sequence of pairs $\langle (q_j, r_{j+1}) \rangle_{j < i}$ such that for some sequence $\langle \sigma_j \rangle_{j \leq i}$, the sequence (4.1) is a trace of \mathcal{O} .

We use *behavior* and *history* interchangeably.

We write $A^{\mathcal{F}(s_0, \cdot)}$ to denote the run of A with oracle access to functionality \mathcal{F} with initial state s_0 . When the initial state is clear, we write $A^{\mathcal{F}(\cdot)}$. The (\cdot) is a reminder that we regard $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ as function-like, i.e. as returning results r_j in response to queries (c_j, p_j) .

When a randomized algorithm A executes against an oracle $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$, any partial run of $A^{\mathcal{F}(\cdot)}$ induces a history \mathcal{H} of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$. When the run completes with an answer a , after having induced the $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ -history \mathcal{H} , then we write $(a, \mathcal{H}) \leftarrow A^{\mathcal{F}(\cdot)}$. When we will not need a , we write $(\cdot, \mathcal{H}) \leftarrow A^{\mathcal{F}(\cdot)}$. When we do not need \mathcal{H} , we write $a \leftarrow A^{\mathcal{F}(\cdot)}$ as usual.

Where $\mathcal{H} = \langle (q_i, r_i) \rangle_i$ is a history, we write $\text{query}(\mathcal{H})$ to refer to the sequence $\langle q_i \rangle_i$. We also write $v \in_i \mathcal{S}$ when \mathcal{S} is a sequence and v occurs in the i^{th} position \mathcal{S} . Naturally, for some v, \mathcal{S} , $v \in_i \mathcal{S}$ and $v \in_j \mathcal{S}$ with $i \neq j$.

4.1 Defining the CAIF properties

We regard a CAIF device as an oracle by identifying its state with the intrinsic secret IS ; no command alters this state. Its commands are the four special commands of Section 3.2, i.e. a syntactic object consisting of an instruction name together with values for the arguments provided in Section 3.2. The result is either \perp if the instruction fails for those arguments, or else the stipulated result. The size of the state of a CAIF device is constant, namely the length $|IS|$.

The CAIF functionalities form a family $\{C\}_k$ of oracles depending on the choice of cryptographic primitives to be used in them; these in turn depend on a security parameter k determining key sizes, block sizes, etc.

We may also regard an instance of the IF as an oracle. Its state consists of `log` and `protstore`, which grow in proportion to the number of queries (ignoring repeated `iattest(v)` queries). The definition of δ here depends on the parameters F_{log} determining tags, and the family of distributions D_{ℓ, P_s, P_r} , since these determine the resulting state σ_{j+1} and the result r_{j+1} which is either a tag τ or handle η .

For this section we identify the instruction `protect-for` with `iattest`; we identify `check-attest` with `icheck`, and so forth.

Our CAIF and IF oracles always take queries of the form (c, p) , where c is a syntactic object we call a command and p is a service principal (i.e. a service hash). We follow the practice of Chapter 2 in writing behaviors in the form $\langle (c_j, p_j, r_j) \rangle_{j < i}$ rather than $\langle ((c_j, p_j), r_{j+1}) \rangle_{j < i}$ as in the definition above.

Lemmas 1–3 establish some properties that the IF satisfies, and here we introduce some related properties that CAIF devices achieve. The first two are absolute rather than probabilistic, and express the same properties established

in Lemma 1, item 1 and Lemma 2 item 1, resp. The remaining properties define approximations. We will show that CAIF devices with good crypto primitives achieve tight approximations.

An adversary A is a randomized algorithm with access to an oracle. When A is an adversary, $A_{q,t}$ denotes the adversary A except that it immediately halts if it exceeds q oracle queries or t computational steps. Further, we regard adversaries as possibly stateful machines that may operate in phases; the $A_{q,t}$ notation in this case means that all phases of A 's execution combined may make at most q oracle queries and may take at most t computational steps, or the adversary immediately halts.

Definition 4 (CAIF properties) *Let $\{C\}_k$ be a CAIF functionality and let k be a security parameter for which C_k is defined.*

1. A respects attestation log correctness iff, for all $\mathcal{H} = \langle (c_i, p_i, r_i) \rangle_i$ such that $(-, \mathcal{H}) \leftarrow A^{C_k(\cdot)}$, for all i and $j > i$, $c_i = \text{iattest}(v)$ and $c_j = \text{icheck}(p_i, v, r_i)$, then $r_j = \text{true}$.
2. A respects protection log correctness iff, for all $\mathcal{H} = \langle (c_i, p_i, r_i) \rangle_i$ such that $(-, \mathcal{H}) \leftarrow A^{C_k(\cdot)}$, for all i and $j > i$, $c_i = \text{iprotect}(p_j, v)$ and $c_j = \text{iretrieve}(p_i, r_i)$, then $r_j = v$.
3. The attestation unforgeability advantage of A is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{a-u}(A, C, k, q, t) &= \Pr[(p, v, \tau); \mathcal{H}] \leftarrow A_{q,t}^{C_k(\cdot)} : \\ &\quad \exists i. \forall j < i. (\text{icheck}(p, v, \tau), p', \text{true}) \in_i \mathcal{H} \wedge \\ &\quad (\text{iattest}(v), p, \tau) \notin_j \mathcal{H} \end{aligned}$$

4. The protection unforgeability advantage of A is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{p-u}(A, C, k, q, t) &= \Pr[(p, v, \eta); \mathcal{H}] \leftarrow A_{q,t}^{C_k(\cdot)} : \\ &\quad \exists i. \forall j < i. (\text{iretrieve}(p, \eta), p', v) \in_i \mathcal{H} \wedge \\ &\quad (\text{iprotect}(v, p'), p, \eta) \notin_j \mathcal{H} \end{aligned}$$

5. Let algorithm $P^{(\cdot)}(m, p_s, p_r)$ query its oracle with $(\text{iprotect}(p_r, m), p_s)$, receive result η , and then terminate with an answer we ignore. The protection unforgeability advantage of A is $\text{Adv}_{p-c}(A, C, k, q, t) = |p_0 - p_1|$ where:

$$\begin{aligned} p_b &= \Pr[(m_0, m_1, p_s, p_r, \alpha) \leftarrow A_{q,t}^{C_k(\cdot)}(\perp); \\ &\quad (-, \langle (\text{iprotect}(p_r, m_b), p_s, \eta) \rangle) \leftarrow P^{C_k}(m_b, p_s, p_r); \\ &\quad (x; \mathcal{H}) \leftarrow A_{q,t}^{C_k(\cdot)}(\alpha, \eta) : \\ &\quad x = 1 \wedge |m_0| = |m_1| \wedge (\text{iretrieve}(p_s, \eta), p_r) \notin \text{query}(\mathcal{H}) \end{aligned}$$

We first prove the two absolute properties, since these are very simple.

Lemma 4 A CAIF device in which mac_h is a (deterministic) function respects attestation log correctness.

Proof: Follows immediately by the function property of mac_h . ///

We say that an encryption algorithm $(\text{enc}_h, \text{dec}_h)$ satisfies perfect decryption iff, whenever $\eta \leftarrow \text{enc}_h(m, k)$, $\text{dec}_h(\eta, k)$ succeeds and $\text{dec}_h(\eta, k) = m$.

Lemma 5 A CAIF device in which $(\text{enc}_h, \text{dec}_h)$ satisfy perfect decryption respects protection log correctness.

Proof: Follows immediately from the definition of perfect decryption. ///

4.2 The cryptographic primitives

To prove that the CAIF construction satisfies these properties, we must first state the properties we assume about the cryptographic primitives we use in the construction. The cryptographic primitives we rely on, for a given security parameter k , are:

kdf_h : a keyed function $\text{kdf}_h : \{0, 1\}^k \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^k$;

mac_h : a keyed function $\text{mac}_h : \{0, 1\}^k \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\text{taglen}}$, for some tag length taglen

enc_h : a randomized authenticated encryption function $\text{enc}_h : \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\{0, 1\}^*)$.

dec_h : the corresponding decryption function $\text{dec}_h : \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^k \rightarrow \{\perp\} \cup \{0, 1\}^*$. We assume that $r \rightarrow \text{enc}_h(p, sk)$ implies $\text{dec}_h(r, sk) = p$, called the *perfect decryption assumption*.

The quality of each of these functions is determined by an *advantage* that the adversary may have using this function, defined in terms of the intent of each.

The key distribution function kdf_h . Let R_k be an oracle mapping arbitrary-length inputs to outputs of length k at random. The *pseudorandomness advantage* of kdf_h is the function:

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{prf}}(A, \text{kdf}_h, k, q, t) = |\Pr[sk \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^k : A_{q,t}^{\text{kdf}_h(sk, \cdot)} = 1] - \Pr[A_{q,t}^{R_k(\cdot)} = 1]|.$$

Ideally, when this advantage is negligible for polynomial time A as k increases, then kdf_h is pseudorandom. A good CAIF implementation offers only a small advantage.

