

Cloud Computing Security

Foundations and Research Directions

Suggested Citation: Anrin Chakraborti, Reza Curtmola, Jonathan Katz, Jason Nieh, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, Radu Sion and Yinqian Zhang (2022), "Cloud Computing Security", : Vol. XX, No. XX, pp 1–112. DOI: XXX.

Anrin Chakraborti

Reza Curtmola

Jonathan Katz

Jason Nieh

Ahmad- Reza Sadeghi

Radu Sion

Yinqian Zhang

This article may be used only for the purpose of research, teaching, and/or private study. Commercial use or systematic downloading (by robots or other automatic processes) is prohibited without explicit Publisher approval.

now
the essence of knowledge
Boston — Delft

Contents

1	Acknowledgements	2
2	Introduction	3
2.1	Secure Infrastructure	4
2.2	Secure Computation	5
2.3	Secure Storage	6
1	Secure Infrastructure	8
3	Virtualization	9
3.1	Trusted Designs	10
3.2	Formally-Verified Hypervisors	12
3.3	Future Directions	14
4	Hardware-Enabled Security	15
4.1	Trusted Execution Environments	16
4.2	Open Challenges and Future Research Direction	24
5	Side-Channels	25
5.1	Side-channel Attacks	26
5.2	Side-channel Defenses	34

5.3	Future Directions	37
II	Secure Computation	39
6	Secure Distributed Computation	40
6.1	The Ideal World	42
6.2	The Real World	45
6.3	Defining Security	46
6.4	Feasibility Results and Secure Protocols	48
6.5	Open Questions	49
7	Encrypted Search	50
7.1	Searchable Encryption	50
7.2	Encrypted Databases	53
III	Secure Storage	54
8	Data Access Privacy	55
8.1	Access Privacy	57
8.2	Communication-Efficient ORAMs	59
8.3	Round-Trip Efficient ORAMs	62
8.4	Compute-Efficient ORAMs	63
8.5	Other Practical Considerations	63
9	Provable Data Possession	68
9.1	Prior approaches	70
9.2	Provable Data Possession	70
9.3	Dynamic Provable Data Possession	72
9.4	Proofs of Retrievability	73
9.5	Towards Auditing Distributed Storage Systems	74
9.6	Remote Data Integrity Checking With Server-side Repair	77
9.7	Future Research Directions	79
	References	82

Cloud Computing Security

Anrin Chakraborti¹, Reza Curtmola², Jonathan Katz³, Jason Nieh⁴,
Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi⁵, Radu Sion⁶ and Yinqian Zhang⁷

¹*Duke University; anrin.chakraborti@duke.edu*

²*New Jersey Institute of Technology; reza.curtmola@njit.edu*

³*University of Maryland, College Park; jkatz@cs.umd.edu*

⁴*Columbia University; nieh@cs.columbia.edu*

⁵*Technische Universität Darmstadt;
ahmad.sadeghi@trust.tu-darmstadt.de*

⁶*Stony Brook University; sion@cs.stonybrook.edu*

⁷*Southern University of Science and Technology; yinqianz@acm.org*

ABSTRACT

Cloud services have revolutionized modern computing. The benefits of outsourcing data and computation comes with security and privacy concerns. This article explores the advances in cloud security research across both industry and academia, with a special focus on secure infrastructure, services and storage. Besides overviewing the state of the art, the article highlights open problems, and possible future research directions.

1

Acknowledgements

Reza Curtmola's work was supported by the NSF through awards 1801430, 2043104, and 1565478. He would like to thank his co-authors without which some of the work referenced in this article would not have been possible.

Jason Nieh's work was supported in part by two Amazon Research Awards, a Guggenheim Fellowship, DARPA contract N66001-21-C-4018, and NSF grants CCF-1918400, CNS-2052947, and CCF-2124080.

The work of Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi and his co-contributors Emmanuel Stapf, Patrick Jauernig and Ferdinand Brasser was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) in the StartUpSecure funding program (16KIS1417).

Radu Sion's work was supported by the NSF through award 2052951, and ONR through award N000142112407.

2

Introduction

Cloud services have revolutionized computing in the modern world. In an increasingly networked ecosystem, it is commonplace for enterprises and private parties alike to leverage cloud services for storage and compute. The most obvious benefits include scalability, increased availability, and the potential for reduced costs¹ when compared to lower-scale on-premise infrastructures. In addition, cloud-hosted data (and compute) is accessible across platforms and is not limited by geographical constraints making collaboration attractively viable.

However, these benefits come with their share of pitfalls. Over time cloud architecture have become increasingly complex. Cloud platforms today run tens and sometimes hundreds of millions of lines of code to support a wide range of services and capabilities. From a security perspective, this results in an enormously large attack surface, which is now much more attractive to determined knowledge and resource-intensive attackers, mainly due to its potential to expose millions of customers' critical data. This is further exacerbated by the fact that multi-tenancy, inherent in the very fabric of the cloud value proposition

¹But lower costs are not a given – and very often, applications not designed to scale properly may incur comparably astronomical costs when run in the cloud.

can bring forth significant and unforeseen security issues including the now-ubiquitous side channels – not usually of concern in single-user systems and enterprise networks – but that now completely compromise vast swaths of the infrastructure and customer workloads. As a result, cloud security has become a focal point for security researchers over the past decade.

This article discusses a number of key issues critical in this endeavour. We focus here on challenges that the authors found are particularly interesting. We provide an overview of some of the solutions while highlighting noteworthy designs and discussing remaining open problems. We also note that **a holistic complete view of this vast problem space, effectively spanning all layers of modern computing, is out of scope and cannot be addressed in any one piece of work.**

Structure of the Article Cloud security is a broad topic encompassing concepts from a large cross section of domains. To make this article concise and meaningful, we target several topics and challenges that are almost entirely specific to clouds. For this reason, general computing security topics such as intrusion detection, software protection, phishing etc. are excluded. While these are important building blocks that need to be considered in an end-to-end cloud-centric design, they have been extensively addressed elsewhere.

The article is divided into three parts based on a broad clustering into hardware, computation, and storage. Specifically the intuition is that a typical cloud stack will need to: i) secure the platforms on top of which clouds services e.g., on-demand VMs run, ii) secure the services e.g., by providing by secure compute capabilities, and iii) secure data stored at rest on the cloud-hosted storage platforms. We now briefly overview each part.

2.1 Secure Infrastructure

Cloud infrastructure is extremely complex involving several components such as networks, hardware etc. Nevertheless, a critical cornerstone component of any contemporary cloud architecture is the underlying computation virtualization technology.

Secure Hypervisors Arguably, systems that enable virtualization e.g., hypervisors constitute the most security-sensitive component of a cloud architecture since they usually run millions of lines of code at the highest privilege level with full access to the underlying hardware and user data. Securing this software is one of the foremost challenges to building secure clouds. Chapter 3 discusses the state of the art in trusted hypervisor designs, in addition to techniques that formally verify hypervisors for secure deployments.

Hardware-Enabled Security Trusted execution environments (TEEs) are an integral part of cloud infrastructure. They protect confidentiality and integrity of client application data from other tenants, as well as from an untrusted cloud provider. Widely-deployed TEEs like Intel SGX (Intel Corporation, 2014) and AMD SEV (Kaplan *et al.*, 2016) make it possible to run computation isolated from all the other untrusted software running in the same system, with strong hardware-backed guarantees. Chapter 4 discusses these technologies highlighting their merits and demerits.

Side-Channels Multi-tenancy in clouds supported by virtualization also introduces other challenges, specifically in the form of side-channels. This is because a cloud tenant may have its computation co-located with other potentially untrusted and malicious parties. This unrestricted sharing of resources between mutually distrustful parties creates new attack vectors that is not typical to single-user systems or even enterprise networks. Chapter 5 discusses the potential pitfalls of multi-tenancy and outlines solutions that effectively defend against side-channels in cloud environments.

2.2 Secure Computation

With Platform-as-a-service (PaaS) and Software-as-a-service (SaaS), cloud services provide various ways for users to outsource and compute on cloud hardware. One particularly popular instance of this is machine learning as a service (MLaaS). Naturally, in these settings, the user would like to ensure that the computation is performed with certain

verifiable guarantees which includes confidentiality of input/output, correctness of results etc.

Secure Distributed Computation Multi-party cryptographic techniques are important building blocks for secure cloud computation. Informally, secure multiparty computation involves two (or more) mutually-untrusting parties jointly computing on shared data while ensuring that they learn nothing more than what the protocol specifies about each others' inputs etc. In the cloud setting, the untrusted party is the cloud service while the users constitute the trusted parties. Chapter 6 discusses the results in distributed secure computation which enable secure computing in the cloud.

Encrypted Search Client-side encryption is an essential first step towards protecting data stored on cloud platforms. This strong protection comes at the cost of usability and performance since the server can no longer search and compute on the data. Encrypted search techniques (e.g., searchable encryption) take a middleground approach and enable keyword searches in encrypted documents. Encrypted databases further extend this idea and support rich query functionalities like joins etc. Chapter 7 discusses these techniques and highlights their merits and demerits.

2.3 Secure Storage

Most cloud services provide Storage-as-a-services (STaaS). This has become a popular option for enterprises to store data in a cost-effective way as opposed to setting up on-premise data centers. However, the abundance of data on online (often public) spaces raises important security concerns that are not handled by conventional encryption. We discuss two such challenges.

Access Pattern Privacy Chapter 8 discusses the problem of access privacy for data stored on clouds. It is well-known that revealing access patterns to data can reveal a wealth of information about the contents, even when the data is encrypted. This problem is especially concerning

in clouds where the (potentially untrusted) cloud provider has easy access to the data access patterns through access logs etc.

Provable Data Possession Chapter 9 discusses the problem of provable data possession. Cloud services rarely provide verifiable guarantees with regards to the integrity and long-term reliability of the stored data. If the data is lost, damaged or revealed to unauthorized sources, the damage is irreversible. Provable data possession ensures that clients can verify that an untrusted provider indeed ensures all the proper guarantees for the stored data, and detect corruptions if any.

Part I

Secure Infrastructure

3

Virtualization

Virtualization technologies are the backbone of cloud architectures, enabling users to move their data and computation off-site to cloud-hosted virtual machines (VMs). The most critical component of a virtualized system is the hypervisor which provides the VM abstraction (Bugnion *et al.*, 2017). The hypervisor controls the hardware and typically runs at the highest privilege level. However, commodity hypervisors, that are often integrated with a host operating system kernel, present a large potential attack surface with access to VM data in CPU registers, memory, I/O data and boot images. Attackers that exploit hypervisor vulnerabilities may gain access to all VM data (potentially belonging to different clients) compromising privacy and integrity guarantees. Therefore, securing hypervisors against unauthorized access and other potential attack vectors is of paramount importance to securing cloud services. There is a long line of work on designing more secure hypervisors for clouds. In the following, we highlight various approaches for addressing this problem.

3.1 Trusted Designs

Bare-Metal Hypervisors Unlike hosted hypervisors which integrate with a host operating system kernel, bare-metal hypervisors are standalone hypervisors. They often claim a smaller TCB as an advantage over hosted hypervisors, but in practice, the aggregate TCB of the widely-used Xen (Barham *et al.*, 2003) bare-metal hypervisor includes *Dom0* (Colp *et al.*, 2011; Zhang *et al.*, 2011a), which includes an entire Linux kernel, and therefore is no smaller than hosted hypervisors like KVM (Kivity *et al.*, 2007; Dall and Nieh, 2014). Some work thus focuses on reducing Xen’s attack surface by redesigning *Dom0* (Murray *et al.*, 2008; Colp *et al.*, 2011; Butt *et al.*, 2012).

Microhypervisors Microhypervisors (Steinberg and Kauer, 2010; Heiser and Leslie, 2010) take a microkernel approach to build clean-slate hypervisors from scratch to reduce the hypervisor TCB. For example, NOVA (Steinberg and Kauer, 2010) moves various aspects of virtualization such as CPU and I/O virtualization to user space services. The virtualization services are trusted but instantiated per VM so that compromising them only affects the given VM. Others simplify the hypervisor to reduce its TCB by removing (Shinagawa *et al.*, 2009) or disabling (Nguyen *et al.*, 2012) virtual device I/O support in hypervisors, or partitioning VM resources statically (Keller *et al.*, 2010; Siemens, 2019). HyperLock (Wang *et al.*, 2012), DeHype (Wu *et al.*, 2013), and Nexen (Shi *et al.*, 2017) focus on deconstructing existing monolithic hypervisors by segregating hypervisor functions to per VM instances. While this can isolate an exploit of hypervisor functions to a given VM instance, if a vulnerability is exploitable in one VM instance, it is likely to be exploitable in another as well. Nexen builds on Nested Kernel to retrofit Xen in this manner, though it does not protect against vulnerabilities in its shared hypervisor services.

Retrofitting Commodity Hypervisors A different approach to building trusted hypervisors is retrofitting a commodity hypervisor to reduce the TCB based on microkernel principles while inheriting its extensively virtualization features. Hypsec (Li *et al.*, 2019) partitions a mono-

lithic hypervisor into a trusted core, called the *corevisor* and a large untrusted host called the *hostvisor*. Hypsec leverages hardware virtualization support to isolate and protect the corevisor and execute it at a higher privilege level than the hostvisor. The corevisor has full access to hardware resources, provides basic CPU and memory utilization and mediates all exception and interrupts. More complex operations such as I/O and interrupt virtualization, and resource management is delegated to the hostvisor.

CloudVisor (Zhang *et al.*, 2011a) uses a small, specialized host hypervisor to support nested virtualization and protect user VMs against an untrusted Xen guest hypervisor, though Xen modifications are required. CloudVisor encrypts VM I/O and memory but does not fully protect CPU state, contrary to its claims of “providing both secrecy and integrity to a VM’s states, including CPU states.” For example, the VM program counter is exposed to Xen to support I/O. As with any nested virtualization approach, performance overhead on application workloads is a problem. Furthermore, CloudVisor does not support widely used paravirtual I/O. CloudVisor has a smaller TCB by not supporting public key cryptography, making key management problematic.

3.1.1 Software Protection

Various projects extend a trusted hypervisor to protect software within VMs, including protecting applications running on an untrusted guest OS in the VM (Chen *et al.*, 2008; Yang and Shin, 2008; McCune *et al.*, 2010; Chhabra *et al.*, 2011; Hofmann *et al.*, 2013), ensuring kernel integrity and protecting against rootkits and code injection attacks or to isolate I/O channels (Wang *et al.*, 2009; Riley *et al.*, 2008; Seshadri *et al.*, 2007; Wang *et al.*, 2015b; Zhou *et al.*, 2014), and dividing applications and system components in VMs then relying on the hypervisor to safeguard interactions among secure and insecure components (Garfinkel *et al.*, 2003; Strackx and Piessens, 2012; Ta-Min *et al.*, 2006; Liu *et al.*, 2015b). Overshadow (Chen *et al.*, 2008) and Inktag (Hofmann *et al.*, 2013) use a more trusted hypervisor component to protect against untrusted kernel software. Overshadow and Inktag also assume applications use end-to-end encrypted network I/O, though

they protect file I/O by replacing it with memory-mapped I/O to encrypted memory.

Protecting User Data with Specialized Hardware To protect user data in virtualization systems, there is work that require VM support for specialized hardware such as Intel SGX Intel Corporation, 2014 or ARM TrustZone. These hardware-backed designs are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4 . Haven (Baumann *et al.*, 2014a) and S-NFV (Shih *et al.*, 2016) use Intel SGX to protect application data. Others Zhu *et al.*, 2017; Hua *et al.*, 2017 run a security monitor in ARM TrustZone and rely on ARM IP features such as TrustZone Address Space Controller to protect VMs. vTZ (Hua *et al.*, 2017) virtualizes TrustZone and protects the guest TEE against an untrusted hypervisor, but does not protect the normal world VM. HA-VMSI (Zhu *et al.*, 2017) protects the normal world VM against a compromised hypervisor but supports limited virtualization features.

3.2 Formally-Verified Hypervisors

Formally-verified hypervisors provide a theoretically-sound approach to building trusted hypervisors for clouds. seL4 (Klein *et al.*, 2009; Klein *et al.*, 2014) and CertiKOS (Gu *et al.*, 2016; Gu *et al.*, 2019) are verified systems with hypervisor functionality. While various versions of seL4 exist, noninterference properties and functional correctness have only been verified on a single uniprocessor version (*seL4 Supported Platforms n.d.*); bugs have been discovered in other seL4 versions (Oberhauser *et al.*, 2021). The verified version only supports Armv7 hardware and has no virtualization support (*seL4 Supported Platforms n.d.*). Another seL4 Armv7 version verifies the functional correctness of some hypervisor features, but not MMU functionality (*seL4 Supported Platforms n.d.*; Klein *et al.*, 2018), which is at the core of a functional hypervisor. seL4 does not support shared page tables (*seL4 Reference Manual Version 11.0.0* 2019), and verifying multiprocessor and hypervisor support remain future work (*Frequently Asked Questions on seL4 n.d.*). It lacks most features expected of a hypervisor. Its device support via virtio is unverified and also needs to be ported to its platform, limiting its virtio

functionality. For example, seL4 lacks support for virtio block devices and has no vhost optimization. Building a system using seL4 is much harder than using Linux (*Frequently Asked Questions on seL4* n.d.).

