

Automatic and Incremental Repair for Speculative Information Leaks

Joachim Bard¹, Swen Jacobs¹, and Yakir Vizel²

¹ CISA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Germany

² Technion, Israel

Abstract. We present CURESPEC, the first model-checking based framework for *automatic repair* of programs with respect to information leaks in the presence of side-channels and speculative execution. CURESPEC is based on formal models of attacker capabilities, including observable side channels, inspired by the SPECTRE attacks. For a given attacker model, CURESPEC is able to either prove that the program is secure, or *detect* potential side-channel vulnerabilities and *automatically insert mitigations* such that the resulting code is provably secure. Moreover, CURESPEC can provide a *certificate* for the security of the program that can be independently checked. We have implemented CURESPEC in the SeaHorn framework and show that it can effectively repair security-critical code, for example the AES encryption from the OpenSSL library.

1 Introduction

Speculative execution is an indispensable performance optimization of modern processors: by predicting how branching (and other) conditions will evaluate and speculatively continuing computation, it can avoid pipeline stalls when data from other computations is still missing. When this data arrives, in case of a correct guess the results of the computations can be committed. Otherwise they have to be discarded, and the correct results computed. However, even when the results are not committed to registers that are available at the software level, speculative computations may leave traces in the microarchitecture that can leak through *side channels*, as demonstrated by the family of SPECTRE attacks [5, 10, 21]. For example, the cache is usually not cleaned up after a misspeculation, enabling *timing attacks* that can discover data used during speculation.

Since the discovery of SPECTRE, several countermeasures have been developed [19–21, 29]. As neither speculation nor side channels can be removed from current hardware without sacrificing significant amounts of computing power, the problem is usually dealt with at the software level. Mitigations for SPECTRE usually prevent information leaks during speculative execution by prohibiting “problematic” instructions from being executed speculatively.

Most of the existing mitigations prevent some SPECTRE attacks, but are known to be incomplete [10], i.e., the modified code may remain vulnerable, in circumstances that may or may not be known. In addition, there have been approaches that use formal methods to obtain code that is *guaranteed* to be

resilient against clearly defined types of SPECTRE attacks, and a formal notion of *speculative constant-time security* has been proposed [11] that can give guarantees against timing attacks under speculation. However, these methods all have certain shortcomings: either they require manual modification of the code if potential leaks are found [11, 12, 16], they do not precisely state the security guarantees of automatically hardened code [28], or they are based on a security type system, which are known to be rather difficult to extend to different assumptions (e.g., attacker models) or guarantees [27].

Motivating example. Consider the three programs in Fig. 1. The original program P is shown in (a). It accesses a public array \mathbf{a} at position i after checking that the access to \mathbf{a} is in bounds. In speculative execution, this bounds-check can be ignored, which enables to read arbitrary program memory and store it (albeit temporarily) into \mathbf{k} . The information leak appears when \mathbf{k} is used in another memory access to public array \mathbf{b} , making \mathbf{k} observable to an attacker through a cache-based timing attack.

Our repair approach is based on a transformation of P with the following goals: (i) capture computations that are executed speculatively; (ii) identify possible information leaks under speculation; and (iii) enable the prevention of speculation using fences³.

<pre> 1 if (i < size_a) { 2 k = a[i] * 512; 3 tmp = b[k]; 4 }</pre>	<pre> 1 bool spec = false; 2 if (*) { 3 spec = spec !(i < size_a); 4 k = a[i] * 512; 5 assert(!spec); 6 tmp = b[k]; 7 }</pre>	<pre> 1 bool spec = false; 2 bool fence2 = true; 3 bool fence3 = false; 4 if (*) { 5 spec = spec !(i < size_a); 6 assume(!(fence2 && spec)); 7 k = a[i] * 512; 8 assume(!(fence3 && spec)); 9 assert(!spec); 10 tmp = b[k]; 11 }</pre>
(a) Original program	(b) Speculative execution semantics	(c) Speculative execution and fence semantics

Fig. 1: Example program and its version with speculative and fence semantics

Fig. 1(b) presents a modification P_s of P , demonstrating the first point. We assume that speculative executions can start at conditional statements, i.e., the processor may ignore the condition and take the wrong branch. Therefore, we replace the branching condition by a non-deterministic operator $*$ that can return either `true` or `false` (Line 2). Moreover, an auxiliary variable `spec` is added in order to identify whether an execution of P_s corresponds to a speculative or a non-speculative execution of P . Namely, `spec = true` at some point in an execution of P_s iff the corresponding execution of P is possible *only* under speculation. In Fig. 1(b), `spec` is assigned `true` in Line 3 if the negation of the branching condition holds.

³ Other methods, e.g. *speculative load hardening* (SLH, as appears in <https://tinyurl.com/3nybax4u>), can also be used as a mitigation in our repair algorithm.

To detect information leaks under speculative execution, we assume that there is a set \mathbf{VInst} of memory accesses that should not be performed under speculation, and for such memory accesses we add an assertion `spec = false`. Assuming that the nested array read in Line 3 of P (Fig. 1(a)) is in \mathbf{VInst} , the transformed program P_s (Fig. 1(b)) contains such an assertion at Line 5.

To enable prevention of speculation, in Fig. 1(c) we add auxiliary variables `fence i` for every line i in P with an instruction, and initialize them with truth values that determines whether speculation should be stopped before reaching line i of P . We model the fact that fences stop speculation by adding assumptions that at line i of P we cannot have `fence i = true` and `spec = true` simultaneously (Line 6 and Line 8 of Fig. 1(c)). In this example, speculation can only start in Line 1 of P and `fence2 = true` stops speculation before Line 2 of P , implying that the vulnerable instruction in Line 3 of P is not reachable under speculation.

Note that in this example we assume that fence variables have fixed truth values, reducing the problem to a safety verification problem. In our repair algorithm, we start with a program where all variables `fence i` are initialized to `false`, and allow the algorithm to manipulate initial values of the `fence i` in order to find a version of the program that is secure against a given type of SPECTRE attacks (determined by our choice of vulnerable memory accesses \mathbf{VInst}). Upon termination, our algorithm returns a list of instructions such that adding fence instructions in these positions (of the LLVM code) will make P secure.

To formalize the ideas presented on this example, in Section 2 we will introduce a formal model for the standard semantics of a program P , then introduce a semantics that includes speculative executions in Section 3, and finally present our automatic repair approach in Section 4.

Our contribution. In this paper, we present CURESPEC. CURESPEC is the first model checking based framework for *automatic repair* of programs with respect to information leaks that are due to speculative execution. Applying CURESPEC to a given program results in a program with a *certified* security guarantee. CURESPEC is *parameterized by a threat model*, given as a set of instructions that may leak secret information to the attacker if executed under speculation. This makes our technique applicable to a wide range of speculative execution attacks, including different SPECTRE attacks that have been identified in the literature [10]. For a given threat model, CURESPEC is able to either prove that the program is secure, or *detect* potential side-channel vulnerabilities. In case vulnerabilities are detected, CURESPEC *automatically inserts mitigations* that remove these vulnerabilities, and proves that the modified code is *secure*. Since CURESPEC is based on model checking, it provides a *certificate* for the security guarantee in the form of an inductive invariant.

CURESPEC is a framework with two main parts: (i) a reduction of the problem of finding information leaks that are due to speculation to a safety verification problem; and (ii) a model checking based algorithm for detection and repair of possible vulnerabilities. For (i), we build on previous results that introduced formal modeling of speculative execution semantics [7], and extend this formal model to enable not only the detection of possible leaks, but also their automatic

repair. For (ii), we extend the well-known IC3/PDR approach [9, 18, 22] to a repair algorithm for our problem. When the underlying model checking algorithm discovers a possible leak, CURESPEC modifies the program to eliminate this vulnerability. Then it resumes the verification process, and eliminates further vulnerabilities until the program is secure. An important feature of our technique is that the modified code is not verified from scratch, but the model checking algorithm maintains its state and re-uses the information obtained thus far. Finally, when CURESPEC proves safety of the (possibly repaired) program, the underlying PDR-algorithm produces an inductive invariant, which is a formal certificate of the desired security property.

We implemented CURESPEC in SEAHORN [17], a verification framework for C programs, and evaluated it on the “standard” test cases for SPECTRE vulnerabilities, as well as different parts of OpenSSL, demonstrating its practicality.

To summarize, in this paper we provide the first method that *combines* the following aspects:

1. formal verification of programs with respect to information leaks under speculation, parameterized by a threat model;
2. automatic repair by insertion of mitigations that stop speculative execution;
3. formal guarantees for the repaired code in form of inductive invariants; and
4. an implementation that scales to practical encryption algorithms.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Model Checking Programs

We consider first-order logic modulo a theory \mathcal{T} and denote it by $FOL(\mathcal{T})$. We adopt the standard notation and terminology, where $FOL(\mathcal{T})$ is defined over a signature Σ of constant, predicate and function symbols, some of which may be interpreted by \mathcal{T} . In this paper \mathcal{T} is the theory of Linear Integer Arithmetic and Arrays (LIA). We use `true` and `false` to denote the constant truth values.