The message authentication code. The *existential unforgeability advantage* of mac_h for security parameter k is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{eu\text{-}mac}(A, \text{mac}_h, k, q, t) = & \Pr[sk \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^k; \\ & ((v, \tau), \mathcal{H}) \leftarrow A_{q,t}^{\text{mac}_h(sk, \cdot)} : \\ & \text{mac}_h(sk, v) = \tau \wedge \text{mac}_h(v) \notin \text{query}(\mathcal{H})] \end{aligned}$$

Guessing a tag without making any queries results in an advantage of 2^{-t} .

The symmetric encryption operations. An ideal $\mathcal{E} = (\text{enc}_h, \text{dec}_h)$ offers, in addition to perfect decryption, also chosen ciphertext indistinguishability, and ciphertext unforgeability.

The *chosen ciphertext indistinguishability advantage* of A against \mathcal{E} is:

$$\text{Adv}_{indCCA2}(A, \mathcal{E}, k, q, t) = |p_0 - p_1|$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p_b = & \Pr[sk \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^k; \\ & (m_0, m_1, \alpha) \leftarrow A_{q,t}^{\mathcal{E}(sk, \cdot)}; \\ & c \leftarrow \text{enc}_h(k, m_b) : \\ & (x; \mathcal{H}) \leftarrow A_{q,t}^{\mathcal{E}(k, \cdot)}(c, \alpha) : \\ & x = 1 \wedge |m_0| = |m_1| \wedge \text{dec}_h(c) \notin \text{query}(\mathcal{H})]. \end{aligned}$$

The *ciphertext unforgeability advantage* of A against \mathcal{E} is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{eu\text{-}enc}(A, \mathcal{E}, k, q, t) = & \Pr[sk \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^k; \\ & (c; \mathcal{H}) \leftarrow A_{q,t}^{\mathcal{E}(sk, \cdot)}; \\ & m \leftarrow \text{dec}_h(sk, c) : m \neq \perp \wedge \text{enc}_h(m) \notin \mathcal{H}]. \end{aligned}$$

4.3 Proving the properties

Now we can state and prove the properties defined in terms of advantages.

Lemma 6 CAIF *satisfies attestation unforgeability. Let k be a security parameter for which CAIF is defined.*

There are reductions $\Gamma_{1,q}$ and Γ_2 with additive computational overhead $t_1(k, q)$ and $t_2(k, q)$ respectively, such that for any A ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{a\text{-}u}(A, \text{CAIF}, k, q, t) \leq & q \text{Adv}_{eu\text{-}mac}(\Gamma_{1,q}(A), \text{mac}_h, k, q, t + t_1(k, q)) + \\ & \text{Adv}_{prf}(\Gamma_2(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_2(k, q)) \end{aligned}$$

Proof: The reduction $\Gamma_{1,q}$ is as follows. First we pick an index i in the range $1 \leq i \leq q$. Then we emulate CAIF for A , except in two ways. First, we use R_k in place of the key derivation function. Second, $\Gamma_{1,q}$ has a MAC oracle which is used to implement attestation-related queries involving the i th unique principal identifier for which A makes either a **attest** or a **check-attest** query. Call this principal p_i .

For all **attest** operations for p_i on value v , $\Gamma_{1,q}$ uses its own oracle on input v and returns that value to A . For all **check-attest** queries for p_i on value v and tag τ , $\Gamma_{1,q}$ uses its own oracle on input v and returns 1 if and only if the result is equal to τ .

When A returns its output, if the output is (p_i, v, τ) , then $\Gamma_{1,q}$ returns (v, τ) , otherwise $\Gamma_{1,q}$ returns \perp , a default answer which is not a forgery.

The running time of $\Gamma_{1,q}(A)$ is the running time of A plus only time to select i , track A 's queries, and prepare the return value; call this $t_1(k, q)$.

The reduction Γ_2 operates with an oracle that may either be $\text{kdf}_h(IS, \cdot)$ or R_k . It emulates CAIF for A , using its oracle in place of the key derivation function. When A outputs a triple (p, v, τ) , Γ_2 does one additional operation, namely **check-attest** (p, v, τ) , receiving the answer b . Γ_2 then outputs 1 if (1) $b = 1$ but (2) A never called **attest** (p, v) as a query during its run, otherwise it outputs 0.

The running time of $\Gamma_2(A)$ is the running time of A plus only the steps needed to do these extra calculations; call this time $t_2(k, q)$.

Let P be the probability that A succeeds in forging given the simulation of CAIF that is run by $\Gamma_{1,q}$. Note that

$$|\text{Adv}_{a-u}(A, \text{CAIF}, k, q) - P| \leq \text{Adv}_{\text{prf}}(\Gamma_2(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_2(k, q)).$$

Further, the probability that A succeeds in forging when run within $\Gamma_{1,q}$ for principal p_i is P/q , since the index i is independent of the entire run of A . But P/q is thus equal to $\text{Adv}_{\text{eu-mac}}(\Gamma_{1,q}(A), \text{mac}_h, k, q)$.

Therefore if $P' = \text{Adv}_{a-u}(A, \text{CAIF}, k, q)$ then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |P' - P| &\leq \text{Adv}_{\text{prf}}(\Gamma_2(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_2(k, q)) \\ P' - P &\leq \text{Adv}_{\text{prf}}(\Gamma_2(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_2(k, q)) \\ P' &\leq q(P/q) + \text{Adv}_{\text{prf}}(\Gamma_2(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_2(k, q)) \\ &\leq q \text{Adv}_{\text{eu-mac}}(\Gamma_{1,q}(A), \text{mac}_h, k, q, t + t_1(k, q)) + \\ &\quad \text{Adv}_{\text{prf}}(\Gamma_2(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_2(k, q)) \end{aligned}$$

as required. ///

Lemma 7 CAIF satisfies protection unforgeability, with $\mathcal{E} = (\text{enc}_h, \text{dec}_h)$. Let k be a security parameter for which CAIF is defined.

There are reductions $\Gamma_{3,q}$ and Γ_4 with additive computational overhead $t_3(k, q)$ and $t_4(k, q)$ respectively, such that for any A ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{p-u}(A, \text{CAIF}, k, q, t) &\leq q \text{Adv}_{eu-enc}(\Gamma_{3,q}(A), \mathcal{E}, k, q, t + t_3(k, q)) + \\ &\quad \text{Adv}_{prf}(\Gamma_4(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_4(k, q)) \end{aligned}$$

Proof sketch: The proof of this claim is nearly identical to the proof of Lemma 6, except that $\Gamma_{3,q}$ chooses an i and uses its oracles in place of queries involving the i th unique sender-receiver pair (p_s, p_r) in the queries A makes, and aborts if A returns a triple (p'_s, p'_r, η) with $p'_s \neq p_s$ or with $p'_r \neq p_r$, otherwise it returns η .

Similarly, Γ_4 runs A in its attack on CAIF and tests the output, returning 1 if the η returned represents a ciphertext forgery, or 0 otherwise.

Lemma 8 *CAIF satisfies protection confidentiality, with $\mathcal{E} = (\text{enc}_h, \text{dec}_h)$. Let k be a security parameter for which CAIF is defined.*

There are reductions $\Gamma_{5,q}$ and $\Gamma_{6,b}$ with additive computational overhead $t_5(k, q)$ and $t_6(k, q)$ respectively, such that for any A ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{p-c}(A, \text{CAIF}, k, q, t) &\leq q \text{Adv}_{indCCA2}(\Gamma_{5,q}(A), \mathcal{E}, k, q, t + t_5(k, q)) + \\ &\quad \text{Adv}_{prf}(\Gamma_{6,0}(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_6(k, q)) + \\ &\quad \text{Adv}_{prf}(\Gamma_{6,1}(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_6(k, q)) \end{aligned}$$

Proof: This proof also follows the proof of Lemma 6.

The reduction $\Gamma_{5,q}$ is as follows. First, we pick an index i in the range $1 \leq i \leq q$. Then we emulate CAIF for A except in two ways. First, we use R_k in place of the key derivation function. Second, $\Gamma_{5,q}$ has encryption and decryption oracles which are used to implement protection-related queries involving the i th unique pair of sender and receiver principal identifiers. Call this pair $(p_{s,i}, p_{r,i})$.

For all **protect-for** operations for $p_{s,i}$ on $(p_{r,i}, v)$, $\Gamma_{5,q}$ uses its encryption oracle on input v and returns that value. For all **retrieve-from** operations for $p_{r,i}$ on $(p_{s,i}, \eta)$, $\Gamma_{5,q}$ calls its decryption oracle on input η and returns that result.

When A returns a 4-tuple (m_0, m_1, p_s, p_r) , $\Gamma_{5,q}$ aborts as soon as it is known that $(p_s, p_r) \neq (p_{s,i}, p_{r,i})$, or if $|m_0| \neq |m_1|$. If it has not yet aborted, $\Gamma_{5,q}$ returns (m_0, m_1) and then continues with input c , which is provided to A and continues running A . When A completes, $\Gamma_{5,q}$ returns its output.

Note that $\Gamma_{5,q}(A)$ simply runs A plus some overhead for selecting i and handling the inputs and outputs as described; call this overhead $t_5(k, q)$.

We define reductions $\Gamma_{6,b}$ for each $b \in \{0, 1\}$ as follows. This reduction operates with an oracle that may either be $\text{kdf}_h(IS, \cdot)$ or R_k . It emulates CAIF for A using its oracle in place of the key derivation function. When A returns (m_0, m_1, p_s, p_r) , we calculate $c = \text{protect-for}(p_s, p_r, m_b)$, making one additional query to our oracle. We then output whatever A returns. Let the time for making this additional query and producing the output as described be called $t_6(k, q)$.