CertiKOS proves noninterference for the sequential mCertiKOS kernel (Costanzo *et al.*, 2016) without virtualization support and goes beyond seL4 in verifying the functional correctness of the mC2 multiprocessor kernel with virtualization. However, mC2 provides no data confidentiality and integrity among VMs. Like seL4, CertiKOS also cannot verify shared page tables, so it does not provide verified support for multiprocessor VMs. The verified kernel does not work on modern 64-bit hardware. It lacks many hypervisor features, including dynamically allocated page tables for multi-level paging, huge page support, device passthrough, and VM migration. Its virtio support does not include vhost, is limited to only certain block devices, and requires porting virtio to its platform, making it difficult to keep up with virtio improvements and updates.

Other works have only partially verified their hypervisor code to reduce proof effort. The VCC framework has been used to verify 20% of Microsoft’s Hyper-V multiprocessor hypervisor, but global security properties remain unproven (Cohen *et al.*, 2009; Leinenbach and Santen, 2009). überSpark has been used to verify the üXMHF hypervisor, but their architecture does not support concurrent hardware access, and their verification approach foregoes functional correctness (Vasudevan *et al.*, 2013; Vasudevan *et al.*, 2016).

Despite these advances, it is infeasible to fully verify commercially-deployed hypervisors which may contain more than 2M LOC e.g., KVM, the widely-used Linux hypervisor. As an elegant and scalable solution to this problem, Li *et al.* (Li *et al.*, 2021a) introduce the idea of *microverification* to reduce proof effort by retrofitting a commodity system into a small core and a set of untrusted services, so that it is possible to reason about the properties of the entire system by verifying the core alone. Based on this idea, they introduced *MicroV*, a new framework for verifying the security properties of large, multiprocessor commodity systems to provably guarantee data confidentiality and integrity. They used this verification framework to verify the security properties of a commodity hypervisor for the first time, specifically

KVM (Li *et al.*, 2021a; Li *et al.*, 2021b; Tao *et al.*, 2021). The approach does not verify that KVM is entirely functionally correct, but rather proves that its core is functionally correct and that is sufficient to ensure the security properties hold for the entire hypervisor despite potential vulnerabilities in the rest of KVM.

3.3 Future Directions

Formal verification remains an important ongoing area of work in proving the security of hypervisors. Although the security properties of KVM have been verified, it remains to be seen whether similar approaches can be used to verify other commercially-deployed hypervisors with different architectures and implementations, such as Xen or VMware. Another important consideration is whether formal verification can be used to verify other security properties other than confidentiality and integrity. For example, in some domains, availability may be of greater concern, such as in the context of security-critical systems for cyber-physical systems such as self-driving cars, in which security critical components may be isolated in VMs but must be guaranteed to be able to run. It remains to be seen how formal verification techniques might be used to prove availability guarantees for a commodity hypervisor.

Another important direction of future work is hardware security for virtualization. Hardware mechanisms have increasingly been introduced to support various security features for applications. As hypervisors are part of the critical software infrastructure that must be secured, it is only a matter of time until hardware mechanisms are introduced to support the improved security of hypervisors. For example, if hardware were available that could guarantee the confidentiality and integrity of applications despite potential hypervisor vulnerabilities, this would substantially mitigate the security risk due to complex commercially-deployed hypervisors. Such hardware might provide mechanisms that a hypervisor could leverage to manage VMs without giving the hypervisor access to VM data.

4

Hardware-Enabled Security

In this section, we discuss *Trusted Execution Environments (TEEs)*, often enabled by specialized secure hardware, which is increasingly finding its way into cloud infrastructures. Contemporary workload isolation mechanisms in cloud computing focus on protecting the cloud environment from accesses by untrusted tenants, i.e., they provide security *for* the cloud service provider. Very often however, tenants want to protect the confidentiality and integrity of their application data not only from other tenants but also *from* the cloud itself, and specifically higher privileged system software, such as the hypervisor. In most of the current cloud infrastructures, clients rely on the service provider for data and code integrity. However, this is problematic since the cloud infrastructures may be compromised by malicious actors or software bugs. Since formally-verified hypervisors, discussed in Chapter 3, are not yet ubiquitously deployed, cloud customers are left with no choice other than to rely on the cloud service provider's security measures. Trust must be placed in the complete software stack, in particular the hypervisor, with the inherent underlying risk whereby a compromised component can lead to severe data leakages.

Hardware-enforced isolated execution environments, also known as

TEEs, represent a paradigm shift in computer architectures, which will impact the computing landscape fundamentally. It will revolutionize cloud computing and enable many new applications and scenarios, similar to hardware-based virtualization kick-started cloud computing in general. In this section we will discuss TEEs in the context of cloud computing in detail. First, we give an overview of some of the major TEEs, or TEE architectures as we call them in the remainder of this section, that are already available on today's server platforms. Next, we discuss in detail which problems TEE architectures currently face. On the one side, these are security problems mainly in the area of side-channel attacks. On the other side, TEE architectures also face performance and functionality problems, e.g., when it comes to the support of legacy cloud-native workloads. In the end, we point to recent research which aims to tackle the aforementioned problems and we identify important future research directions.

4.1 Trusted Execution Environments

TEE architectures are already actively used to protect sensitive cloud computing workloads. The biggest players in the server market, Intel and AMD, both designed TEE architectures, namely, Intel Software Guard Extensions (SGX) and AMD Secure Encrypted Virtualization (SEV) which we describe in this section. Moreover, we point to new emerging TEE architectures not yet available which were specifically designed to secure cloud computing.

4.1.1 Intel Software Guard Extensions

The server market is still dominated by Intel which achieved a market share of 92% in 2020 (TrendForce, 2021). In 2015, Intel SGX (Intel, 2014) was introduced with the Skylake microarchitecture as one of the first TEE architectures which protects sensitive applications in isolated execute context, called *enclaves*. Intel SGX was first introduced in the desktop processors but later also included in the server processors to enable the protection of secure microservices in the cloud.

Adversary model. The adversary model of SGX assumes a strong adversary that can compromise all system software, even the operating system kernel and hypervisor. Furthermore, the adversary is able to compromise or misconfigure system peripherals in order to perform Direct Memory Access (DMA) attacks (Markettos *et al.*, 2019; Zhou *et al.*, 2012). Cache side-channel attacks are not considered in the adversary model of SGX (Johnson, 2018). Also, importantly, while the adversary is allowed to perform simple physical attacks on associated components such as DRAM (e.g., cold-boot attacks (Halderman *et al.*, 2009)), she is assumed to *not be able to perform more sophisticated physical penetration or exfiltration attacks on the overall system and its CPUs.*

Design & features. In SGX, instances of a TEE, called enclaves, are used to execute sensitive program code in user space, isolated from each other and from a potentially malicious operating system or hypervisor. Each enclave is bundled with a regular non-sensitive application which invokes the enclave as a child process. During the enclave setup, the integrity of the enclave code is verified (attested), i.e., an authenticated measurement (i.e., typically a binary hash) of the code loaded into the enclave is reported either locally or remotely. When an enclave is executed, it shares its virtual address space with its host process. The untrusted operating system performs the enclave memory management, handles the enclave exceptions and provides I/O services to the enclaves (Intel, 2017). All enclave code or data leaving the CPU is always encrypted before being stored in memory. This allows SGX to protect enclaves from simple hardware attacks and malicious DMA requests. Furthermore, it enables SGX to persistently store the enclave states after their execution.

Hardware primitives & TCB. The enclave code and data (e.g., its page tables) is protected from an unauthorized access by system software through primitives in hardware. SGX is mostly implemented inside of the CPU through microcode, e.g., a new set of instructions to control and communicate with the enclaves was introduced. Additionally, minimal hardware changes are made at the page table walker. When a page fault

is triggered as a result of a TLB miss, the SGX microcode checks if the virtual address points to enclave memory and subsequently performs access control on it. Only if the current execution context is allowed to access the enclave memory, the address translation is performed and the physical address loaded into the TLB. The transparent encryption outside of the CPU package is performed by a new hardware component called the Memory Encryption Engine (MEE). Together with the MEE, the CPU forms the hardware TCB of the system. The enclave attestation scheme is implemented in a set of enclaves provided by Intel, e.g. the Quoting Enclave which computes attestation signatures. These privileged enclaves have access to the keys in the SGX hardware and represent the software TCB of the system.

4.1.2 AMD Secure Encrypted Virtualization

The second biggest player in the server market, AMD, with a market share of 8% in 2020 (TrendForce, 2021) introduced their own TEE architecture for servers platforms, Secure Encrypted Virtualization (SEV) (Kaplan *et al.*, 2016), in 2017.

Adversary model. The adversary model of AMD SEV is comparable to the one assumed in Intel SGX. AMD also assumes a strong adversary which can even compromise the hypervisor layer and perform DMA and simple hardware attacks. As in the adversary model of SGX, cache side-channel attacks are not considered.

Design & features. SEV provides protection for complete Virtual Machines (VM) in cloud scenarios and is designed on top of AMD's Secure Memory Encryption (SME) technology. SEV isolates VMs, which represent a TEE instance, from each other and the underlying hypervisor layer by encrypting each VM transparently with an individually-generated encryption key. The keys are generated from random sources at the VM launch time. Access to these keys is limited to hardware, thus, the hypervisor or any other software component outside the VM cannot interfere with the encryption. An identification key embedded into the firmware can be used from the VM owner to verify the initial state of

its VM through remote attestation. In the first version of SEV, only the VM memory was encrypted when stored in memory outside of the CPU package. The later introduced SEV-ES (Encrypted State) (Kaplan, 2017) extended the protected VM state to the CPU registers to prevent information leakage to the hypervisor (Hetzelt and Buhren, 2017). In contrast to SGX, SEV did not provide integrity for the encrypted memory pages in its first version which was exploited in injection and replay attacks (Hetzelt and Buhren, 2017). However, in 2020, AMD introduced SEV Secure Nested Paging (SNP) (AMD, 2020) which added the missing integrity protection capability.

Hardware primitives & TCB. SEV utilizes the hardware primitives introduced with SME, namely, an AES crypto engine embedded into the memory controller that performs the encryption/decryption of the data leaving the CPU and the AMD Secure Processor (SP). The SP represents a dedicated security subsystem (based on the ARM architecture) that manages the cryptographic key and is integrated into the AMD SoC. Moreover, the SP performs the attestation of the VMs. In SEV-enabled SoCs, SME is combined with the virtualization technology from AMD (AMD-V) such that the SP manages one key per VM. When VM data is loaded into the CPU cache, it is protected by an access control mechanism relying on Address Space Identifiers (ASIDs). The hardware TCB of SEV comprises the CPU, SP and AES crypto engine. Moreover, the SP firmware needs to be trusted.

4.1.3 Emerging Cloud TEE Architectures

The most eye-catching design difference between Intel SGX and AMD SEV is the granularity at which both TEE architectures can protect sensitive applications. Intel SGX isolates at the process level, whereas SEV provides isolation at the VM level. SEV's focus on protecting complete VMs makes it much more suitable for the server market since existing VM workloads can be directly deployed within SEV-protected VMs. In Intel SGX, comparable results can only be achieved with cumbersome workarounds, as we discuss in Section 4.1.6.

Intel Trust Domain Extensions. In order to also provide isolation on a VM granularity level, Intel designed a new TEE architecture called Intel Trusted Domain Extensions (TDX) (Intel, 2021). Comparable to AMD, Intel achieves this by combining its memory encryption technology, called Total Memory Encryption (TME), with its virtualization technology, called Intel VT-x. The assumed adversary model is comparable to AMD SEV since TDX also aims to protect sensitive VMs even from a compromised hypervisor component and thus, from a potentially malicious cloud provider. To attest the isolated VMs (called *Trusted Domains*), TDX leverages the attestation technology introduced with Intel SGX.

Currently, AMD and Intel together control 99% of the global server market, however, there is a new competitor. The ARM architecture which is the dominating processor architecture in the embedded market, offers characteristics which makes their usage on server platforms very promising, namely, the energy efficiency of their processors, the high number of rather small processor cores which allows to manage computing resources more flexible, and the fact that ARM's licensing model allows customers to also modify the processor designs. At Amazon's AWS, already 50% of the newly deployed cloud servers are ARM-based (Anandtech, 2021) and just recently, Oracle announced that ARM server will be offered on the Oracle Cloud (Magouryuk, 2021).

ARM Confidential Compute Architecture. In 2021, together with the new ARMv9 processor architecture, ARM announced a novel TEE architecture for their server processors with the name ARM Confidential Compute Architecture (CCA). The goals of CCA are aligned with those of AMD SEV and Intel TDX, i.e., CCA aims to protect sensitive cloud workloads in isolated VMs, even in the presence of a malicious cloud provider. Similarly to SGX and SEV, CCA provides a transparent memory encryption for the isolated VMs (called *Realms*) by introducing a Memory Protection Engine (MPE) in front of the memory controller. CCA is not substituting the older TrustZone security technology available on the majority of all ARM processors. Instead, CCA implements its Realms in a orthogonal security state of the processor. Moreover, the newly introduced hardware modifications also enable TrustZone to

implement a more dynamic memory management.

4.1.4 Hardware Security Modules

HSMs (*Hardware Security Module (HSM) n.d.*) are physical computing devices that safeguard and manage digital keys for strong authentication and provide crypto-processing. These modules traditionally come in the form of a plug-in card or an external device that attaches directly to a computer or network server. HSMs mainly address an adversary that aims to physically tamper with the hardware with the aim of gaining access to the data residing therein. This is why HSMs are typically certified to recognized anti-tamper standards such as FIPS 140-2 (*Security Requirements for Cryptographic Modules n.d.*). Most commercially available HSMs are certified to FIPS 140-2 Level 3.

The Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) Publication 140-2 (*FIPS 140-2 n.d.*) and 140-3 (*FIPS 140-3 n.d.*) are U.S. government computer security standards used to accredit HSMs (*Cryptographic Module Validation Program n.d.*). The standard provides four increasing, qualitative levels of security intended to cover a wide range of potential applications and environments. The security requirements cover areas related to the secure design and implementation of an HSM. These areas include HSM specification; ports and interfaces; roles, services, and authentication; finite state model; physical security; operational environment; cryptographic key management; electromagnetic interference/compatibility (EMI/EMC); self-tests; design assurance; and mitigation of other attacks.

Security Levels 1-3. Security Level 1 provides the lowest level of security. Basic security requirements are specified (e.g., at least one Approved algorithm or Approved security function shall be used). No specific physical security mechanisms are required beyond the basic requirement for production-grade components. Level 2 improves upon the physical security mechanisms of Security Level 1 by requiring features that show evidence of tampering, including tamper-evident coatings or seals that must be broken to attain physical access to cryptographic keys and critical security parameters (CSPs) within the module, or pick-resistant locks on covers or doors to protect against unauthorized

physical access. Level 3 attempts to prevent the intruder from gaining access to CSPs held within the HSM. Physical security mechanisms are meant to have a higher probability of detecting and responding to attempts at physical access, use or modification.

Services such as AWS CloudHSM ([AWS CloudHSM n.d.](#)), Google Cloud Key Management ([Google Cloud Key Management n.d.](#)), and Azure Key Vault ([Microsoft Azure Key Vault n.d.](#)) provide NIST FIPS 140-2 Level 3 certified Hardware Security Modules as a service in the cloud to manage customer secrets (keys, credentials etc).

Unfortunately traditional HSMs are designed mainly for key management, cannot run arbitrary software, and have very limited general-purpose processing capability. This is why deploying HSMs, while useful in protecting encryption keys, simply cannot protect running workloads.

4.1.5 Next Generation HSMs: TEEs with Anti-Tamper Protections.

Fortunately, a new generation of HSM hardware is upcoming that combines the strong anti-tamper security of HSMs with the ability to run arbitrary workloads within the protection boundary. One example is the ENFORCER Anti-Tamper Server ([ENFORCER Server n.d.](#)), the first NIST FIPS 140-2 Level 4 certified server and high-performance next generation HSM that can run off-the-shelf x86 software. This server provides both standard HSM cryptographic accelerator functionality but can also *execute arbitrary computation tasks with privacy, software and data confidentiality, and provide remote hardware and software stack integrity attestation.*

FIPS Security Level 4 provides a higher level of security than that of a the typical Level 3 HSM. At this level, physical security mechanisms provide a complete set of reactive envelopes of protection around the HSM, detecting and responding to all unauthorized attempts at physical access. Penetration of the HSM enclosure results in the immediate zeroization of all sensitive information. Security Level 4 is essential for operation in physically unprotected environments. Security Level 4 also protects against a security compromise due to environmental conditions or fluctuations outside of normal operating ranges for voltage

and temperature.

A number of ongoing efforts aim at integrating such next generation HSMs into cloud infrastructures to *provide TEEs with anti-tamper protections*. If successful, they would address many of the challenges associated with traditional TEEs, discussed in the following.