Transition Systems. We define transition systems as formal models of programs. Let X be a set of variables, used to represent program variables. A *state* is a valuation of X . For a state σ and $a \in X$, we denote by $\sigma[a]$ the value of a in σ . We write $\theta(X)$ to represent a formula over X in $FOL(\mathcal{T})$. $\theta(X)$ is called a *state formula* and represents a set of states.

A *transition system* is a tuple $M = \langle X, Init(X), Tr(X, X') \rangle$ where $Init(X)$ and $Tr(X, X')$ are quantifier-free formulas in $FOL(\mathcal{T})$. $Init$ represents the initial states of the system and Tr represents the (total) transition relation. We write $Tr(X, X')$ to denote that Tr is defined over variables $X \cup X'$, where X is used to represent the pre-state of a transition, and $X' = \{a' \mid a \in X\}$ is used to represent the post-state. A *path* in a transition system is a sequence of states $\pi := \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots$, such that for $i \geq 1$: $(\sigma_{i-1}, \sigma'_i) \models Tr$. We also consider the case where a path is a finite sequence of states such that every two subsequent states have a transition. We use $\pi[i]$ to refer to the i -th state of π , namely σ_i . We use $\pi^{[0..n]}$ to refer to the prefix $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$, and π^n to the suffix σ_n, \dots of π . A

path (or a prefix of a path) is called an *execution* of M when $\sigma_0 \models \text{Init}$. Given two paths $\pi_1 = \sigma_0, \sigma_1 \dots$ and $\pi_2 = \sigma'_0, \sigma'_1 \dots$, then $\pi = \pi_1^{[0..n]} \pi_2$ is a path if $(\sigma_n, \sigma'_0) \models \text{Tr}$.

A formula $\varphi(X, X')$ such that for every valuation I of X there is exactly one valuation I' of X' such that $(I, I') \models \varphi(X, X')$ is called a *state update function*. For $Y \subseteq X$, we denote by $\text{id}(Y, Y')$ the state update function $\bigwedge_{a \in Y} a' = a$. While $\text{id}(Y, Y')$ is a formula over $Y \cup Y'$, for readability we use $\text{id}(Y)$.

Safety Verification. A *safety problem* is a tuple $\langle M, \text{Bad}(X) \rangle$, where $M = \langle X, \text{Init}, \text{Tr} \rangle$ is a transition system and Bad is a quantifier-free formula in $\text{FOL}(\mathcal{T})$ representing a set of bad states. A safety problem has a *counterexample of length n* if there exists an execution $\pi := \sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_n$ with $\sigma_n \models \text{Bad}$. The safety problem is *SAFE* if it has no counterexample, of any length. It is *UNSAFE* otherwise.

A *safe inductive invariant* is a formula $\text{Inv}(X)$ such that (i) $\text{Init}(X) \rightarrow \text{Inv}(X)$, (ii) $\text{Inv}(X) \wedge \text{Tr}(X, X') \rightarrow \text{Inv}(X')$, and (iii) $\text{Inv}(X) \rightarrow \neg \text{Bad}(X)$. If such a safe inductive invariant exists, then the safety problem is *SAFE*.

In this work we use SPACER [22] as a solver for a given safety problem. SPACER is based on the Property Directed Reachability (PDR) algorithm [9, 18]. Algorithm 1 presents SPACER as a set of rules, following the presentation style of [18]. We only give a brief overview of PDR and SPACER and highlight the details needed later in the paper for CURESPEC. Given a safety problem, SPACER tries to construct an inductive invariant, or find a counterexample. In order to construct an inductive invariant, SPACER maintains a sequence of formulas F_0, F_1, \dots, F_N , with the following properties: (i) $F_0 \rightarrow \text{Init}$; (ii) $\forall 0 \leq j < N \cdot F_j \rightarrow F_{j+1}$; (iii) $\forall 0 \leq j < N \cdot F_j(X) \wedge \text{Tr}(X, X') \rightarrow F_{j+1}(X')$; and (iv) $\forall 0 \leq j < N \cdot F_j \rightarrow \neg \text{Bad}$.

F_j is an over-approximation of the states reachable in j steps or less. Additionally, SPACER maintains a set REACH of states that are known to be reachable. REACH is an under-approximation of the reachable states.

PDR performs a backward traversal of the states space. The traversal is performed starting from states that violate Bad and constructing a suffix of a counterexample backwards, trying to either show that a state that can reach Bad is reachable (**Candidate**, **Predecessor** and **Cex** rules) or prove that such states are unreachable (**NewLemma** and **Push** rules). During this process the trace of over-approximations F_0, F_1, \dots, F_N is constructed and reachable states are discovered. We later show how these are used in CURESPEC. For more details about PDR and SPACER the interested reader is referred to [9, 18, 22].

2.2 Standard Program Semantics

We assume a program P is represented in a low-level language (e.g. LLVM bit-code) with standard semantics, and includes standard low-level instructions such as unary and binary operations, conditional and unconditional branches, load and store for accessing memory. In addition, it includes the instructions `assume(b)` and `assert(b)` used for safety verification.

Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$ be a line in the program P to be encoded. For simplicity we refer to the instruction at line i as i , and write $i \in P$. We assume there is a special

Input: A safety problem $\langle X, \text{Init}(X), \text{Tr}(X, X'), \text{Bad}(X) \rangle$.
Assumptions: Init , Tr and Bad are quantifier free.
Data: A queue \mathcal{Q} of potential counterexamples, where $c \in \mathcal{Q}$ is a pair $\langle m, j \rangle$,
 m is a cube over state variables, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. A level N . A sequence
 F_0, F_1, \dots . An invariant F_∞ . A set of reachable states REACH .
Output: (SAFE, F_∞) , where F_∞ is a safe inductive invariant, or Cex
Initially: $\mathcal{Q} = \emptyset$, $N = 0$, $F_0 = \text{Init}$, $\forall j \geq 1 \cdot F_j = \text{true}$, $F_\infty = \text{true}$.
Require: $\text{Init} \rightarrow \neg \text{Bad}$
repeat
 Safe If $F_\infty \rightarrow \neg \text{Bad}$ **return** (SAFE, F_∞) .
 Cex If $\langle m, j \rangle \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $m \cap (\text{REACH}) \neq \emptyset$ **return** Cex .
 Unfold If $F_N \rightarrow \neg \text{Bad}$, then set $N \leftarrow N + 1$.
 Candidate If for some m , $m \rightarrow F_N \wedge \text{Bad}$, then add $\langle m, N \rangle$ to \mathcal{Q} .
 Predecessor If $\langle m, j + 1 \rangle \in \mathcal{Q}$ and there are m_0 and m_1 s.t.
 $m_1 \rightarrow m$, $m_0 \wedge m'_1$ is satisfiable, and $m_0 \wedge m'_1 \rightarrow F_j \wedge \text{Tr} \wedge m'$, then
 add $\langle m_0, j \rangle$ to \mathcal{Q} .
 NewLemma For $0 \leq j < N$: given $\langle m, j + 1 \rangle \in \mathcal{Q}$ and a clause φ s.t. $\varphi \rightarrow \neg m$,
 if $(\text{REACH}) \rightarrow \varphi$, and $\varphi \wedge F_j \wedge \text{Tr} \rightarrow \varphi'$, then add φ to F_k , for $k \leq j + 1$.
 ReQueue If $\langle m, j \rangle \in \mathcal{Q}$, and $F_{j-1} \wedge \text{Tr} \wedge m'$ is unsatisfiable, then
 add $\langle m, j + 1 \rangle$ to \mathcal{Q} .
 Push For $1 \leq j$ and a clause $(\varphi \vee \psi) \in F_j \setminus F_{j+1}$,
 if $(\text{REACH}) \rightarrow \varphi$ and $\varphi \wedge F_j \wedge \text{Tr} \rightarrow \varphi'$, then
 add φ to F_k , for each $k \leq j + 1$.
 MaxIndSubset If there is $j > N$ s.t. $F_{j+1} \subseteq F_j$, then
 $F_\infty \leftarrow F_i$, and $\forall k \geq j \cdot F_j \leftarrow F_\infty$.
 Successor If $\langle m, j + 1 \rangle \in \mathcal{Q}$ and exist m_0, m_1 s.t.
 $m_0 \wedge m'_1$ are satisfiable and $m_0 \wedge m'_1 \rightarrow (\text{REACH}) \wedge \text{Tr} \wedge m'$, then
 add m_1 to REACH .
 ResetQ $\mathcal{Q} \leftarrow \emptyset$.
 ResetReach $\text{REACH} \leftarrow \text{Init}$.
until ∞ ;

Algorithm 1: The rules of the SPACER procedure.

program variable $\text{pc} \in X$, called the *program counter*, defined over the domain $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\perp\}$. Let $i \in P$ be an instruction to be encoded. If i is a conditional branch instruction, it is encoded by a *conditional state update function* of the form

$$\tau_i(X, X') := \text{pc} = i \rightarrow (\text{cond}_i(X) ? \text{pc}' = \vartheta_i(X) : \text{pc}' = \varepsilon_i(X)) \wedge \text{id}(X \setminus \{\text{pc}\}),$$

where $\text{cond}_i(X)$ is the condition represented by a state formula and pc is updated to $\vartheta_i(X)$ when the condition holds, and otherwise it is updated to $\varepsilon_i(X)$.