Let $P_{a,b}$ for $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$ be defined to be the probability that $A_{q,t}$ ultimately returns 1 in a run against CAIF where if $a = 1$ then R_k is used in place of the key derivation function, and where after $A_{q,t}$ outputs (m_0, m_1, p_s, p_r) , the value c given to $A_{q,t}$ as input is derived as $c = \mathbf{protect\text{-}for}(p_s, p_r, m_b)$.

Note that:

- For any b , $|P_{0,b} - P_{1,b}| = |P_{1,b} - P_{0,b}| = \mathbf{Adv}_{prf}(\Gamma_{6,b}(A), \mathbf{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_6(k, q))$.
- $|P_{0,0} - P_{0,1}| = \mathbf{Adv}_{p\text{-}c}(A, \mathbf{CAIF}, k, q, t)$.
- $|P_{1,0} - P_{1,1}|/q = \mathbf{Adv}_{indCCA2}(\Gamma_{5,q}(A), \mathcal{E}, k, q, t + t_5(k, q))$. This follows from the observation that the choice of the special index i is independent of the output A produces in this context.

We now prove the required inequality.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Adv}_{p\text{-}c}(A, \mathbf{CAIF}, k, q, t) &= |P_{0,0} - P_{0,1}| \\
&= |P_{0,0} - P_{0,1} + P_{1,0} - P_{1,0} + P_{1,1} - P_{1,1}| \\
&= |P_{1,0} - P_{1,1} + (P_{0,0} - P_{1,0}) + (P_{1,1} - P_{0,1})| \\
&\leq |P_{1,0} - P_{1,1}| + |P_{0,0} - P_{1,0}| + |P_{1,1} - P_{0,1}| \\
&\quad \text{by the triangle inequality.} \\
&= q\mathbf{Adv}_{indCCA2}(\Gamma_{5,q}(A), \mathcal{E}, k, q, t + t_5(k, q)) + \\
&\quad \mathbf{Adv}_{prf}(\Gamma_{6,0}(A), \mathbf{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_6(k, q)) + \\
&\quad \mathbf{Adv}_{prf}(\Gamma_{6,1}(A), \mathbf{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_6(k, q))
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ///

4.4 Proving implementation of the ideal functionality

The properties above help us state and prove a potent claim: that CAIF provides a secure implementation of the ideal functionality IF discussed in Chapter 2.

Specifically, let IF be the instance $\text{IF}[F_{log}, \{D_{\ell, P_s, P_r}\}]$ where, for a CAIF device with given crypto primitives and a particular intrinsic secret IS :

$$F_{log}(v, P) = \mathbf{mac}_h(sk, v) \text{ where } sk = \mathbf{kdf}_h(\mathbf{at}, IS, P);$$

$$D_{\ell, P_s, P_r} \text{ is the distribution generated by } \mathbf{enc}_h(0^\ell, sk) \text{ where } sk = \mathbf{kdf}_h(\mathbf{pf}, IS, P_s, P_r).$$

Note that $\mathbf{iprotect}$ could potentially fail to terminate, if $\forall c \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{enc}_h(sk, 0^\ell))$ we already have c occurring in a record in $\mathbf{protstore}$. However, this will not happen in the run of some oracle TM that is limited to q queries where $q < \min_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}, sk \in \{0,1\}^k} |\text{supp}(\mathbf{enc}_h(sk, 0^\ell))|$, which we will write $q < W$.

We can now state our main implementation claim:

Theorem 1 Let $\{C_k\}$ be a CAIF functionality and let k be a security parameter for which C is defined. Let $\text{Adv}_{\text{imp}}(A, C, k, q, t)$ be defined to be

$$|\Pr[A^{C_k(\cdot)} = 1] - \Pr[A^{\text{IF}_k(\cdot)} = 1]|.$$

There are reductions $\Gamma_{7,q}$, Γ_8 , $\Gamma_{9,q}$, and $\Gamma_{10,q}$ with computational overhead times $t_7(k, q)$, $t_8(k, q)$, $t_9(k, q)$, and $t_{10}(k, q)$ respectively, together with the reductions $\Gamma_{1,q}$, Γ_2 , $\Gamma_{3,q}$, and Γ_4 of Lemmas 6–7, s.t. for all $q < W$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\text{imp}}(A, \text{CAIF}, k, q, t) \leq & q^2 \text{Adv}_{\text{indCCA2}}(\Gamma_{7,q}(A), (\text{enc}_h, \text{dec}_h), k, q, t + t_7(k, q)) + \\ & \text{Adv}_{\text{prf}}(\Gamma_{10}(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q, t + t_8(k, q)) \\ & q^2 (\text{Adv}_{\text{eu-mac}}(\Gamma_{1,q}(\Gamma_{9,q}(A)), \text{mac}_h, k, q, t + t_9(k, q) + t_1(k, q))) + \\ & q (\text{Adv}_{\text{prf}}(\Gamma_2(\Gamma_{9,q}(A)), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_9(k, q) + t_2(k, q))) \\ & q^2 (\text{Adv}_{\text{eu-enc}}(\Gamma_{3,q}(\Gamma_{10,q}(A)), \mathcal{E}, k, q, t + t_{10}(k, q) + t_3(k, q))) + \\ & q (\text{Adv}_{\text{prf}}(\Gamma_4(\Gamma_{10,q}(A)), \text{kdf}_h, k, q + 1, t + t_{10}(k, q) + t_4(k, q))) \end{aligned}$$

Proof sketch:

Without getting into details about the particular reductions, the proof operates as a hybrid argument regarding four probabilities, namely the probabilities that $A^{\mathcal{O}_i(\cdot)}$ outputs 1 for various oracles \mathcal{O}_i for $0 \leq i \leq 3$. The oracles are defined as follows:

$\mathcal{O}_0 = \text{IF}$.

\mathcal{O}_1 implements IF, except that for **protect-for** queries, we select the candidate values c by encrypting the input value v rather than $0^{|v|}$.

\mathcal{O}_2 implements \mathcal{O}_1 except that it uses kdf_h with an intrinsic secret IS instead of using R_k .

$\mathcal{O}_3 = C_k$.

We then construct reductions appropriate for each gap:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Adv}_{\text{ind}}(A, \text{CAIF}, k, q) \\ \hline \underbrace{\Pr[A^{\mathcal{O}_0(\cdot)} = 1]}_{q^2 \text{Adv}_{\text{indCCA2}}(\Gamma_{7,q}(A))} \quad \underbrace{\Pr[A^{\mathcal{O}_1(\cdot)} = 1]}_{\text{Adv}_{\text{prf}}(\Gamma_8(A))} \quad \underbrace{\Pr[A^{\mathcal{O}_2(\cdot)} = 1]}_{q [\text{Adv}_{\text{a-u}}(\Gamma_{9,q}(A)) + \text{Adv}_{\text{p-u}}(\Gamma_{10,q}(A))]} \quad \Pr[A^{\mathcal{O}_3(\cdot)} = 1] \end{array}$$

The lemmas then allow us to bound the rightmost term. A brief description of the reductions follows.

$\Gamma_{7,q}$ is constructed to leverage any ability A has to distinguish between \mathcal{O}_0 and \mathcal{O}_1 . The reduction must make two guesses regarding the encryption key and the ciphertext for which an advantage may exist, which accounts for the q^2 factor on this term.

Γ_8 is constructed to leverage any ability A has to distinguish between \mathcal{O}_1 and \mathcal{O}_2 . Since the only distinction is the key derivation function, this is a distinguishing attack on the pseudorandomness of kdf_h .

$\Gamma_{9,q}$ and $\Gamma_{10,q}$ are constructed to leverage any ability A has to distinguish between \mathcal{O}_2 and \mathcal{O}_3 . The only difference between these two oracles is the use of the private state IF maintains, and any ability to distinguish them can only be queries for which the cryptography-based answer would differ from the state-based answer which would only be some kind of forgery, either an attestation forgery or a protection forgery. Each of these reductions predicts a particular query on which this forgery might occur, which accounts for the q factor here. Let $\Gamma_{9,q}$ be the reduction aiming for an attestation forgery and let $\Gamma_{10,q}$ be the reduction aiming for a protection forgery, with overhead $t_9(k, q)$ and $t_{10}(k, q)$ respectively.

This establishes that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{imp}(A, \text{CAIF}, k, q, t) \leq & q^2 \text{Adv}_{indCCA2}(\Gamma_{7,q}(A), (\text{enc}_h, \text{dec}_h), k, q, t + t_7(k, q)) + \\ & \text{Adv}_{prf}(\Gamma_8(A), \text{kdf}_h, k, q, t + t_8(k, q)) \\ & q(\text{Adv}_{a-u}(\Gamma_{9,q}(A), \text{CAIF}, k, q, t + t_9(k, q))) + \\ & q(\text{Adv}_{p-u}(\Gamma_{10,q}(A), \text{CAIF}, k, q + 1, t + t_{10}(k, q))) \end{aligned}$$

and in turn, applying Lemma 6 and Lemma 7, establishes the desired inequality, substituting for the last two terms.