4.1.6 Performance & Functionality

In the context of cloud computing TEE-architectures have to fulfil not only security requirements, which have been discussed in the previous sections, but they also have to fulfil performance and functionality requirements. On the one hand, the performance impact of security measures on the protected workloads must be minimal. On the other hand, the security mechanism must integrate into the cloud management paradigm allowing for flexible and scalable operation of isolated cloud workloads.

Cost of Security For years Intel SGX was the only commercially available TEE architecture that could provide enclaves to application developers and users on commodity platforms. It was designed to isolate and execute small security sensitive parts of an application, like cryptographic function operation on a secret key. Due to this goal setting, SGX enclaves can only utilize a small portion of system memory, called the enclave page cache, which is only 128 MB.¹ This limits the use of SGX enclaves for complex and resource demanding application.

Already before Intel SGX was available solutions were developed to isolate unmodified applications in SGX enclaves (Baumann *et al.*, 2014b). Over the following years further solutions have been proposed aiming to isolated existing workloads, e.g., docker software containers (Arnautov *et al.*, 2016), in SGX enclaves (Tsai *et al.*, 2014). These efforts show the demand for isolation solutions that allows the isolation of existing server and cloud workloads. However, the design of SGX requires costly and complex software extensions and abstractions to achieve the desired functionalities. In combination with its memory limitations this leas

¹Recently Intel has released now SGX-enabled systems that overcome this limitation, however, they are not widely available.

to performance overheads of such solutions, which prohibit their use in most practical application (Baumann *et al.*, 2014b; Arnaoutov *et al.*, 2016; Tsai *et al.*, 2014).

Scalable and Flexible Security AMD SEV – as well as the upcoming Intel TDX and Arm CCA – overcomes central limitations of Intel SGX, providing more memory for enclaves and enabling the isolation of typical cloud workloads, in particular virtual machines (VMs), by design. However, other cloud workloads, such as software containers with their advantages of swift creation and low resource usage, are not directly supported. Furthermore, the secure management and orchestration of secure enclaves in the cloud is an unsolved problem in practice (Vaucher *et al.*, 2018), limiting the scalability of isolation architectures in the context of cloud.

Many emerging cloud applications, in particular in the context of machine learning (ML), demand extensive computation power that cannot be satisfied by today’s CPUs but requires accelerators like FPGAs, GPGPUs or TPUs. Current TEE solutions are exclusively available to application execution only on CPUs, and hence, they have severe performance disadvantages when used to protect ML application (Brasser *et al.*, 2018). The secure integration and combination of accelerators with CPU-enclaves is an active field of research (Kida *et al.*, 2020), yet, practical solutions are not available in deployed systems.

4.2 Open Challenges and Future Research Direction

Only recently TEE-architectures designed to isolate cloud workloads have been developed, such as ADM SEV, Intel TDX or Arm CCA. However, also those security architectures are tailored to specific use-cases, i.e., isolation of VMs. A flexible TEE-architectures that support various enclave types, as have been developed by research (Bahmani *et al.*, 2021), are missing in practice. Furthermore, the secure management and orchestration of secure enclaves is an open challenge for enclave-isolated workloads in the cloud.

5

Side-Channels

Multi-tenancy is a cornerstone of most sustainable cloud services. To make their cloud business cost-effective, cloud providers typically share computing resources among multiple cloud tenants. The rationale behind such multi-tenant cloud business model is an assumption that not all cloud workloads would fully utilize the claimed computing resources at all time. Therefore, the use of these resources can be maximized through over-provisioning and the cost of maintaining the cloud data centers can be amortized. For example, cloud providers, like Google Cloud, Amazon Web Services (AWS) and Microsoft Azure, usually schedule multiple virtual machines (VMs) on the same cloud physical machine, with the total virtual CPU time and virtual memory consumption of all these VMs larger than what is physically available.

While multi-tenancy makes the cloud business profitable, it is also the root cause of a variety of side channels. Because of cloud multi-tenancy, a cloud tenant may have its computation co-located with its competitors or a malicious tenant targeting random victims. The unrestricted sharing of computing resources among these mutually distrustful bedfellows creates new attack vectors that do not exist in traditional enterprise networks. Side channel is one such attack vector that

allows information leakage from isolated security domains. Side channel leaks confidential data through indirect inferences: While secrets of the isolated security domain cannot be directly learned by an external adversary, the use of such data during the execution may exhibit side effects that are observable from the outside. Such side effects may include power consumption, electromagnetic emission, execution time, acoustics, etc. Studies have shown that external adversaries may make inference on the observed side effects to *guess* the value of the secret data with very high precision.

Of particular interest in the cloud context are the side channels exploitable by software programs remotely controlled by the adversary. As physical accesses to the cloud data centers are unlikely, remote accesses with the highest privilege achievable by a cloud tenant become a reasonable assumption in the cloud threat model. In the cloud context, not all side effects can be exploited as side channels, such as electromagnetic emission, which requires special equipment and physical access to the device to carry out the attack. Therefore, side channels in cloud computing can be considered a subset of all side channels in the computing space.

In this chapter, we provide a literature review of research on both side-channel attacks and side-channel defenses that are relevant in the multi-tenant cloud settings.

5.1 Side-channel Attacks

Side-channel attacks can be categorized by the source of information leakage, which could be either micro-architectural or architectural computing resources. Micro-architectural resources are not directly visible by the software, such as CPU caches, Translation Lookaside Buffers (TLB), Branch Prediction Units (BPU). Architectural resources are outside the CPU package and typically visible to the software. The boundary between the two can be blurry, however. For example, in some cases, resources outside the CPU package, such as DRAM row buffers, are not directly visible to the software, either. In this section, we enumerate a list of computing resources that have been exploited as media of side channels.

5.1.1 CPU Cache

Cache is one of the most commonly used CPU micro-architectural components for constructing side channels. CPU caches hold copies of memory data for more efficient accesses from the execution units. Intel CPUs have multiple levels of caches. The first level that is closest to the CPU execution units is called the L1 cache, which is further split into the L1 data cache and L1 instruction cache. The second level cache is called the L2 cache, which is typically unified for both instruction and data. The third level cache is also called the Last Level Cache (LLC). While L1 and L2 caches are private to each CPU cores, LLC on Intel processors are shared among all cores in the same CPU package. The size of LLC may range from several megabytes to tens of megabytes, while that of the L1 is in the order of kilobytes. But the access latency of L1 cache is much faster than that of L2 and LLC.

The differences of access latency between CPU cache and memory and the nuance between different levels of CPU caches have been exploited to construct side channels. The very first cache-based side-channel attacks could date back to mid-1990s, which were designed to crack cryptographic systems such as RSA and DSS in smart cards (Kocher, 1996; Kelsey *et al.*, 1998).

Categories. Generally speaking, cache side-channel attacks can be separated into two categories (Page, 2002):

1. *Time-driven*: In time-driven attacks (Kocher, 1996; Aciğmez *et al.*, 2007; Brumley and Boneh, 2005; Bernstein, 2005; Bonneau and Mironov, 2006; Osvik *et al.*, 2006), the attacker measures the execution time of certain operations of the victim, in order to infer the sensitive operation. As different control flows would result in different execution times, the attacker may utilize the timing information to track the control flows of the victim, which may further leak information of the execution, even the secret keys.
2. *Trace-driven*: In trace-driven attacks (Percival, 2005; Tromer *et al.*, 2010; Gullasch *et al.*, 2011; Osvik *et al.*, 2006; Aciğmez and Koç, 2006), the attacker infers whether certain cache lines or cache sets

are used by the victim by measuring the execution time of the attacker’s own operations. Different actions of the victim would lead to a different cache state, which is observable by the attacker through manipulating the cache. Trace-driven attacks are more prevailing than time-driven attacks, since oftentimes it is easier for the attacker to manipulate the shared cache, rather than observe the victim’s actions directly.

Researchers have proposed many cache side-channel attack techniques; the major ones include Evict+Time (Osvik *et al.*, 2006) (time-driven), Prime+Probe (Osvik *et al.*, 2006; Percival, 2005; Irazoqui *et al.*, 2015; Liu *et al.*, 2015a) (trace-driven), Flush+Reload (Yarom and Falkner, 2014) (trace-driven), and variations such as Flush+Flush (Gruss *et al.*, 2016; Didier and Maurice, 2021) (trace-driven). They can be used to infer sensitive information via L1 instruction/data cache (Percival, 2005; Tromer *et al.*, 2010) or the LLC (Irazoqui *et al.*, 2015; Liu *et al.*, 2015a; Yarom and Falkner, 2014).

Same-core attacks. Due to the Simultaneous Multi-Threading (SMT) of the modern CPU processors, the execution of different processes running on the same CPU core may be interleaved. Since these processes share the same L1 instruction and data cache, the attacker process may be able to learn sensitive information of the victim running on the same CPU core. There are many existing works (Tsunoo *et al.*, 2003; Brumley and Boneh, 2005; Aciğmez *et al.*, 2005; Percival, 2005; Aciğmez *et al.*, 2007; Osvik *et al.*, 2006; Aciğmez, 2007) that make use of L1 cache information to steal the victim’s secret. Tsunoo *et al.* (Tsunoo *et al.*, 2003) has demonstrated that a same-core attacker can make use of the L1 data cache to break DES. Percival (Percival, 2005), Bernstein (Bernstein, 2005) and Aciğmez (Aciğmez *et al.*, 2007) showed that it is also possible to break AES using L1 data cache. Brumley and Boneh (Brumley and Boneh, 2005) introduced a remote L1 cache side-channel attack that can break RSA of an OpenSSL web server. Aciğmez (Aciğmez, 2007) showed that L1 instruction cache can also be used to break RSA implemented in OpenSSL. The Prime+Probe attack (Osvik *et al.*, 2006) was also designed for the same-core scenario. In the Prime+Probe attack (Osvik *et al.*, 2006), the attacker first occupies specific cache sets (Prime), wait

for the victim to run, then access the same cache sets and measure the time (Probe). The timing difference can be used to infer whether the victim has accessed the cache sets.

Cross-core attacks. In modern CPU architecture, different CPU cores of the same CPU package often share the last-level cache (LLC) to reduce the communication overheads. Due to this reason, when the attacker and the victim run on different cores of the same package, the attacker can still learn information of the victim by introducing LLC cache contentions with the knowledge of cache inclusiveness, cache replacement policy or cache mapping. The Prime+Probe attack (Osvik *et al.*, 2006) has been extended to the LLC by Liu *et al.* (Liu *et al.*, 2015a) and Irazoqui *et al.* (Irazoqui *et al.*, 2015). Flush+Reload (Yarom and Falkner, 2014) was designed to work on the LLC; the attacker first flushes the targeted cache line out of the LLC (Flush), wait for a certain period of time, then measure the time of reloading it (Reload) to see if the victim has accessed the cache line.

Cross-VM attacks. In cloud side-channel attacks, the attacker runs the attacker VM, and tries to infer sensitive information of the victim VM. The most important prerequisite of launching cache side-channel attacks is to make sure that the attacker VM and the victim VM are co-located on the same physical machine, i.e., to achieve *co-residency*. Ristenpart *et al.* (Ristenpart *et al.*, 2009) proposed the first work to mount the attacker VM to be co-resident with the victim VM on Amazon EC2. They designed a way to detect whether co-residency is achieved between the attacker VM and the victim VM, so that further cache side-channel attacks can be launched. After this work, many defenses have been proposed (Zhang and Reiter, 2013; Zhang *et al.*, 2011b), and leading companies have taken actions to mitigate the threats (e.g., remove the ability to perform co-residency check), but new ways to facilitate co-residency detection continues to be found (Varadarajan *et al.*, 2015; Xu *et al.*, 2015; Bates *et al.*, 2012; Inci *et al.*, 2016).

With the co-residency detection, cross-VM side-channel attacks can be further conducted on the cloud. Zhang *et al.* (Zhang *et al.*, 2012) demonstrated a cross-VM cache side-channel attack on Xen platform, which used the Prime+Probe technique on the L1 instruction

cache. They showed that after co-residency detection, they can perform cross-VM attack and steal the victim’s cryptographic keys. Irazoqui et al. (Irazoqui *et al.*, 2015) proposed a cross-VM Prime+Probe attack on the OpenSSL implementation of AES, which utilized the huge pages of LLC. Similarly, Inci et al. (Inci *et al.*, 2016) used Prime+Probe and huge pages to launch side-channel attacks on LLC to extract RSA keys on Amazon EC2. Flush+Reload can also be used to perform cross-VM attacks on VMware to steal AES keys (Irazoqui *et al.*, 2014). Zhang et al. (Zhang *et al.*, 2014) showed that the Flush+Reload technique can be used to perform cross-tenant side-channel attacks on PaaS clouds to infer sensitive information of the victim and hijack the victim’s user account.

5.1.2 Translation Lookaside Buffer

Translation lookaside buffer (TLB) is yet another caching structure internal to the CPU that stores recent translation from physical to virtual addresses. Like caches, TLBs may have multiple levels. L1 TLBs are smaller but faster, which may be split into instruction and data TLBs, and L2 TLBs are larger but slower. Both L1 and L2 TLBs are private to a CPU core. On processors without address space identifiers, every time a context switch takes place, the TLBs on this CPU core needs to be flushed completely. Moreover, logical cores on the same physical core enabled by SMT typically share only a fraction of TLBs.

Timing differences between accessing TLBs and the page table walks have been exploited in a variety of studies (Gras *et al.*, 2018; Koschel *et al.*, 2020). Gras et al. (Gras *et al.*, 2018) introduced TLBleed, which is a side-channel attack mechanism that makes use of shared TLBs to infer sensitive information of the victim, even with existing cache side-channel defenses enabled (Liu *et al.*, 2016; Zhou *et al.*, 2016; Gruss *et al.*, 2017; Sprabery *et al.*, 2017; Chen *et al.*, 2018). They first reverse-engineered the TLB architecture of modern Intel processors, then constructed TLBleed to attack crypto libraries, which can break a 256-bit EdDSA secret key and a 1024-bit RSA key, in the presence of existing defenses. Koschel (Koschel *et al.*, 2020) further showed that TLBs can be used to break the Kernel ASLR.

5.1.3 Execution Units

Aldaya et al. (Aldaya *et al.*, 2019) proposed PortSmash, a side-channel attack technique that make use of the timing information resulted from port contention of modern CPU execution units to infer sensitive information. They showed that it is possible to use such information to steal an ECDSA key, as well as retrieve information from Intel SGX enclaves. Another concurrent work by Bhattacharyya et al. (Bhattacharyya *et al.*, 2019) introduced SMOtherSpectre, which combined the Spectre attack and the port contention to leak information. They further showed an attack on the OpenSSH server which can steal bits of the host's RSA key.

5.1.4 Memory Buses

Cache and memory are connected by a set of memory buses. Use Intel processors as examples, a ring bus is used to connect internal components of a processor package. The LLC is connected to the Integrated Memory Controllers (IMC) by the memory controller bus and the IMCs are connected to the DRAM banks by the DRAM bus.

Memory bus contention has been exploited as side channels. For example, Wu et al. (Wu *et al.*, 2012) constructed a covert channel using bus contention caused by atomic instructions. Specifically, to implement atomic instructions, x86 processors use bus lock signals to temporarily provide exclusive use of the memory bus to the requesting CPU. Although recent processors make use of cache coherence protocols to reduce the need of bus locking, atomic memory accesses to unaligned addresses may still lead to bus locks, resulting in contention in the memory bus. Wu et al. showed that by issuing such atomic memory accesses to unaligned memory regions, a covert channel with a raw bandwidth of 38 Kbps (747 bps with error correction) can be established between two VMs.

Recent studies (Paccagnella *et al.*, 2021; Wan *et al.*, 2021) have shown that the ring interconnect or the ring bus, which is used for communications between the different CPU units (cores, LLC, system agent) on modern Intel processors, can also be used to launch side-channel attacks. Paccagnella et al. (Paccagnella *et al.*, 2021) first

reverse-engineered the complex communication protocols on the ring interconnect, then showed that they can construct a cross-core covert channel with over 4Mbps bandwidth. They further showed that the ring interconnect side-channel attack can be used to 1) extract keys from vulnerable RSA and EdDSA implementations, 2) learn keystroke timings. Wan et al. (Wan *et al.*, 2021) showed a similar side-channel attack that made use of the mesh interconnect of the CPUs.

5.1.5 Memory Deduplication

Operating systems (OS) and hypervisors commonly implement memory deduplication mechanisms, which merge physical memory pages with identical contents to save memory spaces. Write accesses to a merged page will trigger a page fault that is handled by the operating system or the hypervisor, which duplicates the page to allow modification. A simple timing analysis of write accesses to a memory page can be used to determine if the page has been merged by the memory deduplication mechanism—write accesses to deduplicated pages take longer to finish.

Memory deduplication has been exploited as a side channel in the cloud settings. A malicious software program running on the machine may exploit this side channel to learn secret information of other security domains. For example, by crafting the content a memory page and wait until the occurrence of a periodic memory deduplication mechanism, a malicious software can use the side channel to learn if there exists another instance of the page with the same content on the same physical machine.