All other instructions are encoded by an *unconditional state update function* of the form $\tau_i(X, X') := \text{pc} = i \rightarrow \varphi_i(X, X')$, where $\varphi_i(X, X')$ is a state update function⁴. Instructions are either conditional or unconditional depending on their corresponding state update function. We denote by $C \subseteq P$ the set of conditional instructions, i.e., if $i \in C$, then τ_i is a conditional state update function.

⁴ Note that pc is updated also by φ_i . We therefore assume that unconditional state update functions accompany every instruction that is not a conditional branch.

The semantics for the verification instruction $\text{assume}(cond_i(X))$ is captured by a state update function, which is encoded by

$$\tau_i(X, X') := \text{pc} = i \rightarrow ((cond_i(X) ? \text{pc}' = \vartheta_i(X) : \text{pc}' = \text{pc}) \wedge \text{id}(X \setminus \{\text{pc}\})).$$

This encoding requires that at line i the condition $cond_i(X)$ holds. If it does not hold, then the transition relation is stuck in an infinite loop and the program does not progress. Similarly, $\text{assert}(cond(X))$ is captured by a state update function, which is encoded by

$$\tau_i(X, X') := \text{pc} = i \rightarrow ((cond_i(X) ? \text{pc}' = \vartheta_i(X) : \text{pc}' = \perp) \wedge \text{id}(X \setminus \{\text{pc}\}))$$

For **assert**, if the condition $cond_i(X)$ holds, the program continues. Otherwise, pc is set to \perp . This special case allows us to create a safety verification problem by defining the bad states to be those where $\text{pc} = \perp$. To ensure the resulting transition relation is total, we add a state update function that makes sure that if a state where $\text{pc} = \perp$ is ever reached, this state is stuttering:

$$\tau_{\perp}(X, X') := \text{pc} = \perp \rightarrow \text{id}(X)$$

To conclude, given a program P , we obtain a symbolic representation of the transition relation by conjoining the formulas for all lines of the program including τ_{\perp} , i.e., $Tr(X, X') := (\bigwedge_i \tau_i(X, X')) \wedge \tau_{\perp}(X, X')$. The corresponding safety problem is then defined by the resulting transition system $M = \langle X, \text{Init}, Tr \rangle$ and a set of bad states, given as $Bad(X) := \text{pc} = \perp$.

Remark 1. Let P be a program, $\langle M, Bad \rangle$ the corresponding safety problem, and $\pi = \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ an execution of M . Then, for every $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that $(\sigma_{j-1}, \sigma'_j) \models Tr$ there exists $i \in P$ such that $(\sigma_{j-1}, \sigma'_j) \models \tau_i$. We denote this as $i \in \pi$. Moreover, if $\sigma_n \models Bad$ then there exists an assertion violation in P .

3 Modeling Speculative Execution Semantics

When analyzing the *functionality* of a program, speculative execution can be ignored since the results of a computation that is based on *misspeculation* do not alter the program's state: if the condition of a branch turns out to be wrong after speculative execution, any of its results (visible in the microarchitecture, but not on the program level) are discarded and computation backtracks to the correct branch. However, the data used in such a computation may still leak through side channels. Therefore, when analyzing *information leaks through side channels*, the formal model must include speculative execution semantics and take into account possible observations based on misspeculation.

In this section, we first discuss the notion of security and threat models we consider. Later we give a formal definition of the speculative execution model in Section 3.2.

3.1 Threat Models for Speculative Information Leaks

Verifying secure information flow deals with proving that confidential data does not flow to public outputs during the execution of a system [15]. Another way of describing secure information flow is by specifying that confidential data is not *observable* by an attacker.

A well-known class of attacks that can cause information leaks are *timing-attacks*. These attacks use observations about the run-time of a system in order to infer secret data. More precisely, in order for a program to be secure against timing-attacks any two executions of a system where the public inputs and outputs are equivalent for both executions, should be indistinguishable w.r.t. some measure of time (e.g. time to execute a program, latency in memory access, etc.).

Most variants of the SPECTRE attack fall within this class of timing-attacks. These attacks use side-effects of cache collisions caused by code that executes speculatively in order to leak secret information. It is important to note that speculative execution does not change the architectural state of the CPU and only has side-effects (e.g. modifications to the cache). Consequently, if we consider a program to be secure with respect to standard execution semantics, given two different executions of that program that start from the same public inputs, where one execution uses speculative execution and the other does not, both produce the same public outputs. However, due to the side-effects caused by speculative execution, these two executions may still be distinguishable.

We therefore use the following definition of Constant-Time Security (cp. [2]):

Definition 1. *Let M be a transition system of a program P , let $H \subseteq X$ be a set of high-security variables and $L := X \setminus H$ a set of low-security variables. M is Constant-Time Secure if for any two executions π_1 and π_2 of M with $\forall x \in L, i \in \mathbb{N} \cdot \pi_1[i][x] = \pi_2[i][x]$ are also indistinguishable.*

Since the focus of this paper is timing-attacks that can incur due to SPECTRE, we make the standard assumption that the attacker can *distinguish* executions if they differ in the values of `pc`, i.e., their control-flow, or in the location of certain memory accesses. We collect these *vulnerable memory instructions* in a set $\mathbf{VInst} \subseteq P$.

In practice, identifying these instructions depends on our assumptions on the attacker capabilities in the given setting⁵. We consider two variants of SPECTRE-PHT vulnerabilities that are based on the classification by Canella et al. [10]:

- we consider a *strong* SPECTRE model, where the attacker is very powerful and can observe the value of any array access, i.e., any memory access (e.g. array access $a[i]$) is in \mathbf{VInst} . This is motivated by the use of side-channels other than cache timing attacks (and by advanced mistraining strategies for the speculation unit [10]).
- in the *classical* SPECTRE model, an attacker uses the cache content for timing attacks, i.e., if the location i of an array access $a[i]$ is controlled by the

⁵ Compared to the work in [7], our threat model is parameterized in the set of vulnerable instructions and strictly generalizes the fixed threat model used there.

attacker (e.g., the attacker can directly provide it as an input, or the inputs of the attacker have some influence on i), then a nested array access $b[a[i]]$ can be used to reveal the content of $a[i]$. Therefore, here we consider \mathbf{VInst} to contain all array accesses that amount, directly or indirectly, to a nested array access at an attacker-controlled position. Detecting such array accesses can be done statically, using information flow analysis techniques like taint tracking or self-composition.

3.2 Formal Model of Speculative Execution Semantics

Our goal is to check for information leaks *under speculative execution*. To this end, we *assume* that the given program P is constant-time secure in the absence of speculation. We will show that this allows us to reduce the problem of detecting speculative information leaks to the standard safety property of checking whether instructions in the given set \mathbf{VInst} are reachable under speculation in P . First, let us formalize the speculative semantics of P .

Let $M = \langle X, \mathit{Init}, \mathit{Tr} \rangle$ be the standard transition system (Section 2.1) of the program P and \mathbf{VInst} the set of vulnerable instructions. Define the set of Boolean auxiliary variables used to model fences as $\mathcal{F} := \{\mathit{fence}_i \mid i \in P\}$, and let $B \subseteq P$ be the set of fenced instructions, i.e., with $\mathit{fence}_i = \mathit{true}$. Then, the transition system that includes speculative execution semantics is defined as $\hat{M} := \langle \hat{X}, \hat{\mathit{Init}}, \hat{\mathit{Tr}} \rangle$ where $\hat{X} := X \cup \{\mathit{spec}\} \cup \mathcal{F}$, where spec is of sort \mathbb{N}_0 . The initial states of \hat{M} are defined as

$$\hat{\mathit{Init}}(\hat{X}) := \mathit{Init} \wedge (\mathit{spec} = 0) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in B} \mathit{fence}_i \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in P \setminus B} \neg \mathit{fence}_i$$

where spec is initialized to 0, and auxiliary variables in \mathcal{F} are initialized to true if the corresponding instruction is fenced, and otherwise to false .

To define $\hat{\mathit{Tr}}$, recall that speculation starts if the wrong branch is taken for some $i \in C$. At the first such position, spec becomes positive and remains positive for the rest of the execution. In order to formally model this behavior we modify the state update functions in the following manner.

Conditional Instructions. The state update function for each conditional instruction $i \in C$ (as it appears in Section 2.2) is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_i(\hat{X}, \hat{X}') := & \mathit{pc} = i \rightarrow \left(\mathit{fence}_i \wedge \mathit{spec} > 0 ? \mathit{id}(\hat{X}) : \mathit{id}(\hat{X} \setminus \{\mathit{spec}, \mathit{pc}\}) \right) \wedge \\ & \left[((\mathit{spec}' = ((\neg \mathit{cond}(X) \vee \mathit{spec} > 0) ? \mathit{spec} + 1 : 0)) \wedge \mathit{pc}' = \hat{\vartheta}(X)) \vee \right. \\ & \left. ((\mathit{spec}' = ((\mathit{cond}(X) \vee \mathit{spec} > 0) ? \mathit{spec} + 1 : 0)) \wedge \mathit{pc}' = \hat{\varepsilon}(X)) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\hat{\tau}_i$ is stuck in an infinite loop in case $\mathit{spec} > 0$ and fence_i is set to true . Otherwise, if the respective branch condition does not hold, the value of spec has to become positive. If spec is already positive, it remains positive and is incremented. Overall, spec can only be positive in a given execution iff at

least one branch condition of the execution is not met. Careful inspection of the state update function reveals the updates to `pc` are different (e.g. $\hat{\vartheta}(X)$ instead of $\vartheta(X)$). We address this later in the section (\clubsuit).