Hence, if CAIF is implemented with cryptography that meets the recommendations of Section 3.4:

Corollary 1 *If a CAIF device has pseudorandom kdf_h , collision-resistant mac_h and code hashing, and IND-CCA2 enc_h , then that CAIF device is computationally indistinguishable from an instance of IF.*

This proves that the CAIF instructions provide a cryptographic implementation of the ideal functionality IF supporting data provenance via logging and also data confidentiality (with provenance) via escrow using `iprotect`.

Part II

Assured Remote Execution via CAIF

Chapter 5

Our Strategy

In the remainder of the paper, we aim to show that the CAIF mechanism allows us to achieve assured remote execution, and reliably succeeds against a strong, code-selecting adversary in a rigorously verifiable way.

5.1 Achieving Assured Remote Execution

We build up our guarantees of assured remote execution in a succession of steps, and offer two versions.

In the first version, we provide a guarantee that does not depend on any digital signature algorithm to remain secure throughout a device lifetime. This version must establish a shared secret k_s used to provide trust in new signing keys for new signature algorithms whenever they are developed and deployed to the device, or whenever larger key sizes needed for the same algorithm.

The second version is simpler. For short-lived devices, which are assumed never to outlast the period of validity of the signature algorithm and key size favored at the time of initialization, we do not need the burden of a shared secret. In this case, we can effectively start near the end of the first strategy.

In either version, these steps must start off with an assumption. We will assume our device can be started running a known program at least once, at the beginning of its lifetime. The manufacturer must initialize the underlying hardware with a compliant program to run first. Naturally, the manufacturer must already be trusted to produce the hardware correctly, or monitored to ensure that it has, so this is not too large an additional demand.

Two different parties are involved in the early step, one being the device itself. Each CAIF device has a distinct, permanent identifying number we will call its *immutable identifier* $imid$. We regard the immutable identifier as a name of the device, and will often use $imid$ below as a name for the device with that immutable identifier. The $imids$, like other names, may be publicly known.

The other party is an authority that will control this device, which we will call the *device authority* DA . The DA comes to share a secret k_s in step 1, and

will need to store it securely and make it available for subsequent steps, which may occur much later. To ease managing these secrets for a group containing many devices, we will regard each k_s as derived from a group seed using the individual device's *imid* for differentiation.

The anchor service of step 1 must run *only* in a context suitable for secure initialization. We recommend that devices are built with a way to ensure that when it has succeeded, a state change can ensure that it will not execute again. This may be a switch or a wire that can be fused after initialization.

The succession of steps, thus, starts with the assumption 0, and in the first version involves:

0. We assume *local* execution of a single service, specifically at the time of initialization, in a context suitable for secure initialization.
1. The *anchor service* is this first initializing service. The *DA* controlling the device and the anchor service establish a secret k_s shared between *DA* and the device. The anchor service protects k_s for the exclusive use of a particular recipient service svc_1 . It then zeros its memory and exits.

A state change prevents subsequent execution of the anchor service.

Step 1 enables assured *remote* execution, but only for a single service, namely svc_1 . Moreover, only the *DA* can interpret the evidence of assured remote execution, which will be delivered in an authenticated encryption using k_s .

2. We design svc_1 to be a service that receives authenticated requests from *DA*; each request specifies a service hash sh for which to prepare a new shared secret. We call svc_1 the *symmetric distributor service*. The symmetric distributor service generates a symmetric key $kdf(k_s, sh)$, which it protects for the exclusive use of the service with hash sh . It then zeros its memory and exits.

Step 2 enables assured remote execution for *any* service with hash sh via an instance using that sh . However, as in step 1, only the *DA* can interpret the evidence, inferring the assured remote execution of sh .

To enable peers not holding the shared secrets to infer assured remote execution, we take two further steps. They establish a *signing key delegation service*. They may occur near the time of initialization or long afterwards, possibly repeatedly during the device's lifetime with varying algorithms or key sizes.

Suppose that a signing algorithm has been selected, and suitable programs are installed on the device, possibly by recent downloads.

3. A *set-up service* with hash sh generates a signature key pair (dk, dvk) . It interacts with a certifying authority *CA* operated by *DA* using the shared secret $kdf(k_s, sh)$, providing a proof that it holds the signing key dk , and obtaining a certificate that associates the verification key dvk with a service hash dsh , the device's *imid*, and some supplemental values. The

set-up service protects dk for the exclusive use of the service dsh . It then zeros its memory, and exits.

4. The service with hash dsh acts as follows. When invoked with a target service hash sh , it generates a new signing key pair (sk, vk) . It emits a certificate-like association $\llbracket \dots imid, sh, vk, \dots \rrbracket_{dk}$ signed with dk . It protects sk for the exclusive use of the service sh . It then zeros its memory, and exits.

After step 4, any party willing to rely on certificates from this CA can interpret evidence for assured remote execution by any service sh on $imid$. Suppose the code that hashes to sh uses its sk value for signing and never discloses it. Now whenever (i) the CA 's certificate, (ii) the association $\llbracket \dots imid, sh, vk, \dots \rrbracket_{dk}$, and (iii) a signed message $\llbracket m_0 \rrbracket_{sk}$ are all observed, then service sh on $imid$ will have generated the signature $\llbracket m_0 \rrbracket_{sk}$. Thus, sh is assured as executing remotely.

If it will not be necessary to use the device past any algorithm/key-size transition, then a simpler protocol requiring no shared secrets suffices. It starts from the same assumption, and then jumps to the set-up service:

0. We assume *local* execution of a single service, specifically at the time of initialization, in a context suitable for secure initialization.
- 3'. The first, initializing service is a *set-up service* with hash suh . It relies on the secure initialization context to provide an authenticated channel to the CA operated by the DA , and thus does not need a shared secret like $kdf(k_s, suh)$.

It generates a signature key pair (dk, dvk) . It provides a proof that it holds the signing key dk , and obtaining a certificate that associates the verification key dvk with a service hash dsh , the device's $imid$, and some supplemental values. The set-up service protects dk for the exclusive use of the service dsh . It then zeros its memory, and exits.

- 4'. The signing key delegation service with hash dsh is unchanged. It acts as in item 4 as above.

In this version, no assured remote execution guarantee can be reestablished if the signature algorithm or key sizes used in steps 3'–4' ever prove inadequate. However, not having to maintain the shared secret k_s and protect its derivatives $kdf(k_s, sh)$ is a real advantage if the device's lifetime will be short.

5.2 The adversary

Our adversary model is strong. The adversary may install programs on our CAIF devices, and execute them as services. The adversary's programs may use **protect-for** and the other CAIF instructions whenever desired. The adversary can also run our services, unless special provisions prevent some of them from running in particular circumstances, as was the case with anchoring (Chapter 6). The only more general constraints are:

- The active service hash in a CAIF instruction will be the hash of the actual contents of that executable. In particular, assuming the hash function is collision resistant, either:
 - the adversary is executing one of our programs, which obeys its stipulated behavior; or else
 - the active service hash will be different from the hashes of our programs.
- The adversary’s calls to `protect-for` etc. may use any arguments to which the adversary can obtain access, though only those.

We model our analysis on the ideal functionality IF, since by Cor. 1, all adversary observations and compliant behaviors are overwhelmingly likely to be compatible with this.

5.3 Formalizing the adversary

To represent this adversary model, we introduce a predicate of code hashes, `compliant`, true (intuitively speaking) of the hashes of programs that we have vetted. When we assume a service hash sh is `compliant`, the consequence is:

- every use of the CAIF instructions with active service hash sh will be part of an instance of some specified role,

where we have specified a number of roles that represent the behaviors defined in Sections 7.3 and 6.1.

Wildcat roles. We specify the adversary’s powers—beyond the usual network adversary’s powers to interrupt, redirect, and synthesize messages, to extract and retain their contents, and to execute cryptographic operations using any keys they may possess—by three *wildcat* roles with names beginning `wc-`, so-called because they may use the IF instructions in whatever unexpected patterns would benefit the adversary:

wc-protect, causes an `iprotect` instruction with current service sh_s , recipient sh_r , and value v into an escrow record in the protected store `protstore`, yielding handle h .

wc-retrieve, which causes an `iretrieve` instruction and transmits the value v for further adversary use, if the current service is sh_r , the intended source is sh_s , and h is the handle for v escrowed for sh_r by sh_s in the protected store `protstore`.

wc-attest, which causes an `iattest` instruction, storing a log record for v with the current service sh_s to be deposited in the `log`.

A wildcat role for `check-attest` is unnecessary in this context, because it is a conditional that produces no new kinds of data, and the relevant cases can be represented for protocol analysis via pattern matching.

Rules constraining the wildcat roles. The wildcat roles are constrained by rules that stipulates that if sh is a **compliant** service hash, then instances of the wildcat role with current service parameter sh do not occur. As a consequence, CAIF instructions with these **compliant** current services occur *only* in roles that represent the rule-bound, non-wildcat roles to be described in subsequent sections.

Chapter 6

Anchoring a CAIF Device

When a CAIF device has been manufactured and arrives at the warehouse of the purchaser—or alternatively, when it is ready to be shipped—it can be *anchored*.