Suzaki et al. (Suzaki *et al.*, 2011) first demonstrated a side-channel attack that exploits Linux KVM virtual machine’s kernel samepage merging to detect the existence of certain applications on other VMs. Owens et al. (Owens and Wang, 2011) exploits memory deduplication to perform OS fingerprinting of other VMs sharing the same physical machine. Lindemann et al. (Lindemann and Fischer, 2018) also uses this side channel in the cross-VM setting for determining the version of a particular software on another VM. Xiao et al. (Xiao *et al.*, 2013) exploited memory deduplication to construct cross-VM covert channels at a transmission rate of 90 bps.

5.1.6 DRAM Row Buffer

Modern DRAM is organized in banks. Each DRAM module contains multiple banks. A bank is composed of memory arrays that are organized in rows and cells. One row contains multiple memory cells that store the bit values. Request to the bank activates an entire row, loading the values of the memory cells into the row buffer of the bank. Therefore, memory accesses to cells in the current active row are served directly from the row buffer; accesses to a different row will first close the current row, activate the corresponding row, and fetch this row into the row buffer. Therefore, accesses to DRAM cells in the current active row or a different row may exhibit measurable timing differences.

Such timing differences have been exploited by Pessl et al. (Pessl *et al.*, 2016) to construct cross-VM covert channels and side channels. Specifically, in a covert-channel attack, a sender and a receiver have accesses to physical addresses that map to two different rows of the same bank. While the receiver repeatedly access a physical address in its own row and measure average access time, the sender may access a different row to transmit a bit 1, which increases the receiver’s measured access time. A transmission rate of up to 2 Mbps could be achieved. In a side-channel attack, it is required that the attacker has access to the same DRAM row as the one that is used by the victim, which corresponds to interested memory activities that the attacker hopes to learn. Then by “priming” the DRAM bank with a different row accessible to the attacker, the attacker can later “probe” the targeted row and measure the access time. A longer access time indicates that the victim has accessed the shared row during this short interval.

Row-hammer attacks. Since modern dynamic random-access memory (DRAM) has high-density and high-capacity, accessing one cell often cause electrical interferences with neighboring cells; as a result, bit flips may occur in neighboring cells. By cleverly accessing DRAMs with certain patterns, an attacker without any privilege may trigger bit flips in privileged memory regions and cause severe consequences. This attack is called the “row-hammer” attack (Kim *et al.*, 2014). Shortly after this work, Flip Feng Shui (FFS) was introduced by Razavi et al. (Razavi *et al.*, 2016). They demonstrated that FFS can introduce bit flips in

arbitrary memory in a fully-controlled way. They showed that using FFS, an attacker VM can gain control over a co-located victim VM running OpenSSH. A concurrent work by Xiao et al. (Xiao *et al.*, 2016) also utilized row-hammer attacks to perform cross-VM attacks on Xen.

5.2 Side-channel Defenses

Defenses against side-channel attacks can be categorized into software-based defenses and hardware-based defenses, according to where the defense mechanism is implemented.

5.2.1 Software-based Defenses

Attack Detection. The first category of software defenses is to deploy defense systems to detect side-channel attacks and take proper countermeasures. Since the most important pre-requisite of side-channel attacks is to achieve co-residency, there are works focusing on taking actions after detecting co-residency in order to mitigate the side-channel threats. For example, Zhang et al. (Zhang *et al.*, 2011b) showed that a tenant can use side channels to confirm physical isolation of their VMs.

The performance counters (PMCs) widely exist in modern CPUs. They are designed for monitoring specific micro-architectural events for performance, such as cache hit/miss and clock cycles. Since launching the side-channel attacks would trigger these events, PMCs can be used to detect side-channel attacks. Chiappetta et al. (Chiappetta *et al.*, 2016) proposed mechanisms to detect the Flush+Reload attack based on the readings of PMCs. Zhang et al. (Zhang *et al.*, 2016) introduced CloudRadar, which was a monitoring system that can detect cache-based side-channel attacks on the cloud. It used the PMCs to perform anomaly detection to identify cross-VM side-channel attacks.

Isolation. Another major category of defenses is to enforce isolation between the attacker VM and the victim VM. This includes isolating the entire VM using schedulers and migrations, or isolating the shared resources such as caches.

The first approach to achieve isolation is to isolate the VMs. This can be achieved by scheduling the VMs to reduce the risk of sharing. Liu et

al. (Liu *et al.*, 2014b) introduced a covert-channel aware scheduler, which strictly limited the interleaving executions of different VMs to reduce the possibility of side-channel attacks. Varadarajan *et al.* (Varadarajan *et al.*, 2014) proposed a way to achieve soft isolation between VMs through hypervisor schedulers. They showed that by enforcing a *minimum run time (MRT) guarantee* for the virtual CPUs of VM to limit the frequency of preemptions, Prime+Probe attacks can be mitigated. Moon *et al.* (Moon *et al.*, 2015) proposed Nomad, which was a system providing migration-as-a-service on the cloud provider side. It can coordinate VM placement and migration, so that information leakage of co-residency are limited.

Another approach to achieve isolation is to isolation the shared resources such as caches. Cache partitioning and page coloring have been proposed by researchers to mitigate cache side-channel attacks. The ideas are similar: reserve specific cache lines or pages, so that only trusted processes (e.g., processes of the same VM) can access them. The first work of applying cache partitioning to mitigate side-channel attacks was due to Page (Page, 2005), which dynamically split the cache memory into protected regions to achieve isolation. Kim *et al.* (Kim *et al.*, 2012) introduced StealthMem to lock stealth pages in the cache to store sensitive data. Shi *et al.* (Shi *et al.*, 2011b) used dynamic page coloring to protect security-critical operations to make sure that no other process shares the same color. Similarly, Godfrey and Zulkernine (Godfrey and Zulkernine, 2014) showed that coloring-based cache partition in Xen was effective in defeating side channels.

There are other techniques to achieve isolation on shared resources. Zhou *et al.* (Zhou *et al.*, 2016) introduced CacheBar, a *copy-on-access* mechanism to manage physical pages shared across mutually distrusting parties. When different parties access the same physical page, each of them will have a local copy, i.e., there is no sharing, thus LLC side-channel attacks are defeated. Zhang *et al.* (Zhang and Reiter, 2013) proposed a cache cleansing mechanism to remove the signals contained in the cache, in order to achieve isolation. Similarly, Godfrey and Zulkernine (Godfrey and Zulkernine, 2014) demonstrated that flush caches of all levels during context switches in a hypervisor can effectively defeat cache side-channel attacks.

Noise Injection. Noise injection is also an effective defense mechanism against side-channel attacks. By injecting random noise, the side-channel signals are weakened so that it is harder to launch the attack. The most common approach is to add noise to the timer readings. In Intel processors, *rdtsc* is widely used as the timer; therefore, many works proposed methods to add noise to mitigate side-channel attacks. Osvik et al. (Osvik *et al.*, 2006) suggested to add random delays to the *rdtsc* to obfuscate the real readings. Martin et al. (Martin *et al.*, 2012) first evaluated several methods to reduce the precision of *rdtsc*, such as making the least significant bits. After showing that these approaches were ineffective, they demonstrated that adding delays to *rdtsc* calls can defeat side-channel attacks.

5.2.2 Hardware-based Defenses

Researchers have utilized new hardware features or proposed new hardware designs to detect or mitigate the side-channel attacks.

Specialized hardware features. Hardware transactional memory (HTM) allows threads to execute *transactions* in parallel; each thread works on a private snapshot to execute one transaction. Whenever there are conflicting memory accesses, the transaction will be aborted and the changes will be rolled back. Otherwise, the changes are committed atomically. The most widely used HTMs are cache-based HTMs; one of the recent commercial implementations is the Intel Transactional Synchronization eXtension (TSX). The transactions will abort when the accessed memory regions are not in the cache, which makes it a good tool for detecting cache-based side-channel attacks. Gruss et al. (Gruss *et al.*, 2017) and Chen et al. (Chen *et al.*, 2018) have shown that Intel TSX can be used to effectively detect cache side-channel attacks.

Intel Cache Allocation Technology (CAT) was introduced in 2016 to provide software control of where data is allocated into the last-level cache (LLC). It allows the OS or hypervisor to group applications into classes of service (CLOS), and specifies the amount of LLC available to each CLOS. Liu et al. (Liu *et al.*, 2016) utilized the CAT to partition the LLC into secure and non-secure partitions to build a pseudo-locking mechanism. They built a prototype system using Xen running linux

VMs on a cloud server and showed that it can mitigate LLC cache side-channel attacks.

New cache design. Researchers also proposed new cache designs to lock cache lines or perform randomization in order to mitigate side-channel attacks. Wang and Lee (Wang and Lee, 2007) proposed the PartitionLocked cache (PLcache), which added the owner information to cache lines to restrict cross-owner eviction. In the same work, they also proposed the Random Permutation Cache (RPCache) to randomize cache mappings. Wang and Lee (Wang and Lee, 2008) further introduced NewCache, another novel cache architecture that adopted direct-mapping and security-aware cache replacement algorithm to achieve better security and performance. Recently Werner et al. (Werner *et al.*, 2019) presented ScatterCache, which enforced cache set randomization and made eviction-based cache attacks impractical.

5.3 Future Directions

Side channel is one of the most prominent attack vectors in multi-tenant cloud computing. Researchers have shown that many shared computing resources can be exploited to perform side-channel attacks. Various defense mechanisms have been proposed to mitigate side-channel threats. Arguably, the arms race between side channel attacks and defenses will continue to exist. The importance of this line of research will be even better understood when public cloud is trusted to outsource more sensitive data and computation.

We foresee two research future directions in the space that will be of continued interest to the researchers. First, new threat models in different cloud settings. As the cloud computing paradigm shifts from heavyweight virtualization towards lightweight containerization, from full-fledged cloud servers towards serverless computations, from compute-centric models to data-centric models, new threat models will emerge. Moreover, confidential cloud computing enabled by hardware-assisted trusted execution environment (TEE) has also introduced new attack vectors for side channels (Wang *et al.*, 2017; Chen *et al.*, 2017; Chen *et al.*, 2019a). As such, we would expect research studies continue

exploring new side-channel attack vectors in the the ever-changing cloud settings.

Second, the design and implementation of side-channel-aware hardware and software systems. For instance, once clouds become the dominating IT infrastructures, cryptographic libraries would consider side channels in the cloud settings a primary threat. Similarly, other software products will be designed with the side-channel attack vectors in consideration. System software, such as operating systems and hypervisors, as well as new computer micro-architectures will be designed and implemented to provide stronger isolation for cloud tenants. We have already witnessed such trend in the confidential cloud computing cases, where changes in the Linux kernels to enable AMD SEV have been merged into the main stream Linux kernels and microcode updates have been released to address ciphertext side-channel attacks (AMD, 2021).

Part II

Secure Computation

6

Secure Distributed Computation

In a typical data/computation outsourcing scenario where the cloud server is untrusted, it would be useful to have access to a “trusted entity” who performs computations on behalf of different parties (servers, administrators, users, etc.). For example:

- Consider a user who wants to *privately* query a database D held by a server. That is, the user wants to learn the result of their query q while not revealing q to the server; the server may be willing to answer a single query for the user, but does not want to user to learn anything else about D . This could be solved by having the two parties send q and D , respectively, to a trusted entity, who evaluates the query and returns the result to the user.
- Imagine there are multiple cloud providers who wish to generate statistics about how many times they have been hacked, or to determine how many of them have been impacted by a certain vulnerability. However, none of them is willing to reveal sensitive information about exploits they have experienced to anyone else. Here, again, a trusted entity could be used to solve this problem: each provider would simply send their sensitive data to the trusted

entity, who could then compute the desired statistics and send the results back to everyone.

- A collection of distributed servers may wish to maintain a tamper-proof *log* of ordered transactions (i.e., a *blockchain*) on which they all agree. In this setting, a trusted entity could accept transactions from the servers and locally maintain an ordered log; it can share the current log (or any portion thereof) with any server upon request.
- A trusted entity can even be useful in cases involving a single party. Consider a user who is concerned about potential exposure of her secret cryptographic key sk in case her machine is hacked. She could mitigate this threat by splitting sk across multiple machines, giving each of them a share of sk . (Formally, this would be done using a cryptographic mechanism called *secret sharing*, but the details are unimportant for this high-level discussion.) Cryptographic operations could then be carried out by having each machine send its share to a trusted entity, who combines the shares to recover sk and then applies the desired operation. This is known as *threshold cryptography*.

Of course, in the real world it may be difficult or impossible to rely on a trusted entity: doing so may not satisfy the policies of all parties involved (i.e., it may not be feasible to identify someone whom everyone is willing to trust), introduces a single point of failure, and may be expensive. Perhaps surprisingly, *secure multiparty computation* (MPC) provides a way for a group of parties to realize a trusted entity via a distributed protocol run by the parties themselves. Indeed, powerful feasibility results from the field of cryptography show that, under certain conditions, it is possible to design a secure-computation protocol matching the behavior of *any* trusted entity. The details are more complex (and we only touch on some of them below), but a high-level consequence is that very often a problem involving multiple distrusting parties can be solved—at least in principle—by imagining how the problem would be solved if a trusted entity were available, and then instantiating the trusted entity using a secure-computation protocol.

Overview of this survey. The goal of this article is to describe *what* secure computation is, not to describe in any detail *how* secure computation works. (In particular, we do not assume the reader has any detailed knowledge of cryptography.) The survey can conceptually be divided as follows:

1. We first describe an *ideal world* in which there is a trusted entity that performs certain actions on behalf of other parties. We discuss several different ways this ideal world can be defined in Section 6.1, and also show how the examples introduced previously can be solved in such an ideal world.
2. In Section 6.2, we then turn our attention to the *real-world environment* in which some protocol is executed. Here, we consider things like the assumed communication model available to the parties, and various assumptions one might place on an adversary trying to disrupt execution of the protocol.
3. In the next section (Section 6.3), we informally define what it means for a protocol to be secure. This also gives us the opportunity to discuss some limitations of secure protocols.
4. Finally, in Section 6.4, we summarize known *feasibility results* regarding the existence of secure protocols. We also provide pointers to cryptographic libraries implementing some of the most-efficient known protocols in various settings.

As noted, we omit from this overview formal security definitions, technical details of secure-computation protocols, or proofs of security; instead, we refer the reader to other surveys (Lindell and Pinkas, 2008; Lindell, 2021) and textbooks (Goldreich, 2004; Hazay and Lindell, 2010; Evans *et al.*, 2018) for such material.

6.1 The Ideal World

In the ideal world we envision a trusted entity, often called an *ideal functionality* and denoted by \mathcal{F} , to which a set of other parties P_1, \dots, P_n have access. Some of these parties may be honest, while others are

corrupted and assumed to be controlled by a single adversary \mathcal{A} . An execution in the ideal world proceeds as follows:

1. Each party P_i begins holding some local input x_i .
2. Each party P_i sends some value x'_i to \mathcal{F} . If P_i is honest then $x'_i = x_i$, but if P_i is corrupted then \mathcal{A} may choose x'_i arbitrarily (perhaps based on all the inputs of the corrupted parties).
3. \mathcal{F} evaluates some program (specified as part of the description of \mathcal{F}) on the inputs it has received, resulting in outputs $y_1 \dots, y_n$.
4. Output y_i is delivered to P_i . If P_i is honest it outputs y_i . The adversary \mathcal{A} gets to see the outputs delivered to all the corrupted parties, and may then output anything it likes.

In some cases, the parties may interact with \mathcal{F} only once; in other cases, the parties may obtain several inputs over time and access \mathcal{F} multiple times, with \mathcal{F} maintaining state between its different invocations.

There are some subtleties missing from the description above (some of which we discuss further below), but it should be clear that a crucial aspect of the ideal world is the program executed by \mathcal{F} . We give some examples that correspond to the scenarios described in the introduction.

- One possible ideal world corresponding to private queries on a database would consist of two parties—a server and a user—along with an ideal functionality \mathcal{F} that executes the following code: on input a database D from the server and a query q from the user, evaluate q on D and return the result to the user. (In this example, the server gets no output.)

In case the user is allowed to make repeated queries, one could consider two possible formulations of the ideal functionality. In the first, each time the user makes a query the server sends a database; in the second, the server sends the database at the beginning of the execution and then that database is used to answer all subsequent queries of the user. Note that the first formulation allows a malicious server to change the database for every query (even if an honest server is supposed to use the

same database each time). This demonstrates how different ideal functionalities can lead to different security guarantees even within the “ideal world” we are considering.