Unconditional Instructions. For unconditional instructions, we must take into account the new auxiliary variables, as well as the fence assumptions that prevent speculation. Given an unconditional instruction $\tau_i(X, X') := pc = i \rightarrow \varphi(X, X')$ we define $\hat{\tau}_i$ in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_i(\hat{X}, \hat{X}') &:= pc = i \rightarrow (\text{fence}_i \wedge \text{spec} > 0 ? \text{id}(\hat{X}) : \\ &\quad \hat{\varphi}(X, X') \wedge \text{id}(\mathcal{F}) \wedge \text{spec}' = (\text{spec} > 0 ? \text{spec} + 1 : 0)) \end{aligned}$$

Again, $\hat{\tau}_i$ enters an infinite loop in case `spec` > 0 and `fencei` is set to `true`.

Speculation Bound. In order to allow a realistic modeling of speculative execution, we consider a model that only allows a bounded speculation window. This modeling comes from the fact that, in any given microarchitecture, the Re-order Buffer (ROB) used to allow out-of-order execution is limited in the number of instructions it can occupy.

Therefore, we assume that for a given micro-architecture there exists a parameter \mathbb{k} that is a bound on speculative executions. In order to enforce this bound, we constrain the transition relation $\hat{T}r$ such that if `spec` ever reaches \mathbb{k} , \hat{M} is stuck in an infinite loop (this can be viewed as a global assumption).

This results in the following two cases for the transition relation:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}r_{<\mathbb{k}}(\hat{X}, \hat{X}') &:= (\text{spec} < \mathbb{k}) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in P} \hat{\tau}_i(\hat{X}, \hat{X}') \\ \hat{T}r_{\geq \mathbb{k}}(\hat{X}, \hat{X}') &:= (\text{spec} \geq \mathbb{k}) \wedge \text{id}(\hat{X}) \end{aligned}$$

Speculative Constant-time Security as a Safety Property. We want to ensure that P does not leak information under speculation. We assume that the attacker has control over speculation, which implies that `spec` $\in L$. Therefore, the condition of Definition 1 needs to hold for executions that make the same speculative choices (cp. *speculative constant-time* [11, 14]). Since we assume that the transition system M (without speculation) is constant-time secure, we therefore only have to compare speculative executions that agree on their control-flow. Since we also assume that additional side-channel observations of the attacker are only possible when a vulnerable instruction in `VInst` is executed, our problem reduces to the standard safety property of checking whether instructions in `VInst` are *reachable under speculation*. This can be modeled by adding an assertion instruction `assert(spec == 0)` before every such instruction.

In the transition relation, this is reflected by defining

$$\hat{\tau}_{a_i}(\hat{X}, \hat{X}') := pc = a_i \rightarrow ((\text{spec} = 0) ? pc' = i : pc' = \perp) \wedge \text{id}(\hat{X} \setminus \{pc\})$$

and letting

$$\hat{T}r(\hat{X}, \hat{X}') := \left(\hat{T}r_{<\mathbb{k}}(\hat{X}, \hat{X}') \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in \text{VInst}} \hat{\tau}_{a_i}(\hat{X}, \hat{X}') \wedge \tau_{\perp}(\hat{X}, \hat{X}') \right) \vee \hat{T}r_{\geq \mathbb{k}}(\hat{X}, \hat{X}').$$

The addition of these assertions is the reason for the different `pc` updates in $\hat{\tau}$ (\clubsuit). Namely, an instruction $j \in P$ that precedes an instruction $i \in \mathbf{VInst}$ now needs to precede the corresponding assertion a_i .

Now, we can encode constant-time security with respect to speculative execution as the safety problem $\langle \hat{M}, \hat{Bad}(X) \rangle$, where

$$\hat{Bad}(X) := \text{pc} = \perp,$$

i.e., the definition of bad states remains unchanged.

Properties of the Speculative Execution Semantics. We give some useful properties of the above semantics. The proofs can be found in Appendix A.

Lemma 1. *Let P be a program, $M = \langle X, \text{Init}, \text{Tr} \rangle$ its transition system, and \hat{M} the transition system including speculative execution semantics. Then, there exists a simulation relation between M and \hat{M} , denoted $M \leq_{sim} \hat{M}$.*

Lemma 2. *Let $\pi = \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ be an execution of \hat{M} such that $\sigma_k \models \hat{Bad}$. Then the following conditions hold: (i) $\sigma_0 \models \text{spec} = 0$ (ii) $\sigma_k \models \text{spec} > 0$ (iii) There exists a unique $0 \leq j < k$ such that $\sigma_j \models \text{spec} = 0$ and $\sigma_{j+1} \models \text{spec} > 0$.*

Lemma 3. *Let P be a program, $M = \langle X, \text{Init}, \text{Tr} \rangle$ its transition system, and $\mathbf{VInst} \subseteq P$. Assume that M is constant-time secure, where observations of the attacker are determined by \mathbf{VInst} . Let $\hat{M} = \langle \hat{X}, \text{Init}, \hat{\text{Tr}} \rangle$ be the transition system of P that includes speculative execution semantics. If \hat{M} is SAFE wrt. \hat{Bad} , then M is constant-time secure, i.e., P does not leak information under speculation.*

4 Automatic Repair under Speculative Execution

In this section we describe CURESPEC, an automatic, model checking based repair algorithm, that fixes SPECTRE related information leaks under speculative execution. All proofs can be found in Appendix A. CURESPEC receives a program P and a set of vulnerable instructions \mathbf{VInst} . If CURESPEC detects that an instruction $i \in \mathbf{VInst}$ is executed under speculation, it repairs P by analyzing the leaking execution and adding a fence instruction that disables speculation in program locations that enabled the leak. This process is iterative and continues until CURESPEC proves that P is secure.

Given a program P , its speculative transition system \hat{M} , and the safety problem $\hat{T} = \langle \hat{M}, \hat{Bad} \rangle$ (as defined in Section 3, w.r.t. a set of vulnerable instructions \mathbf{VInst}). Recall that Algorithm 1 can determine if \hat{T} is SAFE or UNSAFE. When Algorithm 1 returns SAFE, then \hat{M} is constant-time secure with respect to \mathbf{VInst} and speculative execution. Otherwise, a counterexample describing a speculative execution that may leak information is returned and Algorithm 1 terminates.

CURESPEC builds upon Algorithm 1 and extends it such that if \hat{T} is UNSAFE, instead of terminating, repair is applied. The repair process is iterative

- when a leak is detected, it is analyzed, a fence is added to mitigate the leak, and verification is reapplied on the repaired program. However, CURESPEC is *incremental* in the sense that it maintains the state of Algorithm 1 as much as possible and reuses it when verification re-executes. To this end, CURESPEC includes all rules of Algorithm 1 excluding the **Cex** rule, and including two additional rules as described in Algorithm 2: **SpecLeak** and **AddFence**.

SpecLeak. This rule replaces the rule **Cex** from Algorithm 1 and prevents the algorithm from terminating when a counterexample is found. Instead, the leaking execution is stored in π .

AddFence. This rule is responsible for the repair. The trace π is analyzed, and based on the misspeculation that leads to a information leak, a fence that makes π unfeasible is added (by letting $\text{fence}_k = \text{true}$ in \hat{Init} for some k). Note that the trace of F_i and the invariant F_∞ are unchanged which ensures incrementality of the overall algorithm.

The **Safe** rule is amended to additionally return the list of added fences.

Input: A safety problem $\langle \hat{M}, \hat{Bad}(\hat{X}) \rangle$ with $\hat{M} = \langle \hat{X}, \hat{Init}, \hat{Tr} \rangle$.

Assumptions: \hat{Init} , \hat{Tr} and \hat{Bad} are quantifier free.

Data: A queue \mathcal{Q} of potential counterexamples, where $c \in \mathcal{Q}$ is a pair $\langle m, j \rangle$, m is a cube over state variables, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. A level N . A trace F_0, \dots, F_N . An invariant F_∞ . A set of reachable states REACH.

Output: A list of added fences \mathcal{L} and a safe inductive invariant F_∞

Initially: $\mathcal{Q} = \emptyset$, $N = 0$, $F_0 = \hat{Init}$, $\forall j \geq 1 \cdot F_j = \text{true}$, $F_\infty = \text{true}$, $\pi = \langle \rangle$, $\mathcal{L} = \emptyset$.

Require: $\hat{Init} \rightarrow \neg \hat{Bad}$

repeat

SpecLeak If $\langle m, j \rangle \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $m \cap \text{REACH} \neq \emptyset$.

 Let $\pi' = \langle m = \sigma_j, \sigma_{j+1}, \dots, \sigma_N \rangle$ be a path of \hat{M} where $\sigma_N \models \hat{Bad}$.

 Then π' can be extended into an execution $\pi = \pi^* \pi'$ of \hat{M} .