The anchoring process requires us to run a known program on the new, fresh CAIF device. We must run that program in a secure environment, in which we have a protected channel for communications with the device. In Section 6.1 we need an authenticated and confidential bidirectional channel, and in Section 7.6 it need only be an authenticated channel from the device. To achieve this with sufficient confidence may require an environment in which shielded cables connect us with a known device, or in which wireless communications are shielded in a Faraday cage. Thus, we will call this the *ceremony in the metal room*.

6.1 Anchoring with Shared Secrets

Anchoring delivers a shared secret k_s , so that subsequent coordination between the device and an external authority can use k_s in constructing symmetric encryptions and MACs.

In this anchoring process, we will rely on the metal room to provide a channel between ourselves and the device d that provides *authentication* and *confidentiality* to each endpoint. These are reasonable assumptions, given that we can control what devices within the room may transmit messages, and (resp.) what devices may receive them.

The anchor service. The steps of anchoring are:

1. We turn on the device d and cause d to start the *symmetric anchor service* described here, with service hash *anch*.
2. We observe the device identifier *imid*, and prepare a secret seed r and a nonce n . We transmit

imid, anch, dstrh, n, r

where *dstrh* is the service hash of the program that we would like to enable to use the resulting shared secret, which will be defined:

$$k_s = \text{kdf}_h(r, \textit{imid}).$$

3. The service checks that its device has id *imid*, and that its own service hash is *anch*. It then computes $k_s = \text{kdf}_h(r, \textit{imid})$ and uses `protect-for` to protect k_s for the exclusive use of the service with the given service hash *dstrh*.
4. It replies with *n* to confirm completion; it zeroes its memory and exits.

In practice, the seed *r* may itself be derived from a group seed r_0 by differentiating it for *imid*, for instance using $r = \text{kdf}_h(r_0, \textit{imid})$. This eases managing the secrets long-term. The effect of this is that k_s will be available on *imid* only to the service with service hash *dstrh*.

When $r = \text{kdf}_h(r_0, \textit{imid})$, the shared secret $k_s = \text{kdf}_h(\text{kdf}_h(r_0, \textit{imid}), \textit{imid})$ involves *imid* twice. The inner *imid* ensures that *DA* never makes the seed available to any device, and no device can infer another's k_s . The outer *imid* simplifies analysis, since each device may be assured that any putative k_s , even if obtained from the adversary, is independent of the values of other devices.

We do need to ensure that the anchor service *anch* runs *only* with a secure channel to its peer. In practice this probably requires an irreversible state change in device *imid* after which the *anch* program will no longer accept messages.

This concludes the ceremony in the metal room, in the symmetric case. The service *dstrh* may, by contrast, use k_s permanently in the future, typically remotely, without needing any secure environment.

6.2 Analyzing symmetric anchoring

We turn now to analyzing the ceremony in the metal room.

Roles on the device represent the *anchor* service of Section 6.1, together with a role *dev-init-imid* to initialize a device's immutable ID *imid* to a fresh value. A pair of roles represent the *DA*'s interaction with the device. One does set-up to manage the shared secrets, creating a *group seed*. The shared secrets are derived from it by hashing with *imids*. A second *sends the anchor* secret during the ceremony in the metal room.

We verify several properties of this metal room layer, including that k_s and various derivatives of it remain unavailable to the adversary. These claims rely on the assumption that the anchor service hash *anch* is **compliant**, namely that the adversary cannot perform arbitrary actions under the service hash *anch*, as introduced in Section 5.3.

A significant verification at the metal room layer examines what must have happened if the device *anchor* role has run to completion. In this verification, we assume that the metal room provides a channel assuring both authenticity and confidentiality. We find that the anchor secret k_s is obtained from the




Figure 6.1: Metal room activity, symmetric anchoring

DA sending the derived key. The two parties agree on the device’s *imid*, having obtained it from the same device initialization. And the *DA* has properly derived the anchor secret from its group seed (Fig. 6.1).

In this figure, vertical columns represent the successive actions of a single instance of a role, which is named at the top, reading downwards along the double arrows; single arrows represent propagation of messages or values in the device-local state (`protect-for` records here on *imid*, secure seed storage at the *DA*). Message transmission and reception are shown as black nodes ● and blue nodes ●, resp. Local device state writes and reads are gray nodes ●. More comments on the diagrams we use appear at the end of Section 7.5.

In subsequent steps, when we add more roles to model subsequent activities we reverify these properties to ensure that protocol interactions do not undermine them.

6.3 Trust chains

Building on top of the anchoring protocols requires keeping track of the “chain of custody” for trust, meaning a sequence of services—starting from an anchor service—that may have used keys protected for them by their predecessors and generated keys that they protect for their successors. Generally, we store trust chains along with the keys that they validate in the records submitted to `protect-for`. We also deliver trust chains in messages between parties. This allows the parties to ensure that they agree on how the trustworthiness of a key traces back to the anchoring program.

Trust chains are effectively lists of service hashes. If *trch* is a trust chain, we represent the effect of pushing a new hash *h* to it as $h :: trch$, using a *cons* operation written $::$. We sometimes also write $\langle h_0, h_1, \dots, h_k \rangle$ as an equivalent to $h_0 :: \langle h_1, \dots, h_k \rangle$. Thus, h_k is the oldest entry.

We have successfully designed and verified protocols relying on trust chains of length up to five (see Section 7.3).

6.4 The symmetric key distributor service

The anchor service may be used with any choice of *dstrh*. However, a particularly useful choice of *dstrh* is a *symmetric key distributor service*. The symmetric key distributor program will retrieve the shared secret k_s and use it to decrypt a message that is thereby authenticated as coming from the *DA*. This message contains:

- a target service hash *acth* for which a new symmetric key $\text{kdf}_h(k_s, \text{acth})$ should be derived;
- a trust chain $\text{trch} = \langle \text{dstrh}, \text{anch} \rangle$;
- some message *payld* that should be passed to the service *acth* when it subsequently runs.

The distributor service checks its agreement with the trust chain, i.e. that its service hash is *dstrh* and it retrieved its k_s from the source service *anch*. If successful, the distributor service derives the new key $\text{kdf}_h(k_s, \text{acth})$, which the *DA* can also derive. It then protects the payload and this key for *acth*:

```
protect-for acth (imid, (acth :: trch), payld, kdf_h(k_s, acth)),
```

after which it zeroes its memory and exits. As a consequence, the *DA* now knows a secret, namely $\text{kdf}_h(k_s, \text{acth})$, which on the device *imid* can only be obtained by the service *acth*.

This in turn enables the *DA* to open a bidirectional authenticated, confidential channel to *imid* where only service *acth* can be the peer.

6.5 Analyzing symmetric key distribution

In this layer of analysis, we add a role representing the *symmetric key distributor* service on the device, together with a role *use-it* that retrieves the distributor's key and uses it generate a confirmation message. We also add a third role executed by the *DA*. It delivers the *distribution request* to the device for a run of the distributor service with a target *acth*, and it terminates successfully after receiving a confirmation message from *acth*.

Assuming that the distribution request selects **compliant** code hashes for *anch*, *dstrh*, and the target service *acth*, the distribution service will be using a k_s generated by the behavior in Fig. 6.1; it handles the request and derives a key for *acth*. The latter uses the key to prepare a confirmation for the requester (Fig. 6.2). The value *seed* is stored in state in the *DA*, while the value k_s is stored in the device state inside a *protect-for* record, generated in the lower left node of Fig. 6.1.

Omitting the assumption that *acth* is **compliant**, a separate analysis shows that, in addition to Fig. 6.2, **wc-retrieve** can alternatively expose the derived key. This is the expected effect, given our strong adversary model.




Figure 6.2: Distributor request

One aspect of Fig. 6.2 deserves emphasis. Because arrows point out of the box at the upper right, the behaviors in the remainder of the diagram cannot come before the anchoring ceremony. But because no arrows point *into* the box at the upper right, the anchoring ceremony behaviors may come as long as desired before the remainder of the diagram.

Hence, the distributor may be used to set up keys for software at any time after the ceremony in the metal room, e.g. long after the device has arrived in orbit on a satellite. This functionality assures remote execution with no subsequent local contact.

Chapter 7

Delegating Signing Keys

Suppose that (dk, dvk) is a signature key pair for some signing algorithm. We call the signing key dk a *delegation key* and the verification key dvk a *delegation verification key* if dk is available only to a service—called a *delegation service*, identified by a service hash dsh —that behaves as follows:

1. When requested to generate a signing key for a target service s identified by its service hash sh , the delegation service generates a fresh target signature key pair (sk, vk) .
2. The delegation service emits a certificate-like message associating $imid$, sh , and dsh with vk , signed by dk .

It stipulates that vk is a verification key whose signing key is available only to the service with service hash sh , and was generated by the current delegation service dsh . Other parameters may also appear in the certificate-like message.

We will call sk and vk a *delegated signing key* and *delegated verification key* resp. for sh .

3. The delegation service protects a record $\dots sk \dots$ containing the delegated signing key for sh 's exclusive use:

`protect-for sh ...sk...`

It then zeroes its unshared memory and exits.

Suppose the target service sh uses sk only to sign messages, without disclosing information about sk . Then any signed message $\llbracket m \rrbracket_{sk}$ that verifies using vk was signed by the target service s executing on the same device.