- Similarly, one can imagine multiple parties P_1, \dots, P_n representing cloud providers, each of whom has as input their own sensitive information about how they have been impacted by certain vulnerabilities. \mathcal{F} in this case would take input x_i from each of the parties, compute some statistical result y based on the received inputs, and then send y to each party. Alternately, one could modify the ideal functionality so that only one designated party (say, P_1) learns the output while the other parties learn nothing.
- An ideal world capturing the security requirements of a blockchain might be defined as follows: parties P_1, \dots, P_n continually receive transactions as input and send them to an ideal functionality \mathcal{F} as they receive them. \mathcal{F} maintains an array `Blocks` initialized as empty and a counter i initialized to 0; upon receiving the same transaction `tx` from at least t parties (where $1 \leq t \leq n$ is some threshold), it sets `Blocks[i] := tx` and increments i . Moreover, \mathcal{F} accepts queries of the form `(request, j)` from any party, to which it responds by sending `Blocks[j]` to the party making that request. The interesting thing to note here is that \mathcal{F} is not doing any significant computation, per se; rather, it is being used simply to ensure agreement among the parties regarding the contents of a globally accessible array.
- An ideal functionality for threshold cryptography is straightforward to define. We only remark here that for meaningful security to hold (even in the ideal world!) we must ensure that the shares of the secret key known to the corrupted parties (and hence to the adversary \mathcal{A}) do not by themselves reveal anything about the secret key sk .

When we discuss feasibility results in Section 6.4 we focus on the simplest case where the parties interact with \mathcal{F} only once, and where \mathcal{F} evaluates a known (possibly randomized) function f on the inputs

it receives from the parties; f returns a vector of outputs y_1, \dots, y_n , one for each party. (This is sometimes referred to as *secure function evaluation*.) Even in this case, there is an important distinction between so-called *fully secure* functionalities \mathcal{F} that guarantee output delivery (meaning that no matter what the adversary does, \mathcal{F} sends every party P_i its corresponding output y_i) and functionalities that are *secure with abort* (meaning that the adversary is given the ability to send a special input to \mathcal{F} that prevents it from sending output to some of the honest parties). Note that in the latter case the adversary may violate *fairness*, in the sense that it learns the output of all the corrupted parties but can prevent all honest parties from learning their outputs.¹

6.2 The Real World

In the real world there is no trusted entity who can serve as an ideal functionality; all we have are the parties P_1, \dots, P_n themselves. As in the ideal world, each party P_i begins holding some local input x_i ; now, however, the parties must run some distributed protocol Π amongst themselves to accomplish a desired task (such as computing $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$).

Although seemingly straightforward, there are in fact many different ways the real-world protocol execution can be defined. We highlight as few different options:

- The available communication network needs to be specified. It is typical—though not universal—to assume that every pair of parties is connected by a secure (i.e., private and authenticated) channel. But one could also additionally assume that the parties have access to a *broadcast channel* allowing any party to broadcast a message to all other parties. (Even if a physical broadcast channel is not available, a logical broadcast channel one can itself sometimes realized by a distributed protocol run by the parties.)

There is also the question of whether communication is assumed to be *synchronous*, so any message sent is guaranteed to be received

¹One might wonder what the advantage is of working with a functionality that is “only” secure with abort. The reason for doing so is because in some settings it is impossible for any protocol to realize the fully secure version of the functionality. See Section 6.4.

within some known time interval, or whether communication is *asynchronous*, with no guarantees about message delivery.

- It may be reasonable to assume certain setup is available to the parties; for example, the parties may share a public-key infrastructure (PKI) in advance of any protocol they execute.
- It is also crucial to be clear what is assumed about the adversary. (Such assumptions are also part of the ideal world, but we did not present them there since the assumptions used in the real and ideal worlds must match and are usually driven by real-world considerations.) The most prominent issues to consider here are:
 - The *threshold* of parties the adversary is assumed able to corrupt.
 - If the adversary is assumed to follow the protocol honestly (but may then try to learn disallowed information from the protocol execution), we refer to the adversary as *semi-honest* or *honest-but-curious*. In the more general, *malicious* case no such assumptions are made and the attacker may deviate from the protocol in any way it likes.

Of course, any protocol secure against malicious adversaries will also be secure against semi-honest adversaries, but protocols in the latter case may be more efficient.

6.3 Defining Security

Fix some ideal world including an ideal functionality \mathcal{F} ; fix also the real world including some protocol Π to be executed by the parties. What does it mean for (the real-world execution of) Π to securely realize (the ideal-world execution of) \mathcal{F} ? Intuitively, we expect that if Π securely realizes \mathcal{F} then there should be no attacks on Π except those that can be carried out against \mathcal{F} (and—if we have defined \mathcal{F} appropriately—any such attacks are considered inconsequential). This is precisely what the formal definition of secure multiparty computation guarantees. In a bit more detail (though still informally), a protocol Π securely realizes an

ideal functionality \mathcal{F} if the following holds:²

For any real-world adversary \mathcal{A} attacking an execution of Π in the real world, there is a corresponding adversary \mathcal{A}' (corrupting the same parties that \mathcal{A} does) that achieves the same result by attacking \mathcal{F} in the ideal world.

Again, the upshot of this is that any security property that is achieved in the ideal world must also be achieved in the real world. This implies several expected guarantees such as *privacy* (the adversary learns nothing about the inputs of the honest parties beyond the output of the corrupted parties) and *correctness* (the output of the honest parties must correspond to the computation of \mathcal{F} on some inputs); perhaps more interestingly, it also implies somewhat unexpected guarantees such as *input independence* (the inputs chosen by the corrupted parties cannot depend on the inputs of the honest parties). The last point demonstrates a major advantage of the “simulation-based” security definition that we have been using: namely, it ensures security just like the ideal world, without having to write out a list of all desired security guarantees.

An important point to keep in mind, however, is that the security guarantees provided by a protocol Π securely realizing an ideal functionality \mathcal{F} are (in general) *no more than* those provided by the ideal world itself. Two specific concerns that often arise, and may need to be dealt with, are:

- In the ideal world (and hence in the real world, too), nothing prevents the adversary from *changing the inputs* of corrupted parties. In some applications, this may ruin the integrity of the underlying computation: for example, consider what happens when computing the average temperature recorded by a collection of sensors in a building if a corrupted sensor reports a temperature of 127 °C.

²We note that for simplicity our discussion here ignores the computational complexity of the adversaries \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' , as well as the fact that security of Π may rely on the (assumed) hardness of certain cryptographic problems.

This can be addressed (at least, to some extent) by suitably defining the functionality \mathcal{F} : for example, \mathcal{F} could ignore temperature readings outside a predetermined range when computing the average.

- The attacker *may be able to learn information about honest parties' inputs* based on its own inputs and the output(s) it learns. As a trivial example, consider the two-party functionality \mathcal{F} that computes the average of both parties' inputs—given the average (and its own input), the attacker can exactly compute the input of the other party. Characterizing the information an attacker can learn in this way is, in general, an unsolved problem, though techniques from differential privacy (Dwork and Roth, 2014) can be used in conjunction with secure computation to mitigate the problem.

6.4 Feasibility Results and Secure Protocols

We have so far spent a lot of time defining secure computation, but have not yet discussed when secure-computation protocols exist! In fact, seminal results from the '80s and '90s showed broad feasibility results for secure computation. In what follows we focus on secure function evaluation, and assume that the real-world protocol is executed by n parties—up to t of whom may be corrupted—in a synchronous network with a secure channel between every pair of parties as well as a broadcast channel.³ In this setting we have the following known results (Yao, 1986; Goldreich *et al.*, 1987; Ben-Or *et al.*, 1988; Chaum *et al.*, 1988; Rabin and Ben-Or, 1989; Beaver, 1989; Beaver and Goldwasser, 1989; Goldwasser and Levin, 1990):

Theorem 6.1. When $t < n/2$, for any functionality \mathcal{F} there is a fully secure protocol computing \mathcal{F} in the presence of t malicious corruptions.

Theorem 6.2. Under standard cryptographic assumptions, when $t < n$ then for any functionality \mathcal{F} there is a fully secure protocol computing

³If a physical broadcast channel is not available, one can be emulated by a distributed protocol with no additional assumptions when $t < n/3$, or assuming a PKI and the existence of secure signature schemes when $t < n$.

\mathcal{F} in the presence of t semi-honest corruptions, and a secure-with-abort protocol computing \mathcal{F} in the presence of t malicious corruptions.

Note that Theorem 6.2 encompasses the special case of two-party computation, when one of the two parties may be corrupted.

The initial work on secure computation was concerned primarily with establishing feasibility rather than concrete efficiency. But over the past 20 years there has been a tremendous effort directed toward designing highly efficient protocols and providing implementations of such protocols in various libraries. We highlight in particular Sharemind (Bogdanov *et al.*, 2008), the EMP toolkit (Wang *et al.*, 2016), and SCALE-MAMBA⁴. Hastings *et al.* (Hastings *et al.*, 2019) provides a survey of other libraries and provides a detailed comparison among them.

6.5 Open Questions

The main questions regarding feasibility of secure computation have largely been settled. However, an active area of research is to investigate the best possible efficiency of secure-computation protocols in different settings. One can approach this question from both a concrete or an asymptotic point of view; one can explore the question for generic protocols computing arbitrary functions or for protocols computing some specific function of interest. Focusing on asymptotic results for generic protocols, outstanding open questions include determining the optimal round complexity for unconditionally secure protocols tolerating $t < n/2$ corrupted parties (see Ishai and Kushilevitz, 2004 for some discussion of the difficulty of resolving this question) as well as the minimal communication complexity in the same setting (see Goyal *et al.*, 2021 for some recent progress).

One possible approach for obtaining improved efficiency is to consider relaxed (but still meaningful) notions of security. See Aumann and Lindell, 2010; Huang *et al.*, 2012 for some work in that direction.

⁴See <https://homes.esat.kuleuven.be/~nsmart/SCALE>.

7

Encrypted Search

For almost all outsourced data scenarios, client-side encryption is the first line of defense against curious/malicious storage providers, as well as other potentially un-sanitized software running on the cloud. However, the server can no longer search/compute on the encrypted data hindering many useful functionalities e.g., keyword searches. General multi-party computation, as described in Chapter 6, can enable this but often times this comes at high computation (and communication) costs. To overcome this challenge, tailor-made tools for encrypted search and compute have been proposed.

7.1 Searchable Encryption

Searchable encryption allows clients to search directly in remote encrypted data. In these efforts, clients either linearly process the data using symmetric key encryption mechanisms, or, more often, outsource additional secure meta-data mostly of size linear in the order of the original data set. This meta-data aids the server in searching through the encrypted data set while revealing as little as possible. The primary focus of most of the existing work on searchable encryption has been reducing search complexity – the cost of searching for a particular keyword

(or a combination of keywords) in the database. In addition, searchable encryption schemes have also been optimized for other parameters including locality of access and range queries

Song *et al.* (Song *et al.*, 2000) proposed a scheme for search on encrypted data in a scenario where a mobile, bandwidth restricted user, wishes to store data (e-mail) on an untrusted server. The scheme requires the user to split the data into fix-sized words, encrypt each word separately using a symmetric key protocol and xor the result with a structure containing a pseudo-random bit string and a mapping of the string under a secret key, using a pseudo-random function. The secret key is made dependent on the encrypted word. The resulting data is stored on the server. The structure enables the detection of keyword matches, without revealing the server the keyword or the contents of the stored data. The paper also discusses the use of an encrypted index, allowing the whole data to be encrypted as a block.

Eu-Jin Goh (Goh, 2003) proposed to associate indexes with the documents stored by the server. More precisely, the index of a document is a Bloom filter containing a codeword for each each unique word in the document. The codeword of a word is derived by twice applying a pseudo-random function to the word. The size of document indexes, as documented in the paper, is proportional to the document size. Chang and Mitzenmacher (Chang and Mitzenmacher, 2005) proposed a similar approach, where the index associated with documents consists of a string of bits of length equal to the total number of words used (dictionary size). Two solutions are given, one where the dictionary of words can be stored at the client and one where it has to be stored encrypted at the server.

The schemes described so far have linear search complexity since all document indices must be searched to determine if a keyword appears in a document. Curtmola *et al.* (Curtmola *et al.*, 2006) proposed the first sublinear searchable encryption scheme. The idea is to store an *inverted index* that associates keywords with the documents identifiers in which they appear. The index consists of an array made up of per-keyword linked lists – each node is encrypted using a key that is stored in the previous node. The nodes are randomly permuted and the location of the starting node of the linked list associated with a particular keyword

is stored in an *index table*, at a random location determined by a pseudo-random permutation, taking as input the keyword.

Kamara *et al.* (Kamara *et al.*, 2012) proposed the first dynamic searchable encryption scheme based on the construction by Curtmola *et al.* that allows updates to the database securely without rebuilding the entire inverted index. This is achieved by tracking the locations (in the index) which need to be updated in a *deletion array*, and leveraging homomorphic encryption to update pointers without decryption.

Golle *et al.* (Golle *et al.*, 2004) extend searchable encryption to conjunctive keyword searches on encrypted data. They propose two solutions. The first solution requires the server to store capabilities for conjunctive queries, with sizes linear in the total number of documents. The paper claims that a majority of the capabilities can be transferred offline to the server, but this only assumes that the client knows beforehand its future conjunctive queries. The second solution requires much less communication between the client and the server, proportional with the number of keywords in the conjunctive search, but doubles the size of the data stored by the server. A severe limitation of these schemes is the requirement of specifying the exact positions where the search matches have to occur.

Cash *et al.* (Cash *et al.*, 2013a) designed the first conjunctive keyword search with sub-linear search complexity. The scheme leverages the inverted index construction by Curtmola *et al.* (described above). The idea is to query the least frequent keyword in the conjunctive search first and then filter documents for the other keywords.

A public-key version of searchable encryption was proposed by Boneh *et al.* (Boneh *et al.*, 2004), where e-mails encrypted by senders with the public key of the intended receiver are stored on untrusted mail servers. The paper presents protocols allowing receivers to search. In the first protocol, a non-interactive searchable encryption scheme, is based on a variant of the Diffie-Hellman problem and uses bilinear maps on elliptic curves. The second protocol, using only trapdoor permutations, needs a large number of public/private key pairs. Both protocols require the individual encryption of each word.

7.2 Encrypted Databases

Encrypted databases enable clients to execute rich queries without the need to decrypt the data. Various cryptographic techniques have been employed to build encrypted databases. This includes homomorphic encryption, order-preserving encryption (OPE), searchable encryption etc. (Fuller *et al.*, 2017).

A particularly interesting lightweight encrypted database solution is CryptDB (Popa *et al.*, 2011), a system that allows executing SQL queries over encrypted data. Instead of a one-fit-all mechanism e.g., homomorphic encryption, CryptDB employs several different SQL-aware encryption strategies including order-preserving encryption (OPE), searchable encryption and homomorphic encryption .

Pappas *et al.* (Pappas *et al.*, 2014) designed a DBMS that ensures query privacy against a compromised server. Unlike CryptDB, the goal here is to ensure privacy of both the data and the queries. This is achieved by using a combination of secure computation, additively homomorphic encryption and a new bloom filter based search index.

The aforementioned databases are vulnerable to reconstruction attacks. Recent work by Grubbs *et al.* (Grubbs *et al.*, 2017) demonstrate several attack vectors for encrypted database construction through information leaked from database caches, logs etc. In addition, several attack vectors rely on information leakage through query access patterns, volume etc (Kellaris *et al.*, 2016; Grubbs *et al.*, 2018). Chapter 8 details approaches that address this problem.

Part III

Secure Storage

8

Data Access Privacy

Encryption alone is not sufficient to protect confidentiality of data stored in the cloud since it does not hide metadata e.g., access patterns, timing information etc. Leaking access patterns in particular is a serious threat in client-server scenarios where the storage provider can easily observe and log user *access patterns*.

To see why this is a problem, first consider the following toy example: a user (client) stores an alphabetically-sorted encrypted dictionary of items on an untrusted storage platform. The storage provider observes all client accesses by logging API calls e.g., GET, PUT requests. *If an encrypted keyword is inserted/deleted, the sequence of requests for accessing the particular item as well as for other bookkeeping operations e.g., truncating the dictionary etc. can leak information about the keyword(s) such as the constituent letters etc.* In fact, the observer can make knowledgeable guesses about the exact keywords with varying degrees of accuracy based on information obtained *apriori* about the dictionary contents. Permuting the keywords in the storage does not solve this problem since this still allows attacks through frequency analysis – the “popularity” of a particular keyword leaks how often it is likely to appear in a typical text application.

The following two scenarios demonstrate the real world implications of leaking access patterns to an untrusted storage server.

- Consider a cloud-hosted database containing sensitive information e.g., hospital patient records. Regulatory compliance necessitates storing the database encrypted. However, even with encrypted records, *database reconstruction attacks* such as (Grubbs *et al.*, 2017; Falzon *et al.*, 2020) are able to infer records by observing query results – common attributes such as names, age, geographical location etc. are frequently queried and the attribute values follow known distributions e.g., an attacker might know that a certain disease is common in people of a certain age group. These attacks mainly leverage query access patterns as well the volume of query results.
- Cloud-hosted services often allow users to perform expensive computation on remote processors. While leveraging trusted execution environments e.g., Intel SGX can ensure that the computation runs in a tamper-proof environment and the results generated are correct, the memory access patterns (even within the enclave’s cryptographically-protected memory region) can leak information about the computation (Nayak *et al.*, 2017), and the input data (Yu *et al.*, 2019).
- Access and search pattern leak significant amounts of information for searchable encryption systems (Liu *et al.*, 2014a; Oya and Kerschbaum, 2021).