AddFence If $\pi \neq \langle \rangle$, choose $j \leq k \leq N$ where $\sigma_k \models \text{spec} > 0$. Modify \hat{Init} s. t. $\hat{Init} \models \text{fence}_k$. $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L} \cup \{\text{fence}_k\}$. $\mathcal{Q} \leftarrow \emptyset$, $\text{REACH} \leftarrow \hat{Init}$, $\pi \leftarrow \langle \rangle$.

until ∞ ;

Algorithm 2: Repair algorithm CURESPEC

4.1 Analyzing the Leaking Execution π

When Algorithm 2 detects a potential leak in \hat{M} , **SpecLeak** stores this execution in π . In **AddFence**, Lemma 2 is used to identify where speculation starts in π . Based on that, we define the following:

Definition 2. Let $\pi = \sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_N, \dots$ be an execution of \hat{M} such that $\sigma_N \models \hat{Bad}$, and $0 < k \leq N$ such that $\sigma_{k-1} \models \text{spec} = 0$ and $\sigma_k \models \text{spec} > 0$. Then $\pi^{[0..k-1]} = \sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{k-1}$ is called the non-speculating prefix of π , and $\pi^k = \sigma_k, \dots$ the speculating suffix of π . We call k the speculative split point of π .

By construction, we have $\text{spec} = 0$ in $\pi^{[0..k-1]}$. Therefore, letting $\text{fence}_i = \text{true}$ for any instruction $i \in \pi^{[0..k-1]}$ has no effect on the transitions in $\pi^{[0..k-1]}$. However, since $\text{spec} > 0$ in π^k , letting $\text{fence}_i = \text{true}$ for any $i \in \pi^k$ makes

π an unfeasible path. In order to formalize this intuition we use the following definition and lemmas.

Definition 3. *Let P be a program and $\hat{M} = \langle \hat{X}, \hat{Init}, \hat{Tr} \rangle$ its speculative execution transition system. If for $i \in P$ it holds that $\hat{Init} \models \neg \text{fence}_i$, then adding a fence to i results in a new transition system $\hat{M}_i = \langle \hat{X}, \hat{Init}_i, \hat{Tr} \rangle$ where $\hat{Init}_i := \hat{Init}[\neg \text{fence}_i \leftarrow \text{fence}_i]$.*

Here, $\hat{Init}[\neg \text{fence}_i \leftarrow \text{fence}_i]$ denotes the substitution of $\neg \text{fence}_i$ with fence_i . After substitution it holds that $\hat{Init}_i \models \text{fence}_i$, and initialization for all other variables is unchanged. Thus, the initial value of fence_i is the only difference between \hat{M}_i and \hat{M} .

Lemma 4. *Let $\pi = \sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_N$ be an execution of \hat{M} such that $\sigma_N \models \hat{Bad}$ and $k \leq N$ be its speculative split point. For any instruction $i \in P$ such that $i \in \pi^k$ (see Remark 1), $\hat{Init} \models \neg \text{fence}_i$. Moreover, π is not an execution of \hat{M}_i and for every execution $\hat{\pi} = \hat{\sigma}_0, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_m$ of \hat{M}_i , $\hat{\pi}^k$ is not an execution of \hat{M}_i .*

By Lemma 4, it is sufficient to let $\text{fence}_i = \text{true}$ for any instruction $i \in \pi^k$ in order to make π an unfeasible path. Then, CURESPEC can be resumed and search for a different leaking execution, or prove that the added fences make P secure. This results in the following properties of our repair algorithm.

4.2 Properties of CureSpec (Algorithm 2)

As noted earlier, CURESPEC is *parametrized* by the set VInst of possibly vulnerable instructions. While in this paper we focus on instructions that are vulnerable to SPECTRE, CURESPEC can detect other kinds of instructions that are executed under speculation, and as a result, repair such instances where execution under speculation may lead to unwanted transient behavior.

Theorem 1. *Let P be a program and $\hat{M} = \langle \hat{X}, \hat{Init}, \hat{Tr} \rangle$ its speculative execution transition system. Then, on input $\langle \hat{M}, \hat{Bad} \rangle$, CURESPEC terminates and returns a list \mathcal{L} such that for $\hat{M}_s = \langle \hat{X}, \hat{Init}_s, \hat{Tr} \rangle$, where $\forall i \in \mathcal{L} \cdot \hat{Init}_s \models \text{fence}_i$, it holds that $\langle \hat{M}_s, \hat{Bad} \rangle$ is SAFE (as witnessed by the final invariant F_∞).*

The proof idea is that we are making progress whenever we add a fence, since there are only finitely many possible fence positions. Moreover, if we put a fence before every instruction, then there certainly cannot be any speculative leaks.

Lemma 5 (Incrementality). *Let P be a program and let M and \hat{M} be its transition system and speculative execution transition system, respectively. For $i \in P$, if $\hat{Init} \models \neg \text{fence}_i$ then $M \leq_{\text{sim}} \hat{M}_i \leq_{\text{sim}} \hat{M}$.*

The proof of this lemma relies on the fact that adding a fence can only exclude executions in \hat{M} that are not possible in M .

By Lemma 5, over-approximations computed with respect to \hat{M} are also over-approximations with respect to M . This allows CURESPEC to reuse information

between different repair iterations. While rule **AddFence** resets \mathcal{Q} , REACH, and π , it does not reset the current level N , the trace F_0, \dots, F_N , and the invariant F_∞ , where F_∞ and F_j over-approximate the states that are reachable (in up to j steps). Note that while **AddFence** resets REACH, in practice parts of REACH can be retained even after a fence is added. Intuitively, the repair loop resembles a Counterexample Guided Abstraction Refinement (CEGAR) loop [13].

This *incremental* way of using Algorithm 1 within CURESPEC makes repair already much more efficient than a *non-incremental* version that completely restarts verification after every modification (see Section 5). However, allowing the algorithm to add fences after every instruction in P may still be inefficient, as there are (unnecessarily) many possibilities, and the repair may add many unnecessary fences. Therefore, in the following we describe several heuristics for optimizing the way fences are added.

4.3 Heuristics and Optimizations

Fence placement options. As described in Section 3, speculation can only start at conditional instructions and the information leak itself happens at an instruction $i \in \mathbf{VInst}$. Thus, we can restrict the set of instructions for which we introduce fence variables fence_i to one of the following: (i) after each conditional instruction $i \in \mathcal{C}$, in both branches, or (ii) before every instruction $i \in \mathbf{VInst}$. In the following, option (i) will be called the *after-branch*, and (ii) will be called *before-memory*. In both cases correctness according to Theorem 1 is preserved.

Fence activation. When a leaking execution π is found, there might be multiple positions for a fence that would prevent it. We employ a heuristic that activates a fence variable as close as possible to the bad state. In case that fence placement option (i) is used, this means that π is traversed backwards from the bad state until a conditional instruction is reached, and a fence is activated in the branch that appears in π . Under option (ii), the instruction $i \in \mathbf{VInst}$ that is causing the leak in π is the last instruction in π , and we activate the fence right before i . In both cases, this not only removes the given leaking execution, but also other executions where speculation starts before the newly added fence (cp. Lemma 4).

5 Implementation and Evaluation

Implementation. We implemented CURESPEC⁶ in the SEAHORN verification framework [17]. This gives us direct access to an LLVM front-end. We compile each benchmark (see below) with Clang⁷ 10.0.0 to LLVM using optimization level -O2. The speculative execution semantics is added *after* these compilation passes, which is important because they might introduce new vulnerabilities.

The modified program is encoded into Horn rules [6] and then passed to Z3 [25] version 4.10.2, SeaHorn’s internal solver. Upon termination, our tool can output the inductive invariant of the repaired program, together with its

⁶ <https://github.com/user-28119294/CureSpec>

⁷ <https://clang.llvm.org/>

speculative semantics, in SMT-LIB format, such that this certificate can be checked independently by any SMT solver that supports the LIA theory.

Evaluation: Benchmarks. We evaluated CURESPEC on four sets of benchmarks. The first set consists of Kocher’s 15 test cases⁸, which are simple code snippets vulnerable to SPECTRE attacks. To show that CURESPEC can also handle complex programs from a domain that handles sensitive data, we have selected representative and non-trivial (measured in the number of LLVM instructions and conditional instructions, see Table 1 for details) benchmarks from OpenSSL 3.0.0⁹ and the HACL* [30] cryptographic library.

A first set of OpenSSL benchmarks includes two versions of AES block encryptions: (i) `aes_encrypt`, which uses lookup tables and (ii) `aes_encrypt_ct`, a constant-time version. Both of these only encrypt a single AES block. We also include both AES encryptions in cipher block chaining mode (`aes_cbc_encrypt` and `aes_cbc_encrypt_ct`, respectively), which encrypt arbitrarily many blocks, resulting in significantly more complex and challenging benchmarks. The second set of SSL benchmarks includes functions used for the multiplication, squaring, and exponentiation of arbitrary-size integers (`bn_mul_part`, `bn_sqr_part`, and `bn_exp_part`, respectively). Since the full versions of these include function calls to complex subprocedures (with an additional 18900 LLVM-instructions and more than 4100 branches), we abstract these called functions by uninterpreted functions. Finally, the HACL* benchmarks include the following cryptographic primitives: (i) `Curve25519_64_ecdh`, the ECDH key agreement using Curve25519 [4], (ii) the stream cipher `Chacha20_encrypt`, (iii) a message authentication code using the Poly1305 hash family [3] (`Poly1305_32_mac`).