An observer with knowledge about the code with hash sh can thus draw conclusions about events on the device. Specifically, the observer is assured of the remote execution of sh on $imid$, which generated $\llbracket m \rrbracket_{sk}$.

A delegation service may be installed long after the device has been put into use, and while it is in a remote, uncontrolled environment. For instance, if new

digital signature algorithms are needed years after the device has been placed into service, a new delegation service based on those algorithms can be installed then. Multiple delegation services offering different algorithms may coexist, since they will have different hashes dsh_1, dsh_2 reflected in their certificates.

A delegation service may be developed independently of any of the target services that will use its delegated keys, and before them. Its service hash dsh may thus appear as a constant in the code of a target service sh , which, when retrieving its signing key from an encrypted record, will stipulate the authorized delegation service dsh .

Many refinements of this scheme are possible, differing—for instance—in what appears in the certificate-like signed message; in the authorization check before generating a delegated key; in what signature algorithms are used; and in how the delegation key dk is recognized by other parties.

Here, we consider having a certifying authority under the control of the device authority DA certify the delegation key dk . A *delegation set-up service* interacts with the CA , obtaining a certificate that allows other parties to recognize dk as a delegation key trusted by DA .

After identifying our assumptions and security goals (Sections 7.1–7.2), we first describe and analyze the scheme acting over a channel we simply assume to be authenticated as reaching the CA from the delegation set-up service on the device in question (Sections 7.3–7.4). We then modify the scheme to show a particular way to implement the authenticated channel using k_s and the symmetric key distributor, and enrich the analysis (Section 7.5). Section 7.6 considers how to use signature key delegation as an alternative to the anchoring described in Chapter 6, assuming that the device is short-lived, and will not outlive the digital signature algorithm used in this delegation service. In this case, the metal room itself provides the authenticated channel.

7.1 Assumptions for delegating signing keys

Our delegation scheme relies on the assumptions:

- (i) the certifying authority is uncompromised;
- (ii) the certifying authority interacts with the delegation set-up service on the device through an authenticated channel when doing the certification.

The anchoring in Chapter 6 provides ways to establish the authenticated channel, with a specific service as endpoint, required in Assumption (ii). Moreover, for a particular target service with service hash sh one may assume:

- (iii) the service with service hash sh ensures sk is used for signing messages, but not in any other way; hence sh does not disclose sk .

7.2 Security goal

Suppose three messages are observed: A digital certificate from *CA* associating the delegation verification key *dvk* with the service hash *dsh*; a delegation certificate $\llbracket \dots sh, dsh, vk, \dots \rrbracket_{dk}$ associating *vk* with service hash *sh*; and a signed message $m = \llbracket m_0 \rrbracket_{sk}$ that verifies under *vk*. Our *main security goal* is: When assumptions (i) and (ii) hold, and (iii) holds for this *sh*, then:

1. The delegation set-up service has generated *dk*, obtained the certificate on *dvk* and *dsh*, and protected *dk* solely for the delegation service *dsh*;
2. The delegation service *dsh* generated (*sk*, *vk*), emitted the certificate on *sh* and *vk*, and protected *sk* for the sole use of the service *sh*;
3. This service *sh* used *sk* to sign m_0 , yielding *m*.

The observer thus infers, subject to (i)–(iii), that the delegation process proceeded correctly, and that *sh* is responsible for m_0 .

This is the assured remote execution claim for m_0 .

7.3 Delegation over an authenticated channel

The scheme involves (1) a *delegation set-up service* with hash *suh*, (2) a *certifying authority CA*, (3) the *delegation service* itself with hash *dsh*; and (4) the *target services* with hashes sh_1, \dots, sh_n that will use delegated keys. The *CA* needs to receive the proof-of-possession message on an authenticated channel from *dsh* on *imid*.

The delegation set-up service. The delegation set-up service *suh* operating with a generic authenticated channel on device *imid* does this:

1. It obtains a *certify request* (ultimately from the *CA*) containing:

$$imid, dsh, suh, trch, serial, CA,$$

checking that *suh* is its code hash and *imid* is its device. The resulting certificate will contain the serial number *serial*, and *trch* is a trust chain as in Section 6.3.

2. It generates a signing key pair (*dk*, *dvk*).
3. It transmits a proof-of-possession message on the authenticated channel:

$$\llbracket serial, imid, dsh, suh, trch, dvk \rrbracket_{dk}$$

4. It executes **protect-for** with target service *dsh* on a record containing *imid*, the trust chain $dsh :: suh :: trch$, and (*dk*, *dvk*).
5. It receives the resulting certificate $\llbracket imid, dsh, suh, trch, serial, dvk \rrbracket_{CA}$.

The certifying authority for delegation keys. The certifying authority *CA* for delegation keys starts with an *imid* for a device to receive a delegation certificate, together with hashes *suh* and *dsh* for the set-up service and delegation service. It also receives a trust chain *trch* leading back to an anchor program, as in Section 6.3. Then:

1. It sends a certify request containing:

$$imid, dsh, suh, trch, serial, CA$$

where *serial* is a fresh serial number for the resulting certificate.

2. It receives a proof-of-possession report signed by the delegation key *dk*:

$$\llbracket serial, imid, dsh, suh, trch, dvk \rrbracket_{dk}$$

This is received on an authenticated channel with source *suh* on *imid*.

3. The *CA* emits a certificate

$$\llbracket imid, dsh, suh, trch, serial, dvk \rrbracket_{CA}$$

binding the delegation verification key *dvk* to the hash *dsh* of the delegation program, as well as other values: the trust chain, the device *imid* on which the delegation set-up program is running and the serial number *serial*. It is signed by the *CA* private signing key.

The delegation service. When delegation set-up has completed, the delegation service with service hash *dsh* can now run. The part of its behavior that matters is straightforward:

1. It retrieves the key record from intended source *suh*, checking the embedded trust chain $dsh :: suh :: trch$;
2. It generates a key pair (*sk*, *vk*) and protects it for a service *s* with a service hash *sh*, along with the extended trust chain $sh :: dsh :: suh :: trch$;
3. It emits a certificate-like signed message binding *vk* to *sh* on device *imid*:

$$\llbracket imid, sh, dsh :: suh :: trch, n, vk \rrbracket_{dk},$$

where *n* is a fresh value like a serial number. A recipient can appraise the trustworthiness of this claim based on the hashes *dsh*, *suh*, and *trch*.

Regardless of how the delegation service chooses when to generate and certify a delegated key—or which services and hashes merit this treatment—the protocol security goal given above is satisfied.

determines this is the only way that the certificates and signed message $\llbracket m_0 \rrbracket_{sk}$ can be observed, subject to (i)–(iii).

In Fig. 7.1, which slightly simplifies CPSA’s diagram, vertical columns represent the successive actions of a single instance of a role, reading downwards along the double arrows; single arrows represent propagation of messages or values in the device-local state (`protect-for` records here). Message transmission and reception are shown as black nodes \bullet and blue nodes \bullet , resp. Local device state writes and reads are gray nodes \bullet . The white node \circ and dashed line will be expanded subsequently (see Fig. 7.2).

Fig. 7.1 shows that in this scenario, $\llbracket m_0 \rrbracket_{sk}$ was in fact generated by the expected (rightmost) role instance *sh*, which obtained its key from the delegation service to its left; that in turn generated the certificate on *vk* and obtained its signing key *dk* from the delegation set-up service preceding it, which in fact interacted with the *CA* to generate the certificate.

Assured remote execution. Fig. 7.1 shows, subject to assumptions (i)–(iii), that messages signed by *sk* are generated by the known program *sh* operating on device *imid*, the basic assured remote execution guarantee.

Familiar techniques allow us to build authenticated and confidential channels to *sh* on top of this conclusion, such as the Station-to-Station protocol [14] or using *m₀* to send a public key for a Key Encapsulation Mechanism [41].

7.5 Adapting delegation to the anchor

The anchoring ceremony in the metal room provides a shared secret k_s with the device authority *DA*, and the symmetric key distributor can differentiate this to a key $k_{sud} = \text{kdf}_h(k_s, \text{su}h)$ that *su**h* and the *DA* can use to provide the authenticated channel to the *DA*’s certificate authority.

When the symmetric key distributor receives a command from the *DA* to generate a derived key, the message also contains a payload from that should be passed to the target service when it subsequently runs (Section 6.4). We instantiate the payload as the *CA*’s certify request *imid*, *dsh*, *su**h*, *trch*, *serial*, *CA*. The delegation set-up service retrieves this, together with a trust chain *trch*’ and the derived key k_{sud} , using `retrieve-from`. The trust chain *trch* represents the *DA*’s choice of an acceptable chain of custody for k_{sud} , while *trch*’ contains its actual history, as analysis will confirm.

Since *anch*, *dstrh*, *su**h*, and *dsh* are all present in the certificate on *dvk* and the certificate-like association, we analyze this assuming all these service hashes are **compliant**. A consumer may trust the *CA* not to emit a certificate unless the trust chain it contains is acceptable to the device authority *DA*.

With the additional assumption that the target service hash *sh* is **compliant**, analysis yields a single possibility shown in Fig. 7.2 that enriches the Fig. 7.1 as expected. The certificate request is transmitted on the arrow from the *CA* to the symmetric key distributor *dstr* encrypted under k_s . The *dstr* protects the certificate request and its actual trust chain, together with k_{sud} for retrieval by




Figure 7.2: Message signed with delegated key, with anchoring

the set-up service. A systematic theory of protocol transformation that would allow us to instantiate channels in this way would be desirable, and some work in this direction has occurred.