Intuitively, these attacks succeed because many applications have data-dependent access patterns i.e., the order in which items are accessed by the application, the frequency of access etc. depends on the input. For instance, the memory access patterns of several sorting algorithms (e.g., bubble sort) reveal information about the input to the algorithm. This problem also manifests in more complex algorithms such as graph algorithms (Goodrich and Simons, 2014) and machine learning (Ohrimenko *et al.*, 2016).

8.1 Access Privacy

One way to solve the access privacy problem for encrypted databases is to always access it in its entirety. That is, on every access, each and every item is retrieved from the database, re-encrypted/modified and re-uploaded back. In this way, the server does not learn any information about the item of interest. Obviously, this approach does not scale to large databases usually outsourced to cloud server. In light of this, several more efficient approaches have been considered. *Private information retrieval* (PIR) (Chor *et al.*, 1998) allows a client to access items from a database without revealing the item of interest. However, PIR is mainly a tool for static databases, or databases that are not updated often. Updating a database with PIR capabilities often entails re-uploading the entire database. Alternatively, the database can be encrypted using a fully (or partially) homomorphic encryption scheme. Then, the database can be accessed and updated server-side by computing on ciphertexts. However, the main drawback here is that in order to hide access patterns, the computation must involve *all* items in the database, lest it leaks the item(s) of interest. Despite recent advances in making homomorphic encryption schemes efficient, the total computation required is generally considered far too expensive for real-world deployments.

Oblivious RAM (ORAM) Oblivious RAM protocols provide a more practical alternative to solve the access privacy problem by leveraging only basic cryptographic primitives e.g., symmetric key crypto-systems. An Oblivious RAM (ORAM) protocol allows a client to store and manipulate an array of N blocks on an untrusted server without revealing the data or access patterns. Specifically, the logical array of N blocks is indirectly stored into a specialized back-end data structure on the server, and an ORAM scheme specifies an access protocol that implements each logical access with a sequence of physical accesses to that back-end structure. An ORAM scheme is secure if for any two sequences of logical accesses of the same length, the physical accesses produced by the protocol are computationally indistinguishable. We refer the reader to the seminal work on oblivious RAM by Goldreich and Ostrovsky for more precise definitions (Goldreich and Ostrovsky, 1996).

Evaluation Metrics Intuitively, based on the informal definition, an ORAM protocol will fetch more items per access than what is actually required. This is to "obfuscate" the actual item that was requested by the client. Furthermore, once an item has been fetched, it needs to be randomly replaced to new a location server-side. This is to prevent the server from linking a future access with previous accesses for the same item. One way to do this securely is to *randomly reshuffle* the database after every access (or a batch of accesses). As the server is untrusted, either the client reshuffles the database, or tasks the server to reshuffle without decrypting the data by leveraging expensive cryptographic primitives e.g., homomorphic encryption. The former introduces communication overheads as a subset of the database has to be downloaded and re-uploaded, while the latter introduces server-side computation overheads. Additionally, the reshuffle mechanism may be interactive and require multiple *rounds* of communication. With these factors in mind, ORAMs are evaluated on the following metrics

- **Communication Complexity (Bandwidth)** is defined as the total amount of data that a client needs to read and re-upload to the server in order to complete a request. Usually, communication is measured in terms of the number of physical data *blocks* that need to be transferred from storage to access one logical data block. Blocks are usually the same size as memory pages on the client system.
- **Round Complexity** measures the number of round trips required between the client and server in order to complete one logical request. Additional round trips add significant communication delays. Obviously, an efficient ORAM protocol will only require one round of communication per logical request.
- **Server-Side Computation** for ORAMs that employ expensive cryptographic primitives. Expensive computation affects overall performance from the standpoint of latency and the associated dollar costs.

Existing work on ORAMs have largely focused on optimizing one or

more of these metrics. In the following, we will highlight the noteworthy constructions and refer the reader to the original works for more details.

8.2 Communication-Efficient ORAMs

The seminal work on ORAMs by Goldreich and Ostrovsky (Goldreich and Ostrovsky, 1996) identified communication-efficiency as the primary optimization criteria. The desired goal is to ensure that communication costs scale sublinearly in the database size. Theoretically, it is possible to design ORAM schemes where communication scales poly-logarithmically with the database size (Goldreich and Ostrovsky, 1996).

The construction by Goldreich and Ostrovsky (popularly known as the "hierarchical ORAM") has $O(\log^3 n)$ communication overhead and is based on a simple design called the square-root ORAM. The idea is to randomly arrange n blocks (server-side) with a permutation known only to the client. In addition, there is a cache (or originally called shelter) of size \sqrt{n} (may be a user-defined parameter), which may be stored either client-side or on the server. As required, the client accesses blocks from the server and adds the accessed blocks to the cache. Crucially, for each access, the client also scans the entire cache *even if the block is already found in the main storage*.

The security of this scheme is immediately obvious: i) the server does not know the secret permutation and hence cannot correlate blocks that are accessed from the main storage, and ii) the cache holds blocks that have been accessed once and is scanned entirely every access. Once the cache fills up, the combined blocks remaining in the main storage and the cache are reshuffled and rearranged again using a new random permutation. This is the most expensive step of the protocol as it requires rebuilding the entire storage. In fact, for security, the rebuilding has to be done obliviously i.e., the intermediate steps should not reveal the final locations of the blocks. This step is usually performed using an oblivious sorting algorithm. The sorting in the original construction is performed using a sorting network which has a communication overhead of $O(n \log^3 n)$. Overall, since the reshuffling needs to be performed only when the cache fills up after \sqrt{n} accesses, the communication cost

of the protocol is $O(\sqrt{n} \log^3 n)$. We note that although more efficient oblivious sorting mechanisms exist (Shi, 2020) with communication cost $O(n \log n)$, replacing the expensive sorting network still does not remove the cost dependence on \sqrt{n} in the original construction.

To overcome this dependence, Goldreich and Ostrovsky proposed a construction that essentially amortizes the level reconstruction cost. The ORAM organizes data on the server-side in a hierarchy of levels. The i -th level holds 4^i blocks and the $(i + 1)$ -th level (which can hold 4^{i+1} blocks) is the cache for the i -th level. Conceptually, the top level is an append log. On every read/write, the block that is accessed is re-encrypted and placed in the top level. Obviously, the top level overflows after a fixed number of accesses. At this stage, its constituent blocks are flushed and uniformly randomly placed in the second level. This process is generalized across all the levels and the ORAM has $O(\log n)$ levels. The hierarchical construction has a communication complexity of $O(\log^3 n)$ amortized over all accesses.

Improvements Several subsequent works have addressed the high communication complexity of the original hierarchical construction, while retaining the overall structure. Williams and Sion presented a construction with amortized communication complexity $O(\log^2 n)$ under the assumption that the client has at least $O(\sqrt{n})$ dedicated storage to perform the reshuffles using an oblivious version of the merge sort algorithm (Williams and Sion, 2008). Subsequently, Williams *et al.* presented an ORAM with more efficient search by storing per-level encrypted bloom filters (Williams *et al.*, 2008).

Under assumptions of constant client storage, Pinkas and Reinman used *cuckoo hashing* and randomized shell sort over the original Goldreich and Ostrovsky solution and achieve an amortized communication complexity of $O(\log^2 n)$ (Pinkas and Reinman, 2010). However, Goodrich *et al.* highlights a leak in the construction and provides an alternate construction with amortized communication complexity of $O(\log n)$ with the assumption of $O(n^{1/r})$ client storage with $r > 1$ (Goodrich and Mitzenmacher, 2011).

Deamortization One major drawback of the hierarchical ORAM constructions is that client queries need to wait for the duration of a reshuffle, and this is especially impractical for the larger levels. De-amortized constructions allow queries and reshuffles to proceed together and thus eliminate clients waiting for reshuffles after a level overflow. Goodrich *et al.* showed how to de-amortize the original square root solution and hierarchical solution and achieve a worst-case complexity of $O(\log n)$ in the presence of $O(n^{1/r})$ client side storage where $r > 1$ (Goodrich *et al.*, 2011). Kushilevitz *et al.* used cuckoo hashing and rotating buffers to provide a de-amortized construction with a worst-case communication complexity of $O\left(\frac{\log^2 n}{\log \log n}\right)$ (Kushilevitz *et al.*, 2012). PD-ORAM (Williams *et al.*, 2012) is a de-amortized hierarchical ORAM where level reconstructions are performed in the background while allowing queries to proceed simultaneously. This is achieved by keeping two copies of the data: a read-only copy for the queries and a writable copy where new levels are constructed. Level reconstruction starts as soon as a level is created. To ensure that a new level is available on demand when required for the next round of queries, the level construction is synchronized with the queries by tracking the progress of the reshuffle.

8.2.1 Tree-Based ORAMs

The high worst case costs of hierarchical ORAMs makes them impractical and while deamortized construction fare better in this regard, they often introduce additional overheads e.g., increased storage costs. Tree-based ORAMs provide a more viable alternative to hierarchical ORAMs since they are naturally un-amortized i.e., the worst-case query cost is equal to the average cost. Tree-based ORAMs organize the database blocks in the form of a binary (or ternary) tree. Each node of the tree (denoted as a bucket) contains a fixed number of blocks (which can be real or dummy). Blocks are stored along unique randomly selected paths. To track the location of blocks in tree (the corresponding path), a *position map* associates blocks identifiers. e.g., logical addresses to path identifiers e.g., leaf labels. Once a block is stored along some path, the ORAM maintains the following invariant: *A block mapped to a path*

resides either in any one of the buckets on the path from the root to the corresponding leaf, or in a secure storage. Due to the the random association of blocks to paths, writes may fail when all the buckets along the path are occupied up to capacity. In this case the block needs to be stored temporarily in a secure storage, called the *stash*, which is probabilistically bounded in size, and is usually stored client-side.

Shi *et al.* presented the first tree-based ORAM with worst-case communication cost of $O(\log^3 n)$ (Shi *et al.*, 2011a). Subsequently, Gentry *et al.* improved the communication costs of the construction by a constant factor (Gentry *et al.*, 2013). The major breakthrough in tree-based ORAM designs is due to Stefanov *et al.* , in the form of a construction called Path ORAM (Stefanov *et al.*, 2013). Path ORAM achieves $O(\log n)$ communication costs when the client can spare $O(n)$ local storage, and $O(\log^2 n)$ otherwise. In fact, under certain assumptions (e.g., non-uniform server-side block sizes), Path ORAM can still achieve $O(\log n)$ communication costs. This matches the known lower bound on communication costs. Subsequently, Ren *et al.* and Wang *et al.* have improved on the practical overheads of Path ORAM (Ren *et al.*, 2015; Wang *et al.*, 2015a).

8.3 Round-Trip Efficient ORAMs

Optimizing round-trips for ORAM protocols is as critical for performance as the the overall communication since multiple round-trips to fetch data leads to high latency of access. Unfortunately, none of the aforementioned communication-efficient constructions optimize round-trips. There are two notable constructions that address this problem. SR-ORAM (Williams and Sion, 2012) is a constant round ORAM requiring two round trips with overall communication complexity of $O(\log^2 n \log \log n)$. Since, SR-ORAM follows a hierarchical construction, the worst case complexity is $\Omega(n)$. TWORAM (Garg *et al.*, 2016) overcomes this problem; it features a worst-case communication complexity of $O(\log^3 n)$ and performs accesses in two rounds. Another notable construction is Bucket ORAM (Fletcher *et al.*, 2015) which features single round-trip accesses and communication complexity of

$O(\log n)$ under certain block size assumptions.

8.4 Compute-Efficient ORAMs

A straightforward way to make ORAM protocols more communication efficient, is by leveraging server-side computation. If the server could compute on the data without learning the contents, then the communication burden can be reduced as the server only returns the data block required. A line of work explores this trade-off in communication and computation assuming different server-side compute capabilities.

A version of Ring ORAM (Ren *et al.*, 2015) achieves $O(1)$ communication cost for fetching a block from the server under the assumption that the server can execute XORs over the data blocks before returning them to the client. The overall complexity of the construction is however $O(\log^2 n)$ due to other necessary bookkeeping operations. Onion ORAM (Devadas *et al.*, 2016) has a communication complexity of $O(B)$ where B is the block size of the ORAM. The construction may use either additively homomorphic encryption (AHE) or somewhat homomorphic encryption scheme (SWHE) with different trade-off; see (Devadas *et al.*, 2016) for more details. Recently, Chen *et al.* proposed Onion Ring ORAM which makes practical improvements to the construction (Chen *et al.*, 2019b). An alternate line of work assumes multiple servers to aid the computation. One notable example of this line of work is S^3 ORAM (Hoang *et al.*, 2017) utilizing secret sharing as the underlying primitive.

8.5 Other Practical Considerations

8.5.1 Parallel Access

All aforementioned ORAMs are designed for single-client deployments, that is at any point in time, there is a single-client performing accesses to the ORAM. This naturally ensures consistency and privacy. However, in this setting, clients experience unreasonably long wait times making the schemes impractical.

Boyle *et al.* first introduced an oblivious parallel RAM (OPRAM) construction assuming inter-client communication for synchronization (Boyle *et al.*, 2016). Clients coordinate with each other through an

oblivious aggregation operation and prevent simultaneous queries for the same block. For colliding client accesses, only *one representative* client queries for the required item while all other clients query for dummy items. The *representative* client then communicates the read item to all other colliding clients through an *oblivious multi-cast* operation. Subsequent works (Chan *et al.*, 2017a; Nayak and Katz, 2016; Chen *et al.*, 2016; Chan *et al.*, 2017b; Hubert Chan and Shi, 2017) have optimized Parallel RAMs matching the overhead of a sequential ORAM construction.

TaoStore (Sahin *et al.*, 2016) takes a different approach towards building a parallel ORAM. The construction introduces a trusted proxy such that all client queries are redirected to the trusted proxy which then queries for the corresponding paths from the PathORAM data tree. Further, the proxy runs a secure scheduler to ensure that the multiple path reads do not overlap and leak correlations in the underlying queries. TaoStore achieves a significant increase in throughput but can support only a limited number of parallel clients before the throughput plateaus due to the proxy’s bandwidth constraints.

ConcurORAM (Chakraborti and Sion, 2019) is a parallel ORAM construction which overcomes the bandwidth limitations of TaoStore, and reduces the assumption footprint by removing the need for a trusted proxy and inter-client communication. The construction is aided by several auxiliary data structures that allow queries to proceed in the background with full privacy guarantees without blocking other queries.

8.5.2 Write-Only Privacy

Full ORAM privacy is often unnecessary for practical settings. In several data outsourcing scenarios, it is enough to protect the privacy of write operations. A notable example of this is secure data backup on cloud services like DropBox (Aviv *et al.*, 2017). This privacy definition is satisfied by a class of ORAMs called write-only ORAMs. Li and Datta proposed the first write-only ORAM scheme with an amortized write complexity of $O(B \times \log n)$ where B is the block size of the ORAM and n is the total number of blocks (Li and Datta, 2017). However, the construction suffers from poor (linear in the database size) read

complexity. Hive (Blass *et al.*, 2014) is a write-only ORAM scheme with constant read complexity. It maps data from a logical address space uniformly randomly to the physical blocks on the underlying device. The construction requires a $O(\log n)$ -sized stash. DetWoORAM (Roche *et al.*, 2017) overcomes the requirement of a stash and achieves $O(\log n)$ read complexity and $O(1)$ write complexity.

8.5.3 Range ORAMs

A new ORAM variant, namely Range ORAM, was recently proposed by Asharov *et al.* (Asharov *et al.*, 2019). Unlike traditional ORAMs optimized for single-block accesses, Range ORAMs are optimized for efficiently accessing ranges of blocks. This notion is especially useful when considering the fact that typical filesystems deployed on top of ORAMs usually access contiguous blocks at once e.g., when reading/writing a file. The efficiency goal for Range ORAMs is to ensure that range accesses can be performed with minimal number of disk seeks across the storage device. This is in contrast to traditional ORAMs which randomly place blocks (belonging to the same file) all across the device making file accesses inefficient on high latency drives like HDDs. As a security trade-off range ORAM reveal the sizes of the ranges accessed; see (Asharov *et al.*, 2019) for more details.

Asharov *et al.* presented a construction with $O(r \cdot \log^3 n)$ communication complexity (amortized) to access r contiguous blocks (Asharov *et al.*, 2019). The number of seeks required is $O(\log^3 n \cdot (\log \log n)^2)$ (notice that the number of seeks is independent of r). Chakraborti *et al.* improved this result by providing an unamortized construction with $O(r \cdot \log^2 n)$ communication complexity and requiring $O(\log^2 n)$ seeks (Chakraborti *et al.*, 2019).