Evaluation: Repair Performance. We present in detail the repair performance of CURESPEC based on the strong threat model (see Section 3), i.e., `VInst` consists of all memory accesses in the analyzed program¹⁰, and on the semantics with unbounded speculation. Similar results for a bounded speculation window can be found in Appendix B. For each program, we evaluated the performance for all combinations of the following options: (a) incremental or non-incremental repair, (b) fence placement at every instruction, or according to one of the heuristics (after-branch or before-memory) from Section 4.3. All experiments were executed on an Intel[®] Xeon[®] Gold 6244 CPU @ 3.60GHz with 251GiB of main memory.

Table 1 summarizes the most important results, comparing the **baseline** (non-incremental, every-inst fence placement without fence activation heuristic) to two options that both use incrementality and the heuristic for fence activation, as well as either **after-branch** or **before-memory** for fence placement. We observe that the latter two perform better than the baseline option, with a significant difference both in repair time and number of activated fences, even on the

⁸ <https://www.paulkocher.com/doc/MicrosoftCompilerSpectreMitigation.html>

⁹ <https://github.com/openssl/openssl/tree/openssl-3.0.0>

¹⁰ We did not analyze the benchmarks with respect to the classical SPECTRE model, since that requires manual annotations of the code to determine variables that the attacker can control, which require a deep understanding of the code to be analyzed.

Table 1: Evaluation results on Kocher’s test cases, OpenSSL, and HACL* benchmarks. Test cases not in the table have the similar values as test2. Columns $\#_i$, $\#_b$, and $\#_m$ give the number of instructions, conditional instructions and memory instructions, respectively, which is also the maximal number of possible fences for the respective placement option (every-inst, after-branch, before-memory). The number of inserted fences is shown in the $\#_f$ columns. Presented times are in seconds, averaged over 3 runs, with a timeout of 2 hours. RSS is the average maximum resident set size in GiB.

Benchmark	baseline				after-branch				before-memory			
	$\#_i$	$\#_f$	time	RSS	$\#_b$	$\#_f$	time	RSS	$\#_m$	$\#_f$	time	RSS
test1	14	5	0.4	0.12	2	1	0.1	0.07	2	1	0.1	0.06
test2 (and others)	18	7	0.7	0.15	2	1	0.1	0.07	4	1	0.1	0.07
test5	20	1	0.3	0.16	4	2	0.2	0.08	2	1	0.1	0.07
test7	23	11	1.5	0.17	4	2	0.2	0.07	6	2	0.2	0.08
test9	21	10	1.2	0.16	2	1	0.1	0.06	5	1	0.1	0.08
test10	20	15	1.4	0.15	4	2	0.2	0.07	4	2	0.1	0.07
test12	20	9	0.9	0.15	2	1	0.1	0.06	4	1	0.1	0.07
test15	19	8	0.9	0.15	2	1	0.1	0.07	5	1	0.1	0.08
aes_encrypt_ct	566		timeout		4	3	0.8	0.09	38	3	1.7	0.32
aes_encrypt	476	116	3712.1	11.04	4	3	0.7	0.10	97	3	4.7	0.98
aes_cbc_encrypt_ct	1302		timeout		40	15	100.7	0.65	102	10	80.6	1.41
aes_cbc_encrypt	1122		timeout		40	15	774.5	1.51	220	10	135.1	4.34
bn_mul_part	104	69	48.7	0.72	24	13	2.6	0.18	19	7	1.3	0.16
bn_sqr_part	161	71	109.5	1.05	24	13	3.4	0.19	30	9	2.5	0.22
bn_exp_part	307	139	1939.3	5.60	74	29	57.4	0.82	49	18	21.8	0.61
Chacha20_encrypt	3552		timeout		6	3	8.0	0.33	117	2	8.4	1.90
Poly1305_32_mac	483	93	1143.3	4.76	6	4	2.2	0.12	90	4	6.4	0.72
Curve25519_64_ecdh	351		timeout		8	3	3115.3	1.92	44		timeout	

test cases (except for test5, which is solved with a single fence even without heuristics). Notably, all of the benchmarks that time out in the baseline version can be solved by at least one of the other versions, often in under 2 minutes.

While our heuristics make a big difference when compared against the baseline, a comparison between the two fence placement heuristics does not show a clear winner. The before-memory heuristic results in the smallest number of activated fences for all benchmarks, but the difference is usually not big. On the other hand, for the HACL* benchmarks (and some others), this heuristic needs more time than the after-branch heuristic, and even times out for `Curver25519_64_ecdh`, while after-branch solves all of our benchmarks.

Furthermore, we observe that the fence placement heuristics (after-branch or before-memory) reduce the repair time by 81.8% or 97.5%, respectively. Incrementality, when considered over all parameter settings, reduces the repair time on average by 10.3%, but on the practically relevant settings (with fence placement heuristics) it reduces repair time by 21.5%.

The results for a bounded speculation window are comparable, except that this seems to be significantly more challenging for CURESPEC: repair times increase, in some cases drastically, and `aes_cbc_encrypt` times out regardless of

Table 2: Impact of inserted fences on performance. The time for the non-fixed program is the combined runtime (for 50 random seeds), and the impact columns show the increase in runtime compared to the non-fixed program, for programs repaired with after-branch and before-memory placements, respectively.

Benchmark	input size [MiB]	non-fixed time [s]	after-branch impact	before-memory impact
aes_cbc_encrypt_ct	16	64.49	1.91%	2.26%
aes_cbc_encrypt	16	5.84	53.06%	51.55%
Chacha20_encrypt	64	9.86	6.69%	7.57%
Poly1305_32_mac	256	10.07	67.89%	49.73%

the selected options. Note however that CURESPEC currently does not implement any optimizations that are specific to the bounded speculation mode.

Overall, our results show that CURESPEC can repair complex code such as the OpenSSL and HACL* examples by inserting only a few fences in the right places. Note that for the OpenSSL and HACL* functions, the fences inserted by our repair point to *possible* vulnerabilities, but they might not correspond to actual attacks because of over-approximations in the strong threat model. I.e., CURESPEC may add fences that are not strictly necessary to secure the program.

Evaluation: Performance of Repaired Programs. We evaluate the performance impact of inserted fences on an Intel Core™ i7-8565U CPU @1.80GHz by comparing the runtimes of *non-fixed* programs to those of repaired programs obtained with after-branch and before-memory fence placements, respectively. To get meaningful results we only use benchmarks that have a non-negligible runtime and use 50 random seeds¹¹ to generate input data.¹²

Results are summarized in Table 2. Note that the performance impact is negligible on the constant-time version of AES in cipher block chaining mode, while we have big performance impact on the non-constant time version, even though the number of instructions is similar, and the number of branches and added fences (using a given heuristic) is the same. Moreover, in the Chacha20-implementation, the impact of the three fences from the after-branch heuristic is smaller than the impact of the two fences from the before-memory heuristic.

In summary, the number of fences does not seem to have a strong correlation with the performance impact, which seems to depend more on *where* the fences are added, and on properties of P that are not reflected in the number of instructions or branches. For example, a fence that is placed on an error-handling branch will have much less of an impact on the overall performance than a fence that is placed on a branch that is regularly used in non-erroneous executions of the program. Therefore, we think that optimal placement of fences with respect to their performance impact will be an important direction of future research.

¹¹ obtained from <https://www.random.org/>

¹² Even though CURESPEC with bounded speculation window inserts fewer fences, their impact on performance is very similar. Therefore, we only give a single table.

6 Related Work and Conclusions

Related Work. Existing formal methods for detecting speculative information leaks usually require the program to be repaired manually. This includes the approach by Cauligi et al. [11], which explicitly models the reorder buffer and the processor pipeline, potentially achieving a higher precision than our over-approximating approach. Similarly, the technique developed by Cheang et al. [12] as well as the SPECTECTOR technique [16] are based on extensions of standard notions like observational determinism to speculative execution semantics, and check for these precisely. Moreover, Haunted RelSE [14] extends symbolic execution to reason about standard and speculative executions at the same time. In [24] speculative execution and attacker capabilities are axiomatically modeled in the CAT language for weak memory models, allowing for easy adaption to new Spectre variants. However, it requires to unroll the program and thus has the drawback of not handling unbounded loops/recursion.

On the other hand, there are approaches that automatically repair a given program, but cannot give a formal security guarantee. This includes SpecFuzz [26], which uses fuzzing to detect and repair out-of-bounds array accesses under speculation, as well as oo7 [28], which detects and repairs Spectre leaks by static analysis and a taint tracking approach on the binary level. However, it cannot give a security guarantee since its binary-level analysis may be incomplete.

Another line of work that resembles our approach is the automatic insertion of fences in weak memory models [1, 8, 23]. In contrast to these approaches, our algorithm is tightly coupled with the model checker, and does not use it as a black-box. CURESPEC allows SPACER to maintain most of its state when discovering a counterexample, and to resume its operation after adding a fence.