About the diagrams. In the figures, we have redrawn and simplified the diagrams that CPSA generates itself. We have reordered some role instances to show related activities more clearly. We have grouped repetitions of Fig. 6.1 to show them as a single box. We have also combined adjacent state nodes that are distinct for CPSA. If two data values are loaded from distinct state locations, CPSA treats these as separate events, but we have combined them in our diagrams, for instance the *imid* value and the *ks* value.

CPSA also treats every state transition as a sequence of two or more nodes in which values are loaded from state locations first, after which the new values are stored into state locations. In fact, a transition in which the old value in a location is ignored and overwritten is written as a pair in which an ignored value is read after which a value is stored. In our diagrams we have shown only the storing event.

CPSA also emits information about the messages transmitted and received, etc., the relevant part of which appears only in accompanying text.

7.6 Anchoring with digital signatures

If we choose to use digital signatures as our anchoring method, the anchoring ceremony is simple:

1. We turn on the device d and cause d to start the *delegation set-up service* of Section 7.3.
2. We will supply a peer playing the role of the *certifying authority*.
3. Section 7.3 requires an authenticated channel for messages known to originate from the delegation set-up service on d to our CA. Since we have caused d to start this service on its initial power-up, the metal room ensures that the messages really come from it.

As a consequence, we may infer that when the delegation key dk produces signed messages $\llbracket imid, sh, dsh::suh::trch, n, vk \rrbracket_{dk}$, the security goal given in Section 7.2 holds. In this case, there is no trust information needed beyond dsh and suh , i.e. we choose $trch = \langle \rangle$ to be the empty trust chain.

There are several advantages to anchoring with digital signatures:

- We do not need to retain and protect any shared secret. One would otherwise run the risk of the shared secret becoming inaccessible, or being exposed to an adversary.
- Different parties can receive and interpret messages signed with sk , using the public key certificate to establish trust.
- The protocol analysis is very simple.

There is, however, a major drawback also. This method does not provide any long-term way to reestablish trust in case the digital signature algorithm used in anchoring is subsequently deprecated, or if the security parameter is thought to be inadequate.

Chapter 8

Related Work

Our work cuts across several areas. We offer hardware security akin to existing Trusted Execution Environment (TEE), but with the `protect-for` mechanism. We justify our design via a cryptographic proof that it simulates its ideal functionality. We show its utility by developing specific protocols for assured remote execution; our protocol development process was shaped by the symbolic analysis tool CPSA. Thus, we will discuss related work concerning TEEs, ideal functionality methods, and symbolic protocol analysis.

8.1 Trusted Execution Environments

CAIF is a kind of Trusted Execution Environment (TEE), like Intel’s SGX and TDX [12, 22], AMD’s SEV [23], and academic mechanisms such as Sancus [32, 33] or Keystone and Sanctum for RISC-V [13, 25]. For a recent survey on TEEs and the implementation choices they make, see Schneider et al. [40]. They identify four main security properties from which TEEs select their goals; they state these as:

- (i) verifiable launch of the execution environment for the sensitive code and data so that a remote entity can ensure that it was set up correctly, (ii) run-time isolation to protect the confidentiality and integrity of sensitive code and data, (iii) trusted IO to enable secure access to peripherals and accelerators, and finally, (iv) secure storage for TEE data that must be stored persistently and made available only to authorized entities at a later point in time. ([40, p. 1])

Item (i) is a weak, launch-time version of assured remote execution; (ii) is the category that covers the address space requirements (1–2) we gave in Section 2.2; (iii) is a useful property, but beyond the current goals of CAIF; and CAIF addresses (iv) in a distinctive way, namely via data escrow, i.e. `protect-for`.

The CAIF design inherits many aspects previous TEEs introduced. The `protect-for` category is one mechanism available in SGX, and is featured in Sancus. An intrinsic secret used for key derivation is present in SGX; a shared secret

such as k_s in our Section 6.1 is present in Sancus. Indeed, some mechanisms aim to provide software-independent assurance of interaction with a particular TEE, notably Sancus, in which assured remote execution is achievable without asymmetric cryptography in the trust mechanism.

However, our data escrow mechanism, implemented in `protect-for`, is distinctive. The computation of the `protect-for` key $\text{kdf}_h(\text{"pf"}, IS, src, dst)$, while straightforward, appears not to have been considered in any previous TEE design. Nor could we build something similar on top of the SGX `egetkey` primitive. When executed by the data source, this primitive builds in its identity, yielding a value like $\text{kdf}_h(\text{"pf"}, IS, src)$. When executed by the data destination, it builds in the receiving identity, yielding $\text{kdf}_h(\text{"pf"}, IS, dst)$. Apparently no shared secret can be built from these incomparable keys. For this reason, confidential delivery of data from one TEE to another appears to require asymmetric cryptography via key agreement or public key encryption. It is a new contribution of CAIF to allow confidential delivery between TEEs without any dependence on a long-term method for asymmetric cryptography.

We have seen the value of this mechanism in Chapters 6–7, which show how to use `protect-for` to install new digital signature services long after anchoring, allowing a device to generate and certify signing keys that can—demonstrably—be used only by a single service on the device.

8.2 Ideal functionality methods

In Chapter 4 we showed that a CAIF device, when implemented with strong cryptography, is indistinguishable from the ideal functionality IF. This justified us in modeling protocols with a simple, IF-style state-based treatment of the CAIF instructions. Corollary 1 ensures that no tractable observer can distinguish a CAIF device with strong cryptography from an IF in which data escrow and logging are simply implemented in secure state.

This style of reasoning derives ultimately from Goldreich, Goldwasser, and Micali’s classic treatment of random functions [17], in which they showed that a notion of pseudorandomness is indistinguishable from random for any tractable observer. The value of the approach was spectacularly confirmed in Canetti’s classic on Universal Composability [10], which showed a model in which a variety of functionalities could be securely implemented, thereby justifying their use in any higher level protocol. An enormous literature of applications, variants, and improvements ensued; our Theorem 1 being a small instance of this trend.

8.3 Protocol analysis

Analyzing security protocols has been a major undertaking since the 1980s, when authentication protocols were introduced [31]; Dolev and Yao soon suggested regarding cryptographic messages as forming a free algebra and using symbolic techniques [15]. A variety of formal approaches were developed along

these lines; e.g. [8, 28, 38]. Computational cryptography also suggests methods for protocol verification [5, 9]. This raises the question whether symbolic methods are faithful to the cryptographic specifics, with a number of approaches yielding affirmative results in some significant cases [1, 29, 3]. Our strategy of proving that CAIF is indistinguishable from a purely state-based ideal functionality supports the view that our symbolic protocol analysis is sound.

Thus, we need a protocol analysis that simultaneously represents reading and writing state and also sending and receiving cryptographic messages. State raises distinct problems from reasoning about cryptographic messages. These could be addressed in the context of Tamarin, whose model is fundamentally state-based, as it uses multiset rewriting as an underlying formalism [27]. However, CPSA also has a history of representing and reasoning about state transformations in a primarily message-based formalism [19, 37, 20]; its current treatment of state is documented in its manual [26, Ch. 8].

CPSA's usability is improved by having two modes. It can be used as a *model finder*, which computes the set of essentially different, minimal executions [18]. This is often useful in protocol design, since one can see exactly how much is achieved by a protocol that is not yet good enough to meet its goals. CPSA may also be used as a *theorem prover*, which will prove security goals proposed by its user or produce counterexamples when it runs to completion [39].

Chapter 9

Conclusion

We have introduced CAIF, a minimal hardware functionality to allow services to ensure the *provenance* of data, and to ensure *protection* making it available only to known peer services.

We proved CAIF uses cryptographic primitives to provide a secure implementation of an ideal functionality achieving these properties directly.

We then used the CAIF mechanism to design a sequence of protocols. These depend on an initial secure interaction, a ceremony in a protected space, which can establish a shared secret k_s with an authority. By protecting this key and a succession of its derivatives using the `protect-for` operation, we can construct a succession of channels to known services on the device. These channels may be used from distant locations, for instance if the device is on a satellite, to deliver new programs, and to offer assured remote execution for those programs.

Delegation services may be delivered to the device, to generate signing keys for new signing algorithms, and to provide certificate chains for the keys that associate them with specific services on the device. Thus, assured remote execution for those services is accessible to any peer receiving the certificates.

We have established some core needs for secure reprogramming. Namely, we can deliver new programs to a CAIF device, providing peers assurance of interacting with those new programs. Moreover, with Section 6.1's symmetric anchoring, this ability can outlast the safety of any asymmetric cryptography.

For all peers to know the new program they should interact with, however, imposes a major management burden. Indeed, in many attacks, the adversary benefits by forcing an old version to run even if no compliant peer would do so. Thus, secure reprogramming also requires a way to force an irreversible change. This irreversible change may prevent the old programs from running, or it may simply prevent them from obtaining the keys that previously let them authenticate themselves.

In either case, full secure reprogramming needs a mechanism beyond CAIF. This may require little more than monotonic counters and some constraints on which services can advance them. But that remains as future work.