8.5.4 Hardware-Assisted ORAMs

Oblivious RAM protocols have been used in conjunction with trusted execution environments (TEEs) to design systems with access privacy. ZeroTrace (Sasy *et al.*, 2018) combines ORAMs and Intel SGX, and builds a block-level memory controller that provides oblivious execu-

tion against software adversaries. Other noteworthy examples include databases with oblivious query capabilities (Eskandarian and Zaharia, 2019; Hoang *et al.*, 2018) and oblivious file systems (Ahmad *et al.*, 2018). Typically in these systems, the ORAM logic runs securely in a SGX enclave and the data is hosted on an untrusted storage backend. In this way, the expensive bookkeeping operations are performed by the enclave-hosted trusted logic without any client intervention thereby reducing overall communication. The controller also receives and serves requests from the client; a secure communication channel between the client and the enclave ensures that the block requests remain hidden to the server.

8.5.5 Future Research Directions

Although there is a large volume of work dedicated to optimizing ORAMs for clouds, the state of the art is still impractical for real-world deployments. Firstly, the communication costs are still too high. Patel *et al.* and Asharov *et al.* have made significant strides in this direction by achieving the known communication lower bound (Patel *et al.*, 2018; Asharov *et al.*, 2020). However, these constructions are mainly of theoretical interest as the constants are impractically high. Making these constructions practical, while keeping in mind the aforementioned performance metrics (e.g., round trips, parallelism), encourage more research in this direction.

Secondly, ORAMs are not cost-effective. The high dollar costs of employing ORAMs often outweigh the cost advantages of outsourcing data to a public cloud (Bindschaedler *et al.*, 2015). This is a largely overlooked drawback of existing protocols which needs to be further investigated. The costs are due to communication and storage overheads. Interestingly, cloud services often price communication asymmetrically: uploads are costlier than downloads. Therefore, building ORAMs that exploit this asymmetry (e.g., lower upload costs for higher download costs) is an interesting research direction. ORAM constructions also come with significant storage overheads: all aforementioned constructions require at least $2\times$ the storage, as that required for the raw database. Exploring storage-efficient protocols is an important consideration for

future research.

Finally, for real-world deployments it is important to consider actively malicious adversaries i.e., cloud servers who may modify data or replay old data to the clients. This not only introduces integrity/consistency issues but also impacts privacy. While in a single client scenario, this problem may be solved by integrity-preserving mechanisms (Ren *et al.*, 2013), the problem is significantly amplified in multi-client scenarios. When considering a setting where even the clients can be malicious, Maffei *et al.* showed that to ensure security the server-side computation required is $\Omega(n)$, that is the server must touch all the items in the database for every access (Maffei *et al.*, 2017). In this setting, a scheme is presented with communication complexity of $O(\sqrt{n})$. The lower bound on the server-side compute costs only holds in a single-server setting. Hoang *et al.* recently presented a construction in a multi-server setting with $O(1)$ client-server communication complexity and $O(\log n)$ server-server communication complexity (Hoang *et al.*, 2020). The construction builds on S^3 ORAM (Hoang *et al.*, 2017) and adapts it for a malicious server(s) setting. Future work in this direction may explore new constructions in both the single-server and multi-server settings with lower communication complexities.

9

Provable Data Possession

The increasing popularity of third-party cloud storage services in recent years has brought with it numerous advantages, such as reduced cost, the ability to access the data from anywhere, and the ability to easily share data. These benefits however, did not come without challenges, especially from a security and privacy point of view. Due to trust concerns in the third-party cloud storage provider, security and privacy have been identified among the main challenges that hamper data migration to/from a cloud environment.

Unfortunately, none of the cloud storage services offered verifiable guarantees with regard to the integrity and long-term reliability of the stored data. Basically, in the cloud storage commercial landscape, if data is lost, the best a data owner can hope for is compensation proportional with the size of the data (if any), which may be orders of magnitude away from the actual value of the data.

Circa 2007, Ateniese *et al.* introduced a new framework for remote data integrity checking using provable data possession (PDP) (Ateniese *et al.*, 2007; Ateniese *et al.*, 2011). In this model, the storage server is not trusted to store the data and may try to convince the client (data owner) that it possesses (i.e., stores) the data even if the data

is totally or partially corrupted. Protection against corruption of a large portion of the data is necessary in order to handle servers that discard a significant fraction of the data. This applies to servers that are financially motivated to sell the same storage resource to multiple clients. Protection against corruption of a small portion of the data is necessary in order to handle servers that try to hide data loss incidents. This applies to servers that wish to preserve their reputation. Data loss incidents may be accidental (e.g., management errors or hardware failures) or malicious (e.g., insider attacks).

Remote data integrity checking (RDIC) allows an auditor to challenge a remote server to provide a *proof of data possession* in order to validate that the server possesses the data that were originally stored by a client. An RDIC scheme seeks to provide a *data possession guarantee*.

Requirements. Conforming to an outsourced storage relationship, the client (i.e., data owner) should only be required to store a small, ideally constant, piece of metadata.

Oftentimes, cloud storage presents unique performance demands. Given that file data are large and are stored at remote sites, accessing an entire file is expensive in I/O costs to the storage server and in transmitting the file across a network. Reading an entire archive, even periodically, greatly limits the scalability of network stores. Furthermore, I/O incurred to establish data possession interferes with on-demand bandwidth to store and retrieve data. As such, clients need to be able to verify that a server has retained file data without retrieving the data from the server and without having the server access the entire file.

A scheme for auditing remote data should be both *lightweight* and *robust*. Lightweight means that it does not unduly burden the cloud storage provider (CSP); this includes both overhead (i.e., computation and I/O) at the CSP and communication between the CSP and the auditor. This goal can be achieved by relying on *spot checking*, in which the auditor randomly samples small portions of the data and checks their integrity, thus minimizing the I/O at the CSP. Spot checking allows the client to detect if a fraction of the data stored at the server has been corrupted, but it cannot detect corruption of small parts of the data (e.g., 1 byte). Robust means that the auditing scheme incorporates

mechanisms for mitigating arbitrary amounts of data corruption. Protecting against large corruptions ensures the CSP has committed the contracted storage resources: Little space can be reclaimed undetectably, making it unattractive to delete data to save on storage costs or sell the same storage multiple times. Protecting against small corruptions protects the data itself, not just the storage resource. Many data have value well beyond their storage costs, making attacks that corrupt small amounts of data practical. For example, modifying a single bit may destroy an encrypted file or invalidate authentication information.

9.1 Prior approaches

Before the PDP model, several other mechanisms had been proposed that do not meet the above requirements for remote data integrity checking. Some schemes (Golle *et al.*, 2002) provide a weaker guarantee by enforcing storage complexity: The server has to store an amount of data at least as large as the client’s data, but not necessarily the same exact data. Moreover, most previous techniques require the server to access the entire file, which is not feasible when dealing with large amounts of data, or require storage on the client linear with the size of the data, which does not conform with the notion of storage outsourcing (Deswarte *et al.*, 2003; Sebe *et al.*, 2004; Filho and Baretto, 2006; Shah *et al.*, 2007). A notable exception is the work of Schwarz and Miller (Schwarz and Miller, 2006), which meets most of the requirements for proving data possession, but provides a less formal security analysis. This scheme relies on a special construct, called an “algebraic signature”: A function that fingerprints a block and has the property that the signature of the parity block equals the parity of the signatures of the data blocks.

9.2 Provable Data Possession

A Provable Data Possession (PDP) protocol checks that an outsourced storage site retains a file, which consists of n blocks. The client C (data owner) pre-processes the file, generating a small piece of metadata that is stored locally, transmits the file to the server S , and may delete its

local copy. The server stores the file and responds to challenges issued by the client. Storage at the server is $\Omega(n)$ and storage at the client is $O(1)$, conforming to an outsourced storage relationship.

As part of pre-processing, the client may alter the file to be stored at the server. The client may encrypt, encode or expand the file, or may include additional metadata to be stored at the server.

At a later time, an auditor issues a challenge to the server to establish that the server has retained the file. The auditor requests that the server compute a function of the stored file, which it sends back to the client. Using its local metadata, the auditor verifies the response.

For ease of exposition, the client (data owner) is assumed to be the same entity as the auditor. However, the model can be easily extended to a setting where these two may be separate entities (e.g., if business requirements require separation, or if data privacy is a concern and the auditor should not have access to the plain data (Shah *et al.*, 2008).

Ateniese *et al.* (Ateniese *et al.*, 2007; Ateniese *et al.*, 2011) proposed two PDP schemes which rely on *homomorphic verifiable tags*. The client pre-computes tags for each block of a file and then stores the file and its tags with a server. At a later time, the client can verify that the server possesses the file by generating a random challenge against a randomly selected set of file blocks. The server retrieves the queried blocks and their corresponding tags, using them to generate a proof of possession. The client is thus convinced of data possession, without actually having to retrieve file blocks. Because of the homomorphic property, tags computed for multiple file blocks can be combined into a single value, and so a challenge uses $O(1)$ network bandwidth.

These PDP schemes sample the server's storage, accessing a random subset of blocks. Sampling proves data possession with high probability based on accessing few blocks in the file, which radically alters the performance of proving data possession.

Achieving robustness. An RDIC scheme can be enhanced to provide robustness by using forward error-correcting codes (FECs). Attacks that corrupt small amounts of data do no damage, because the corrupted data may be recovered by the FEC. Attacks that do unrecoverable amounts of damage are easily detected, because they must corrupt

many blocks of data to overcome the redundancy.

Ateniese *et al.* propose a generic transformation that encodes a file using FECs in order to add robustness to any RDIC scheme that relies on spot checking (Curtmola *et al.*, 2008a; Ateniese *et al.*, 2011). A robust RDIC scheme provides protection against arbitrary small amounts of data corruption.

Additional features. The PDP schemes introduced by Ateniese *et al.* (Ateniese *et al.*, 2007; Ateniese *et al.*, 2011) provide several additional useful features. First, they provide *data format independence*, meaning they put no restriction on the format of the data. In particular, files stored at the server do not have to be encrypted. This feature is relevant since PDP schemes may have a significant impact when used with large public repositories (e.g., digital libraries, astronomy/medical/legal repositories, archives etc.). Second, they put no restriction on the number of times the client can challenge the server to prove data possession. Third, they pioneer the notion of *public verifiability*, which allows anyone, not just the data owner, to challenge the server for data possession. For example, an independent third-party auditor can verify possession of the data. The advantages of having public verifiability are akin to those of public-key over symmetric-key cryptography.

9.3 Dynamic Provable Data Possession

The original PDP model was introduced in the context of static data, i.e., data that is not modified after being stored initially. This matches a variety of application scenarios that fall under the umbrella of archival storage. The model was shown to also securely support the append operation (i.e., data blocks are appended at the end of the file), which covers application scenarios such as version control systems (Chen and Curtmola, 2014). The model was subsequently extended by Erway *et al.* to support the full range of dynamic updates to the stored data – i.e., the client can insert, modify, or delete stored data blocks – while maintaining data possession guarantees (Erway *et al.*, 2009; Erway *et al.*, 2015). Dynamic PDP (DPDP) can thus cover a wider range of cloud computing scenarios, including file storage, database services, and

peer-to-peer storage. The proposed DPDP schemes are based on a new variant of authenticated dictionaries which permit efficient membership queries (i.e., a rank-based authenticated dictionary built over a skip list). Different from a static PDP scheme, for a dynamic PDP scheme to be efficient, it must not include order information in the tags, since otherwise an update may cause all tags to be updated. From a performance perspective, the most important cost introduced by a dynamic PDP scheme compared to a static PDP scheme is that the size of a data possession proof grows from $O(1)$ to $O(\log n)$, where n is the number of file blocks.

Subsequently, Etemad and Kupcu (Etemad and K upc u, 2020) show a general framework for constructing DPDP schemes that encompasses existing DPDP-like schemes as different instantiations.

9.4 Proofs of Retrievability

Simultaneously with PDP, Juels and Kaliski have introduced a similar notion, that of *proof of retrievability* (PoR) (Juels and Kaliski, 2007), which allows a client to be convinced that it can retrieve a file previously stored at the server. This PoR scheme uses disguised blocks (called sentinels) hidden among regular file blocks in order to detect data corruption by the server. Although comparable in scope with PDP, this PoR scheme can only be applied to encrypted files and can handle a limited number of queries, which has to be fixed a priori. At a high level, a PoR scheme provides similar guarantees as an RDIC scheme (i.e., a PDP scheme that incorporates robustness to provide protection against small amounts of data corruption). Shacham and Waters (Shacham and Waters, 2008; Shacham and Waters, 2013) improve the PoR state of the art by introducing the most-widely-accepted definitions for PoR-type schemes and giving two PoR protocols based on homomorphic authenticators. The first is based on bilinear maps and achieves public verifiability, whereas the second is based on pseudo-random functions, more efficient, but is only privately verifiable. Erway *et al.* (Erway *et al.*, 2015, Section 7.3) provide a detailed comparison of PDP and PoR schemes.

Although initially proposed for a static setting, PoR schemes were

subsequently extended to a dynamic setting (i.e., the stored data can be updated in time). Initial dynamic PoR schemes were mostly of theoretical interest: (Stefanov *et al.*, 2012) (due to imposing a large amount of client storage and a large audit cost) and (Cash *et al.*, 2013b) (due to imposing large audit overhead). Shi *et al.* (Shi *et al.*, 2013) proposed the first practical dynamic PoR scheme that achieves comparable communication overhead and client-side computation with a standard Merkle hash tree. Like prior PoR and RDIC schemes, this scheme uses FEC codes (erasure codes more precisely) to achieve protection against small data corruptions, but ensures that data updates can be done efficiently by maintaining on the server side an erasure-coded hierarchical log structure that contains recently written blocks. This structure needs a special erasure coding scheme that can be incrementally built over time. Due to the use of this additional metadata, the actual erasure-encoded data only needs to be rebuilt every n write operations, where n is the number of file blocks.

9.5 Towards Auditing Distributed Storage Systems

In many practical cloud storage systems, data should be replicated in order to deal with data loss accidents. Preferably, the replicas should be stored in different geographical locations, in order to ensure failure independence. Replication is a useful mechanism in the context of proving data possession by a cloud storage provider. Whereas techniques such as PDP and PoR are useful to verify remotely the integrity of a single replica, they provide limited value when that single replica is irreparably damaged.

When data is replicated at multiple storage servers, an auditor can execute independently data possession protocols with each of the storage servers. In case any of the replicas is found to be damaged, the data owner can use the healthy replicas to restore the desired level of data replication.

Establishing a guarantee that t replicas of a file are in fact stored by a set of storage servers becomes more challenging when we assume that the storage servers can behave fully malicious (i.e., can collude with each other). The servers that appear to be storing multiple replicas may

be in fact storing only a single copy of the data. In general, this can be done by redirecting and forwarding challenges from the multiple sites to the single site that stores the data. In this way, clients (data owners) remain unaware of the reduction in the availability and durability of data that results from the loss of replicas. Even if the client initially stores replicas on servers in different geographic locations, the servers can then move all the replicas to one location and access them from that location on demand. Such a system is not more reliable than a single-replica system, even though it leads the client to believe so.

Replication systems that rely on untrusted servers have another generic limitation. To prove data availability, the servers can produce replicas on demand upon a client's challenge; however, this does not prove that the actual replicas are stored at all times. For example, malicious servers may choose to introduce dependencies among replicas, by encrypting the replicas before storing them. Replicas can then be decrypted and served on demand whenever they are requested by clients. By storing the encryption key in a single location, the malicious servers can effectively negate any reliability improvements achieved by storing the replicas at different locations. Loss of the encryption key means loss of all the replicas.

Given these generic limitations of replication systems that rely on fully dishonest servers, Curtmola *et al.* (Curtmola *et al.*, 2008b) consider a model in which storage servers are rational and economically motivated. In this context, cheating is meaningful only if it cannot be detected and if it achieves some economic benefit (e.g., using less storage than required by the contract). Such an adversarial model is reasonable and captures many practical settings in which malicious servers will not cheat and risk their reputation, unless they can achieve a clear financial gain. Curtmola *et al.* extend PDP (Ateniese *et al.*, 2007; Ateniese *et al.*, 2011) to apply to multiple replicas so that a client that initially stores t replicas can later receive a guarantee that the storage system can produce t replicas, each of which can be used to reconstruct the original file data. A replica comprises the original file data masked with randomness generated by a pseudo-random function (PRF). As each replica uses a different PRF, replicas cannot be compared or compressed with respect to each other. The homomorphic verification tags of PDP

are modified so that a single set of tags can be used to verify any number of replicas. These tags need to be generated a single time against the original file data. Thus, replica creation is efficient and incremental; it consists of unmasking an existing replica and re-masking it with new randomness. In fact, the proposed multiple-replica PDP scheme is almost as efficient as a single-replica PDP scheme in all the relevant parameters.