Finally, Blade [27] implements a type-based approach to repair Spectre leaks. The typing rules construct a dataflow graph between expressions, similar to taint tracking, and use it to detect possible information leaks. While this approach supports automatic repair and comes with a formal security guarantee, it suffers from the usual drawbacks of type-based approaches: the typing rules assume a fixed threat model, and any change to the type system requires to manually prove correctness of the resulting type system. In contrast, our approach is parameterized in the threat model and can easily be combined with different techniques that detect the set of vulnerable instructions.

Conclusions. We present CURESPEC, an automatic repair algorithm for information leaks that are due to speculative execution, parametric w.r.t. the threat model. It is implemented in the SEAHORN verification framework and can handle C programs. When CURESPEC detects a leak, it repairs it by inserting a fence. This procedure is executed iteratively until the program is proved secure. To this end, CURESPEC uses the model checking algorithm PDR incrementally, maintaining PDR’s state between different iterations. This allows CURESPEC to handle realistic programs, as shown by the experimental evaluation on various C functions from OpenSSL and HACL*. CURESPEC also returns an inductive invariant that enables a simple correctness check of the repair in any SMT solver.

References

1. Abdulla, P.A., Atig, M.F., Chen, Y., Leonardsson, C., Rezine, A.: Counter-example guided fence insertion under TSO. In: Flanagan, C., König, B. (eds.) *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems - 18th International Conference, TACAS 2012, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2012, Tallinn, Estonia, March 24 - April 1, 2012. Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 7214, pp. 204–219. Springer (2012)
2. Almeida, J.B., Barbosa, M., Barthe, G., Dupressoir, F., Emmi, M.: Verifying constant-time implementations. In: *USENIX Security Symposium*. pp. 53–70. USENIX Association (2016)
3. Bernstein, D.J.: The poly1305-aes message-authentication code. In: *FSE. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 3557, pp. 32–49. Springer (2005)
4. Bernstein, D.J.: Curve25519: New diffie-hellman speed records. In: *Public Key Cryptography. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 3958, pp. 207–228. Springer (2006)
5. Bhattacharyya, A., Sandulescu, A., Neugschwandtner, M., Sorniotti, A., Falsafi, B., Payer, M., Kurmus, A.: Smotherspectre: Exploiting speculative execution through port contention. In: *CCS*. pp. 785–800. ACM (2019)
6. Bjørner, N.S., McMillan, K.L., Rybalchenko, A.: On solving universally quantified horn clauses. In: *SAS. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 7935, pp. 105–125. Springer (2013)
7. Bloem, R., Jacobs, S., Vize, Y.: Efficient information-flow verification under speculative execution. In: Chen, Y., Cheng, C., Esparza, J. (eds.) *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis - 17th International Symposium, ATVA 2019, Taipei, Taiwan, October 28-31, 2019, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11781, pp. 499–514. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31784-3_29
8. Bouajjani, A., Derevenetc, E., Meyer, R.: Checking and enforcing robustness against TSO. In: Felleisen, M., Gardner, P. (eds.) *Programming Languages and Systems - 22nd European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2013, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2013, Rome, Italy, March 16-24, 2013. Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 7792, pp. 533–553. Springer (2013)
9. Bradley, A.R.: Sat-based model checking without unrolling. In: *VMCAI. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 6538, pp. 70–87. Springer (2011)
10. Canella, C., Bulck, J.V., Schwarz, M., Lipp, M., von Berg, B., Ortner, P., Piessens, F., Evtvyushkin, D., Gruss, D.: A systematic evaluation of transient execution attacks and defenses. In: *USENIX Security Symposium*. pp. 249–266 (2019)
11. Cauligi, S., Disselkoben, C., von Gleissenthall, K., Tullsen, D.M., Stefan, D., Rezk, T., Barthe, G.: Constant-time foundations for the new spectre era. In: *PLDI*. pp. 913–926. ACM (2020)
12. Cheang, K., Rasmussen, C., Seshia, S.A., Subramanyan, P.: A formal approach to secure speculation. In: *CSF*. pp. 288–303. IEEE (2019)
13. Clarke, E.M., Grumberg, O., Jha, S., Lu, Y., Veith, H.: Counterexample-guided abstraction refinement. In: Emerson, E.A., Sistla, A.P. (eds.) *Computer Aided Verification, 12th International Conference, CAV 2000, Chicago, IL, USA, July 15-19, 2000, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 1855, pp. 154–169. Springer (2000). https://doi.org/10.1007/10722167_15

14. Daniel, L., Bardin, S., Rezk, T.: Hunting the haunter - efficient relational symbolic execution for spectre with haunted relse. In: 28th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2021, virtually, February 21-25, 2021. The Internet Society (2021), <https://www.ndss-symposium.org/ndss-paper/hunting-the-haunter-efficient-relational-symbolic-execution-for-spectre-with-haunted-relse/>
15. Denning, D.E., Denning, P.J.: Certification of programs for secure information flow. *Commun. ACM* **20**(7), 504–513 (1977)
16. Guarneri, M., Köpf, B., Morales, J.F., Reineke, J., Sánchez, A.: Spectector: Principled detection of speculative information flows. In: IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 1–19. IEEE (2020)
17. Gurfinkel, A., Kahsai, T., Komuravelli, A., Navas, J.A.: The seahorn verification framework. In: Kroening, D., Pasareanu, C.S. (eds.) *Computer Aided Verification - 27th International Conference, CAV 2015, San Francisco, CA, USA, July 18-24, 2015, Proceedings, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 9206, pp. 343–361. Springer (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21690-4_20
18. Hoder, K., Bjørner, N.S.: Generalized property directed reachability. In: *SAT. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 7317, pp. 157–171. Springer (2012)
19. Khasawneh, K.N., Koruyeh, E.M., Song, C., Evtushkin, D., Ponomarev, D., Abu-Ghazaleh, N.B.: Safespec: Banishing the spectre of a meltdown with leakage-free speculation. In: *DAC*. p. 60. ACM (2019)
20. Kiriansky, V., Lebedev, I.A., Amarasinghe, S.P., Devadas, S., Emer, J.S.: DAWG: A defense against cache timing attacks in speculative execution processors. In: *MICRO*. pp. 974–987. IEEE Computer Society (2018)
21. Kocher, P., Horn, J., Fogh, A., Genkin, D., Gruss, D., Haas, W., Hamburg, M., Lipp, M., Mangard, S., Prescher, T., Schwarz, M., Yarom, Y.: Spectre attacks: Exploiting speculative execution. In: IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 1–19. IEEE (2019)
22. Komuravelli, A., Gurfinkel, A., Chaki, S.: Smt-based model checking for recursive programs. *Formal Methods Syst. Des.* **48**(3), 175–205 (2016)
23. Kuperstein, M., Vechev, M.T., Yahav, E.: Automatic inference of memory fences. In: Bloem, R., Sharygina, N. (eds.) *Proceedings of 10th International Conference on Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design, FMCAD 2010, Lugano, Switzerland, October 20-23*. pp. 111–119. IEEE (2010)
24. de León, H.P., Kinder, J.: Cats vs. spectre: An axiomatic approach to modeling speculative execution attacks. In: 43rd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2022, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 22-26, 2022. pp. 235–248. IEEE (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP46214.2022.9833774>
25. de Moura, L.M., Bjørner, N.S.: Z3: an efficient SMT solver. In: *TACAS. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 4963, pp. 337–340. Springer (2008)
26. Oleksenko, O., Trach, B., Silberstein, M., Fetzner, C.: Specfuzz: Bringing spectre-type vulnerabilities to the surface. In: *USENIX Security Symposium*. pp. 1481–1498. USENIX Association (2020)
27. Vassena, M., Disselkoen, C., von Gleissenthall, K., Cauligi, S., Kici, R.G., Jhala, R., Tullsen, D.M., Stefan, D.: Automatically eliminating speculative leaks from cryptographic code with blade. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **5**(POPL), 1–30 (2021)
28. Wang, G., Chattopadhyay, S., Gotovchits, I., Mitra, T., Roychoudhury, A.: oo7: Low-overhead defense against spectre attacks via program analysis. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* **47**(11), 2504–2519 (2021)

29. Yan, M., Choi, J., Skarlatos, D., Morrison, A., Fletcher, C.W., Torrellas, J.: Invisispec: Making speculative execution invisible in the cache hierarchy (corrigendum). In: MICRO. p. 1076. ACM (2019)
30. Zinzindohoué, J.K., Bhargavan, K., Protzenko, J., Beurdouche, B.: Hacl*: A verified modern cryptographic library. In: Thuraisingham, B., Evans, D., Malkin, T., Xu, D. (eds.) Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2017, Dallas, TX, USA, October 30 - November 03, 2017. pp. 1789–1806. ACM (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3133956.3134043>

A Proofs

Lemma 1. *Let P be a program, $M = \langle X, \text{Init}, \text{Tr} \rangle$ its transition system, and \hat{M} the transition system including speculative execution semantics. Then, there exists a simulation relation between M and \hat{M} , denoted $M \leq_{\text{sim}} \hat{M}$.*

Proof. Follows from the proof of Lemma 5.