Bibliography

- [1] Martín Abadi and Phillip Rogaway. Reconciling two views of cryptography (the computational soundness of formal encryption). *Journal of Cryptology*, 15(2):103–127, 2002.
- [2] Gorjan Alagic, Daniel Apon, David Cooper, Quynh Dang, Thinkh Dang, John Kelsey, Jacob Lichtinger, Carl Miller, Dustin Moody, Rene Peralta, Ray Perlner, Angela Robinson, Daniel Smith-Tone, and Yi-Kai Liu. Status report on the third round of the NIST post-quantum cryptography standardization process. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8413-upd1>, July 2022.
- [3] Gergei Bana and Hubert Comon-Lundh. A computationally complete symbolic attacker for equivalence properties. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 609–620, 2014.
- [4] David Basin, Cas Cremers, Jannik Dreier, and Ralf Sasse. Tamarin: verification of large-scale, real-world, cryptographic protocols. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 20(3):24–32, 2022.
- [5] Mihir Bellare and Phillip Rogaway. Entity authentication and key distribution. In *Advances in Cryptology – Crypto ’93 Proceedings*, number 773 in LNCS. Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [6] Karthikeyan Bhargavan, Abhishek Bichhawat, Quoc Huy Do, Pedram Hosseini, Ralf Küsters, Guido Schmitz, and Tim Würtele. A tutorial-style introduction to DY*. In *Protocols, Strands, and Logic*, volume 13066 of LNCS, pages 77–97. Springer, 2021.
- [7] Bruno Blanchet. Modeling and verifying security protocols with the applied pi calculus and proverif. *Foundations and Trends® in Privacy and Security*, 1(1):1–135, 2016. DOI: 10.1561/33000000004.
- [8] Bruno Blanchet, Ben Smyth, Vincent Cheval, and Marc Sylvestre. *ProVerif 2.00: automatic cryptographic protocol verifier, user manual and tutorial*. INRIA, 2018. <https://bblanche.gitlabpages.inria.fr/proverif/manual.pdf>.

- [9] R. Canetti and H. Krawczyk. Analysis of key-exchange protocols and their use for building secure channels. In *Advances in Cryptology—EUROCRYPT 2001*, LNCS, pages 453–474. Springer, 2001.
- [10] Ran Canetti. Universally composable security: A new paradigm for cryptographic protocols. In *Proceedings 42nd IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 136–145. IEEE, 2001. Extended version as of 2020 available at <https://eprint.iacr.org/2000/067.pdf>.
- [11] Pau-Chen Cheng, Wojciech Ozga, Enriquillo Valdez, Salman Ahmed, Zhongshu Gu, Hani Jamjoom, Hubertus Franke, and James Bottomley. Intel TDX demystified: A top-down approach. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2303.15540.pdf>, March 2023.
- [12] Victor Costan and Srinivas Devadas. Intel SGX explained. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2016/086, 2016. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2016/086>.
- [13] Victor Costan, Iliia A. Lebedev, and Srinivas Devadas. Sanctum: Minimal hardware extensions for strong software isolation. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 857–874, 2016.
- [14] Whitfield Diffie, Paul C. van Oorschot, and Michael J. Wiener. Authentication and authenticated key exchanges. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 2(2):107–125, 1992.
- [15] Daniel Dolev and Andrew Yao. On the security of public-key protocols. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 29:198–208, 1983.
- [16] William M. Farmer, Joshua D. Guttman, and Vipin Swarup. Security for mobile agents: Issues and requirements. In *19th National Information Systems Security Conference*. NIST, 1996.
- [17] Oded Goldreich, Shafi Goldwasser, and Silvio Micali. How to construct random functions. *J. ACM*, 33(4):792–807, aug 1986.
- [18] Joshua D. Guttman. Shapes: Surveying crypto protocol runs. In Veronique Cortier and Steve Kremer, editors, *Formal Models and Techniques for Analyzing Security Protocols*, Cryptology and Information Security Series. IOS Press, 2011. https://web.cs.wpi.edu/~guttman/pubs/shapes_surveying.pdf.
- [19] Joshua D. Guttman. State and progress in strand spaces: Proving fair exchange. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 48(2):159–195, 2012.
- [20] Joshua D Guttman, Moses D Liskov, John D Ramsdell, and Paul D Rowe. Formal support for standardizing protocols with state. In *Security Standardisation Research*, pages 246–265. Springer, 2015.

- [21] Joshua D. Guttman and John D. Ramsdell. Understanding attestation: Analyzing protocols that use quotes. In *Security and Trust Management*, volume 11738 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 89–106. Springer, 2019.
- [22] Intel trust domain extensions. <https://www.intel.com/content/dam/develop/external/us/en/documents/tdx-whitepaper-v4.pdf>, February 2022. ID 690419.
- [23] David Kaplan, Jeremy Powell, and Tom Woller. AMD memory encryption. <https://www.amd.com/content/dam/amd/en/documents/epyc-business-docs/white-papers/memory-encryption-white-paper.pdf>, October 2021.
- [24] Iliia Lebedev, Kyle Hogan, and Srinivas Devadas. Invited paper: Secure boot and remote attestation in the sanctum processor. In *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, pages 46–60. IEEE Computer Society, 2018.
- [25] Dayeol Lee, David Kohlbrenner, Shweta Shinde, Krste Asanovic, and Dawn Song. Keystone: an open framework for architecting trusted execution environments. In Angelos Bilas, Kostas Magoutis, Evangelos P. Markatos, Dejan Kostic, and Margo I. Seltzer, editors, *EuroSys '20*, pages 38:1–38:16. ACM, 2020.
- [26] Moses D. Liskov, John D. Ramsdell, Joshua D. Guttman, and Paul D. Rowe. *The Cryptographic Protocol Shapes Analyzer: A Manual for CPSA 4*. The MITRE Corporation, 2023. <https://github.com/mitre/cpsa/blob/master/doc/cpsa4manual.pdf>.
- [27] Simon Meier, Cas Cremers, and David Basin. Efficient construction of machine-checked symbolic protocol security proofs. *Journal of Computer Security*, 21(1):41–87, 2013.
- [28] Simon Meier, Benedikt Schmidt, Cas Cremers, and David Basin. The tamarin prover for the symbolic analysis of security protocols. In *Computer Aided Verification: 25th International Conference, CAV 2013, Saint Petersburg, Russia, July 13-19, 2013. Proceedings 25*, pages 696–701. Springer, 2013.
- [29] Daniele Micciancio and Bogdan Warinschi. Soundness of formal encryption in the presence of active adversaries. In *Theory of Cryptography Conference*, pages 133–151. Springer, 2004.
- [30] Moni Naor and Moti Yung. Public-key cryptosystems provably secure against chosen ciphertext attacks. In *ACM Symposium on Theory Of Computing*, pages 427–437, 1990.

- [31] Roger Needham and Michael Schroeder. Using encryption for authentication in large networks of computers. *CACM*, 21(12):993–999, December 1978.
- [32] Job Noorman, Pieter Agten, Wilfried Daniels, Raoul Strackx, Anthony Van Herrewege, Christophe Huygens, Bart Preneel, Ingrid Verbauwhede, and Frank Piessens. Sancus: Low-cost trustworthy extensible networked devices with a zero-software trusted computing base. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 479–498, 2013.
- [33] Job Noorman, Jo Van Bulek, Jan Tobias Mühlberg, Frank Piessens, Pieter Maene, Bart Preneel, Ingrid Verbauwhede, Johannes Götzfried, Tilo Müller, and Felix Freiling. Sancus 2.0: A low-cost security architecture for IoT devices. *ACM Trans. Priv. Secur.*, 20(3):7:1–7:33, July 2017.
- [34] National Institute of Standards and Technology. FIPS 203 (draft): Module-lattice-based key-encapsulation mechanism standard. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.FIPS.203.ipd>, August 2023.
- [35] National Institute of Standards and Technology. FIPS 204 (draft): Module-lattice-based digital signature standard. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.FIPS.204.ipd>, August 2023.
- [36] National Institute of Standards and Technology. FIPS 205 (draft): Stateless hash-based digital signature standard. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.FIPS.205.ipd>, August 2023.
- [37] John D. Ramsdell, Daniel J. Dougherty, Joshua D. Guttman, and Paul D. Rowe. A hybrid analysis for security protocols with state. In *Integrated Formal Methods*, pages 272–287, 2014.
- [38] John D. Ramsdell and Joshua D. Guttman. CPSA4: A cryptographic protocol shapes analyzer. The MITRE Corporation, 2023. <https://github.com/mitre/cpsa>.
- [39] Paul D. Rowe, Joshua D. Guttman, and Moses D. Liskov. Measuring protocol strength with security goals. *International Journal of Information Security*, February 2016. DOI 10.1007/s10207-016-0319-z, http://web.cs.wpi.edu/~guttman/pubs/ijis_measuring-security.pdf.
- [40] Moritz Schneider, Ramya Jayaram Masti, Shweta Shinde, Srdjan Capkun, and Ronald Perez. SoK: Hardware-supported Trusted Execution Environments. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2205.12742>, May 2022.
- [41] Victor Shoup. A proposal for an ISO standard for public key encryption. Cryptology ePrint Archive, 2001. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2001/112.pdf>.