Lemma 2. *Let $\pi = \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ be an execution of \hat{M} such that $\sigma_k \models \hat{B}ad$. Then the following conditions hold: (i) $\sigma_0 \models \text{spec} = 0$ (ii) $\sigma_k \models \text{spec} > 0$ (iii) There exists a unique $0 \leq j < k$ such that $\sigma_j \models \text{spec} = 0$ and $\sigma_{j+1} \models \text{spec} > 0$.*

Proof. From $\sigma_0 \models \hat{I}nit$ follows (i). Since $\sigma_k \models \hat{B}ad$ we have $\sigma_k \models \text{pc} = \perp$. In order for pc to get \perp , there needs to be a point where $\text{spec} \neq 0$ holds (see $\hat{\tau}_{a_i}$). Since spec can never decrease starting from 0 in σ_0 , $\text{spec} > 0$ at that point and (iii) follows. (ii) holds because τ_{\perp} never changes spec afterwards.

Lemma 3. *Let P be a program, $M = \langle X, \text{Init}, \text{Tr} \rangle$ its transition system, and $\mathbf{VInst} \subseteq P$. Assume that M is constant-time secure, where observations of the attacker are determined by \mathbf{VInst} . Let $\hat{M} = \langle \hat{X}, \hat{I}nit, \hat{\text{Tr}} \rangle$ be the transition system of P that includes speculative execution semantics. If \hat{M} is SAFE wrt. $\hat{B}ad$, then M is constant-time secure, i.e., P does not leak information under speculation.*

Proof. We have already argued that, under the assumption that P is constant-time secure without speculation, violations of constant-time security under speculation are only possible at instructions in \mathbf{VInst} that are reached under speculation. Since this is exactly the definition of $\hat{B}ad$, the statement follows immediately.

Lemma 4. *Let $\pi = \sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_N$ be an execution of \hat{M} such that $\sigma_N \models \hat{B}ad$ and $k \leq N$ be its speculative split point. For any instruction $i \in P$ such that $i \in \pi^k$ (see Remark 1), $\hat{I}nit \models \neg \text{fence}_i$. Moreover, π is not an execution of \hat{M}_i and for every execution $\hat{\pi} = \hat{\sigma}_0, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_m$ of \hat{M}_i , $\hat{\pi}\pi^k$ is not an execution of \hat{M}_i .*

Proof. Let $i \in \pi^k$ and j such that $(\sigma_{j-1}, \sigma'_j) \models \hat{\tau}_i$ (see Remark 1). Assume $\hat{I}nit \models \text{fence}_i$. Since the values of fences never change during execution, we have $\sigma_{j-1} \models \text{fence}_i$. Moreover, $\sigma_{j-1} \models \text{spec} > 0$ and thus, $\sigma_{j-1} = \sigma_j = \sigma_N$. We have a contradiction because $\sigma_{j-1} \models \text{pc} = i$. Thus, $\hat{I}nit \models \neg \text{fence}_i$ and π^k is not a path of \hat{M}_i . Therefore, no prefix $\hat{\pi}$ exists such that $\hat{\pi}\pi^k$ is an execution of \hat{M}_i .

Theorem 1. *Let P be a program and $\hat{M} = \langle \hat{X}, \hat{I}nit, \hat{\text{Tr}} \rangle$ its speculative execution transition system. Then, on input $\langle \hat{M}, \hat{B}ad \rangle$, CURESPEC terminates and returns a list \mathcal{L} such that for $\hat{M}_s = \langle \hat{X}, \hat{I}nit_s, \hat{\text{Tr}} \rangle$, where $\forall i \in \mathcal{L}. \hat{I}nit_s \models \text{fence}_i$, it holds that $\langle \hat{M}_s, \hat{B}ad \rangle$ is SAFE (as witnessed by the final invariant F_{∞}).*

Proof. The **SpecLeak** and **AddFence** rules are applicable at most $|\mathcal{F}|$ times each (Lemma 4). Thus, termination follows from the termination of Algorithm 1. After the final application of rule **AddFence**, CURESPEC analyzes \hat{M}_s and constructs an inductive invariant F_{∞} showing that $\langle \hat{M}_s, \hat{B}ad \rangle$ is SAFE.

Lemma 5 (Incrementality). *Let P be a program and let M and \hat{M} be its transition system and speculative execution transition system, respectively. For $i \in P$, if $\hat{Init} \models \neg \text{fence}_i$ then $M \leq_{sim} \hat{M}_i \leq_{sim} \hat{M}$.*

Proof. Let π be an execution of M . Since it does not involve speculative execution there exists a corresponding execution in \hat{M}_i because fences only affect speculative executions. This shows $M \leq_{sim} \hat{M}_i$. Moreover, the additional fence in \hat{M}_i only removes valid executions from \hat{M} . So, $\hat{M}_i \leq_{sim} \hat{M}$ holds, too.

B Additional Experimental Results

We give 4 tables that contain experimental results for all our parameter settings (except for non-incremental without any heuristic, which is the baseline from Table 1).

Table 3: incremental solving, with fence activation heuristic

Benchmark	every-inst			after-branch			before-memory		
	# _f	time	RSS	# _f	time	RSS	# _f	time	RSS
aes_encrypt_ct	3	77.7	7.05	3	0.8	0.09	3	1.7	0.32
aes_encrypt	3	99.4	7.90	3	0.7	0.10	3	4.7	0.98
aes_cbc_encrypt_ct	10	1300.3	30.53	15	100.7	0.65	10	80.6	1.41
aes_cbc_encrypt	10	2143.1	34.35	15	774.5	1.51	10	135.1	4.34
bn_mul_part	7	6.8	0.76	13	2.6	0.18	7	1.3	0.16
bn_sqr_part	9	15.0	1.06	13	3.4	0.19	9	2.5	0.22
bn_exp_part	18	205.1	5.16	29	57.4	0.82	18	21.8	0.61
Chacha20_encrypt	2	5802.9	81.08	3	8.0	0.33	2	8.4	1.90
Poly1305_32_mac	4	53.8	4.70	4	2.2	0.12	4	6.4	0.72
Curve25519_64_ecdh		timeout		3	3115.3	1.92		timeout	

Table 4: non-incremental solving, with fence activation heuristic

Benchmark	every-inst			after-branch			before-memory		
	# _f	time	RSS	# _f	time	RSS	# _f	time	RSS
aes_encrypt_ct	3	86.4	7.04	3	0.8	0.09	3	1.9	0.32
aes_encrypt	3	103.1	7.90	3	1.3	0.11	3	5.6	1.01
aes_cbc_encrypt_ct	10	1819.8	31.63	15	88.5	0.75	10	91.5	1.70
aes_cbc_encrypt	10	2302.9	42.97	15	2539.8	2.31	10	129.9	5.18
bn_mul_part	7	7.5	0.77	13	2.9	0.18	7	1.4	0.16
bn_sqr_part	9	17.6	1.15	13	3.7	0.21	9	2.8	0.24
bn_exp_part	18	249.5	5.66	29	69.6	1.05	18	28.1	0.65
Chacha20_encrypt	2	5506.3	80.46	3	9.1	0.33	2	11.3	1.93
Poly1305_32_mac	4	72.9	4.80	4	2.6	0.12	4	7.4	0.73
Curve25519_64_ecdh		timeout		3	2507.9	1.79		timeout	

Table 5: incremental solving, with fence activation heuristic, speculation window of size 20

Benchmark	every-inst			after-branch			before-memory		
	# _f	time	RSS	# _f	time	RSS	# _f	time	RSS
aes_encrypt_ct	3	245.0	8.40	3	1.8	0.10	3	3.6	0.35
aes_encrypt	3	365.4	8.28	3	2.8	0.12	3	15.6	1.12
aes_cbc_encrypt_ct	8	6296.9	66.89	12	1384.0	5.16	9	1080.8	14.84
aes_cbc_encrypt		timeout			timeout			timeout	
bn_mul_part	7	8.2	0.82	13	3.7	0.19	7	1.7	0.17
bn_sqr_part	9	18.5	1.27	13	5.0	0.21	9	3.4	0.24
bn_exp_part	18	2046.0	8.39	29	1116.0	2.05	18	383.5	1.51
Chacha20_encrypt		timeout		3	89.8	0.33	2	60.0	2.01
Poly1305_32_mac	4	100.8	4.84	4	5.5	0.13	4	10.2	0.78
Curve25519_64_ecdh		timeout		3	3073.0	1.91		timeout	

Table 6: non-incremental solving, with fence activation heuristic, speculation window of size 20

Benchmark	every-inst			after-branch			before-memory		
	$\#_f$	time	RSS	$\#_f$	time	RSS	$\#_f$	time	RSS
aes_encrypt_ct	3	299.0	8.35	3	2.9	0.10	3	6.7	0.36
aes_encrypt	3	426.2	8.13	3	3.9	0.12	3	24.8	1.17
aes_cbc_encrypt_ct		timeout		12	998.9	4.57	9	976.8	13.39
aes_cbc_encrypt		timeout			timeout			timeout	
bn_mul_part	7	10.0	0.84	13	5.0	0.19	7	2.0	0.17
bn_sqr_part	9	23.4	1.34	13	5.9	0.22	9	4.0	0.26
bn_exp_part	18	1531.5	9.99	29	1103.9	2.24	18	557.4	1.86
Chacha20_encrypt		timeout		3	77.1	0.33	2	58.3	2.10
Poly1305_32_mac	4	105.6	4.83	4	7.5	0.13	4	9.7	0.78