In the context of distributed storage, other solutions have subsequently been proposed, to cover various points in the two-dimensional feature-cost space. For example, Bowers *et al.* (Bowers *et al.*, 2009) introduced HAIL, a system that stores a file across multiple servers using redundancy. They consider a mobile adversary, which is capable to corrupt all storage servers, although at different moments in time (i.e., the adversary can corrupt any servers, as long as at most a fixed number of servers are corrupted at any one time). To deal with such a strong adversary, HAIL employs a careful interleaving of different types of error-correcting, which exploits both within-server redundancy and cross-server redundancy. At a high level, HAIL can be thought of as extending the RAID concept into the cloud, by spreading redundancy across multiple cloud servers.

Etemad and Kupcu (Etemad and Küpçü, 2013) explore a Dynamic PDP (DPDP) model in the context of a distributed, replicated storage system. Chen *et al.* (Chen *et al.*, 2010) propose remote data integrity mechanisms optimized for a setting when data is distributed across multiple storage servers using network coding (Dimakis *et al.*, 2007; Dimakis *et al.*, 2010). Li and Lazos (Li and Lazos, 2020) introduce a mechanism for verifying that a file is redundantly stored across multiple physical storage nodes according to a pre-agreed layout and can, therefore, survive node failures. Leontiadis and Curtmola (Leontiadis and Curtmola, 2018) seek to deduplicate replicated storage and design a secure storage system that provides users with strong integrity, reliability, and transparency guarantees about data that is outsourced at cloud storage providers. Users store multiple replicas of their data at different storage servers, and the data at each storage server is deduplicated across users.

Bowers *et al.* (Bowers *et al.*, 2011) proposed RAFT, a mechanism

that allows a data owner to check that a storage server has stored a file F across multiple disk drives, so it can support a desired level of fault tolerance (e.g., data can be recovered if any set of t drives has failed). RAFT is designed specifically for data stored on rotational drives, and exploits the performance limitations of such drives as a bounding parameter.

Damgård *et al.* (Damgård *et al.*, 2019) proposed *proofs of replicated storage*. Such a proof guarantees that a set of servers have reserved the space necessary to store n copies of a file. Previous attempts to achieve a similar guarantee rely on timing assumptions (Protocol Labs, 2017a; Protocol Labs, 2017b): A replica is encoded using a process that is slow, so that an auditor can distinguish between the time an honest server computes a proof and the time a dishonest server would need to re-encode the file at the time of the challenge. In contrast, Damgård *et al.* propose a construction for proofs of replicated storage that does not rely on timing assumptions. As opposed to time-bounded approaches which rely on a public deterministic encoding function, their approach is to use probabilistic encoding, which makes the re-encoding unfeasible. In addition, they focus on achieving *public verifiability*, which allows anyone (not just the data owner) to play the role of the verifier in an audit protocol. In practical terms, this means that decoding a replica can be done by anyone.

9.6 Remote Data Integrity Checking With Server-side Repair

When a distributed storage system is used in tandem with remote data integrity checking (RDIC), several phases can be distinguished throughout the lifetime of the storage system: **Setup**, **Challenge**, and **Repair**. To outsource a file F , the data owner creates multiple replicas of the file during **Setup** and stores them at multiple storage servers (one replica per server). During the **Challenge** phase, the data owner can ask periodically each server to provide a proof that the server's replica has remained intact. If a replica is found corrupt during the **Challenge** phase, the data owner can take actions to **Repair** the corrupted replica using data from the healthy replicas, thus restoring the desired redundancy level in the system. The **Challenge** and **Repair** phases will alternate over

the lifetime of the system.

In cloud storage outsourcing, a data owner stores data in a distributed storage system that consists of multiple cloud storage servers. The storage servers may belong to the same CSP (e.g., Amazon has multiple data centers in different locations), or to different CSPs. The ultimate goal of the data owner is that the data will be retrievable at any point of time in the future. Conforming to this notion of storage outsourcing, the data owner would like to outsource *both the storage and the management* of the data. In other words, after the **Setup** phase, the data owner should only have to store a small, constant, amount of data and should be involved as little as possible in the maintenance of the data. Minimal involvement in the **Challenge** phase can be achieved when using an RDIC scheme that has public verifiability. However, traditionally, the **Repair** phase imposes a significant burden on the data owner, who needs to expend a significant amount of computation and communication. For example, to repair data at a failed server, the data owner needs to first download an amount of data equal to the file size, re-generate the data to be stored at a new server, and then upload this data at a new healthy server (Curtmola *et al.*, 2008b; Bowers *et al.*, 2009). Archival storage deals with large amounts of data (Terabytes or Petabytes) and thus maintaining the health of the data imposes a heavy burden on the data owner.

Chen and Curtmola (Chen and Curtmola, 2013; Chen and Curtmola, 2017) explore a model which minimizes the data owner's involvement in the **Repair** phase, thus fully realizing the vision of outsourcing both the storage and management of data. During **Repair**, the data owner simply acts as a *repair coordinator*, which allows the data owner to manage data using a lightweight device. This is in contrast with previous work, which imposes a heavy burden on the data owner during **Repair**.

The main challenge is how to ensure that the untrusted servers manage the data properly over time (i.e., take necessary actions to maintain the desired level of redundancy when some of the replicas have failed). They consider a new storage system architecture in which each storage server exposes an interface for data manipulation so that the data owner can coordinate the actions of the storage servers in the **Repair** phase. To repair a faulty server during **Repair**, the data

owner identifies healthy servers and instructs them to collaborate. In this process, most of the communication occurs between the storage servers, and the communication between data owner and storage servers is minimized.

Their approach is based on two insights. First, the replicas stored by the storage servers must be different. Second, to enable server-side repair, the data owner gives the servers both access to the original file and the means to generate new replicas. This will allow the servers to generate a new replica by collaborating between themselves during Repair. However, this approach opens the door to a new attack, in which the servers falsely claim they generate a new replica whenever an existing replica has failed, but in reality they collaborate to only generate a replica *on the fly* during the Challenge phase (this attack is referred to as the *replicate on the fly (ROTF) attack*). To overcome the ROTF attack, the proposed approach is to *make replica creation to be time consuming*. In this way, malicious servers cannot generate replicas on the fly during Challenge without being detected. Two schemes are proposed to generate distinct replicas: The first uses a controllable amount of masking to deal with weaker adversaries, and the second uses a variant of butterfly encoding (Dijk *et al.*, 2012) to create dependencies between each of the replica blocks and multiple original file blocks in order to deal with stronger adversaries.

Towards a similar goal to allow servers to generate new replicas, Armknecht *et al.* (Armknecht *et al.*, 2016) propose Mirror, a PoR-based solution that leverages tunable cryptographic RSA-based puzzles to impose significant resource constraints on the storage servers. As a result, a rational cloud storage provider will be incentivized to correctly store and replicate the client's data or risk detection with high probability otherwise.

9.7 Future Research Directions

Ensuring the integrity and long-term reliability of cloud stored data has been an active research area over the past few years and, considering the security and privacy-sensitive nature of the cloud storage paradigm, will likely continue to attract interest for the foreseeable future.

Despite significant progress and despite of the plethora of security guarantees put forth by the academic community, adoption by major cloud storage providers remains an elusive target. Short of native deployment of auditing and data maintenance capabilities by the cloud providers themselves, one can imagine a business model where such services could be offered by a third party auditor running in the same data center where the data is located. This introduces additional concerns, especially when auditing private data, as data owners would need to allow access to their data for the auditor.

The lack of adoption in a commercial setting is a multifaceted problem. Certainly, performance is a significant concern: Providing such strong guarantees as the ones aforementioned in this work could degrade performance. Related to this issue may be the lack of efficient and production level implementations. There are also economic, regulatory and policy reasons. Lack of adoption may seem surprising, because providing such strong guarantees could be seen as a business differentiator. Yet, cloud providers do not seem to have clear economic incentives to provide such strong guarantees, and have focused on more basic security guarantees such as ensuring the privacy and secure sharing of the data.

There are still open problems, especially when trying to achieve simultaneously multiple different guarantees. For example, designing RDIC schemes that are both robust and fully meet data format independence has been challenging. This is because robustness usually imposes encrypting (parts of) the data. As another example, remotely verifying the geographical location of cloud data remains an elusive target, despite some early attempts (Benson *et al.*, 2011; Peterson *et al.*, 2011; Watson *et al.*, 2012; Gondree and Peterson, 2013; Dang *et al.*, 2017) based on time assumptions and distance-bounding protocols.

We conclude by briefly surveying some recent work that may be indicative of the current and future directions in this area. He *et al.* (He *et al.*, 2020) propose to relax some of the trust assumptions through the use of Intel SGX. Shen *et al.* (Shen *et al.*, 2020) propose a protocol that optimizes the communication overhead when data that needs to be audited changes ownership. Leontiadis and Curtmola (Leontiadis and Curtmola, 2019) study RDIC protocols when applied to compressed data. A user delegates the compression to the cloud in a provably

secure way: The user can verify correctness of compression without having to download the entire uncompressed file and check it against the compressed version. Armknecht *et al.* (Armknecht *et al.*, 2021) consider a setting in which third party auditors may be dishonest and data owners can efficiently keep the auditors in check. Chen *et al.* (Chen *et al.*, 2021) introduce a decentralized system for proofs of data retrievability and replication which is incentive-compatible and realizes automated auditing atop off-the-shelf blockchain platforms. Ateniese *et al.* (Ateniese *et al.*, 2020) study proofs of storage-time, which enable a verifier to audit that the outsourced data is continuously available to the server during the entire storage period, not only at the time a valid proof is processed.

References

- Aciiçmez, O. and Ç. K. Koç. 2006. “Trace-driven cache attacks on AES”.
- Aciiçmez, O. 2007. “Yet another microarchitectural attack: exploiting I-cache”. In: *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM workshop on Computer security architecture*. 11–18.
- Aciiçmez, O., W. Schindler, and C. K. Koç. 2005. “Improving Brumley and Boneh timing attack on unprotected SSL implementations”. In: *Proceedings of the 12th ACM conference on Computer and communications security (CCS 05)*. 139–146.
- Aciiçmez, O., W. Schindler, and Ç. K. Koç. 2007. “Cache based remote timing attack on the AES”. In: *Cryptographers’ track at the RSA conference*. Springer. 271–286.
- Ahmad, A., K. Kim, M. I. Sarfaraz, and B. Lee. 2018. “OBLIVIATE: A Data Oblivious Filesystem for Intel SGX”. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 18)*.
- Aldaya, A. C., B. B. Brumley, S. ul Hassan, C. P. Garcia, and N. Tuveri. 2019. “Port contention for fun and profit”. In: *Proceedings of the 40th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P 19)*. 870–887.
- AMD. 2020. “AMD SEV-SNP: Strengthening VM Isolation with Integrity Protection and More”. <https://www.amd.com/system/files/TechDocs/SEV-SNP-strengthening-vm-isolation-with-integrity-protection-and-more.pdf>.

- AMD. 2021. “AMD Secure Encryption Virtualization (SEV) Information Disclosure, AMD-SB-1013”. <https://www.amd.com/en/corporate/product-security/bulletin/amd-sb-1013>.
- Anandtech. 2021. “Arm Announces Neoverse V1, N2 Platforms & CPUs, CMN-700 Mesh: More Performance, More Cores, More Flexibility”. <https://www.anandtech.com/show/16640/arm-announces-neoverse-v1-n2-platforms-cpus-cmn700-mesh>.
- Armknecht, F., L. Barman, J.-M. Bohli, and G. O. Karame. 2016. “Mirror: Enabling Proofs of Data Replication and Retrievability in the Cloud”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 16)*. USENIX Association. 1051–1068.
- Armknecht, F., J.-M. Bohli, G. Karame, and W. Li. 2021. “Outsourcing Proofs of Retrieval”. *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing*. 9(1): 286–301.
- Arnautov, S., B. Trach, F. Gregor, T. Knauth, A. Martin, C. Priebe, J. Lind, D. Muthukumaran, D. O’Keeffe, M. L. Stillwell, D. Goltzsche, D. Eyers, R. Kapitza, P. Pietzuch, and C. Fetzer. 2016. “SCONE: Secure Linux Containers with Intel SGX”. In: *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 16)*. USA: USENIX Association. ISBN: 9781931971331.
- Asharov, G., T.-H. Hubert Chan, K. Nayak, R. Pass, L. Ren, and E. Shi. 2019. “Locality-Preserving Oblivious RAM”. In: *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2019*. Ed. by Y. Ishai and V. Rijmen.
- Asharov, G., I. Komargodski, W.-K. Lin, K. Nayak, E. Peserico, and E. Shi. 2020. “OptORAMa: Optimal Oblivious RAM”. In: *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2020*. Ed. by A. Canteaut and Y. Ishai.
- Ateniese, G., R. Burns, R. Curtmola, J. Herring, O. Khan, L. Kissner, Z. Peterson, and D. Song. 2011. “Remote data checking using provable data possession”. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur.* 14(1): 12:1–12:34.
- Ateniese, G., R. Burns, R. Curtmola, J. Herring, L. Kissner, Z. Peterson, and D. Song. 2007. “Provable data possession at untrusted stores”. In: *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communication Security (CCS 07)*. 598–609.

- Ateniese, G., L. Chen, M. Etemad, and Q. Tang. 2020. “Proof of Storage-Time: Efficiently Checking Continuous Data Availability”. In: *Proceedings of the 27th ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 20)*. The Internet Society.
- Aumann, Y. and Y. Lindell. 2010. “Security Against Covert Adversaries: Efficient Protocols for Realistic Adversaries”. *J. Cryptology*. 23(2): 281–343.
- Aviv, A. J., S. G. Choi, T. Mayberry, and D. S. Roche. 2017. “ObliviSync: Practical Oblivious File Backup and Synchronization”. In: *Proceedings of the 24th ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 17)*.
- “AWS CloudHSM”. <https://aws.amazon.com/cloudhsm/>.
- Bahmani, R., F. Brasser, G. Dessouky, P. Jauernig, M. Klimmek, A.-R. Sadeghi, and E. Stapf. 2021. “CURE: A Security Architecture with Customizable and Resilient Enclaves”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*.
- Barham, P., B. Dragovic, K. Fraser, S. Hand, T. Harris, A. Ho, R. Neugebauer, I. Pratt, and A. Warfield. 2003. “Xen and the Art of Virtualization”. In: *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP 2003)*. Bolton Landing, NY. 164–177. ISBN: 1-58113-757-5.
- Bates, A., B. Mood, J. Pletcher, H. Pruse, M. Valafar, and K. Butler. 2012. “Detecting co-residency with active traffic analysis techniques”. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Workshop on Cloud computing security workshop (CCSW 12)*. 1–12.
- Baumann, A., M. Peinado, and G. Hunt. 2014a. “Shielding Applications from an Untrusted Cloud with Haven”. In: *Proceedings of the 11th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 2014)*. Broomfield, CO. 267–283. ISBN: 978-1-931971-16-4.
- Baumann, A., M. Peinado, and G. Hunt. 2014b. “Shielding Applications from an Untrusted Cloud with Haven”. In: *Proceedings of the 10th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 14)*.

- Beaver, D. 1989. “Multiparty Protocols Tolerating Half Faulty Processors”. In: *Advances in Cryptology—Crypto ’89*. Vol. 435. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 560–572.
- Beaver, D. and S. Goldwasser. 1989. “Multiparty Computation with Faulty Majority”. In: *Advances in Cryptology—Crypto ’89*. Vol. 435. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 589–590.
- Ben-Or, M., S. Goldwasser, and A. Wigderson. 1988. “Completeness Theorems for Non-Cryptographic Fault-Tolerant Distributed Computation (Extended Abstract)”. In: *Proceedings of the 20th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*. ACM. 1–10.
- Benson, K., R. Dowsley, and H. Shacham. 2011. “Do You Know Where Your Cloud Files Are?” In: *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Cloud Computing Security Workshop (CCSW 11)*. Association for Computing Machinery. 73–82.
- Bernstein, D. J. 2005. “Cache-timing attacks on AES”.
- Bhattacharyya, A., A. Sandulescu, M. Neugschwandtner, A. Sorniotti, B. Falsafi, M. Payer, and A. Kurmus. 2019. “SMoTherSpectre: exploiting speculative execution through port contention”. In: *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 19)*. 785–800.
- Bindschaedler, V., M. Naveed, X. Pan, X. Wang, and Y. Huang. 2015. “Practicing Oblivious Access on Cloud Storage: The Gap, the Fallacy, and the New Way Forward”. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communication Security (CCS 15)*.
- Blass, E.-O., T. Mayberry, G. Noubir, and K. Onarlioglu. 2014. “Toward Robust Hidden Volumes Using Write-Only Oblivious RAM”. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 14)*.
- Bogdanov, D., S. Laur, and J. Willemsen. 2008. “Sharemind: A Framework for Fast Privacy-Preserving Computations”. In: *Proceedings of the 13th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security (ESORICS)*. Springer-Verlag. 192–206.
- Boneh, D., G. D. Crescenzo, R. Ostrovsky, and G. Persiano. 2004. “Public key encryption with keyword search”. In: *Proceedings of Eurocrypt 2004*. LNCS 3027. 506–522.

- Bonneau, J. and I. Mironov. 2006. “Cache-collision timing attacks against AES”. In: *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems*. Springer. 201–215.
- Bowers, K. D., A. Juels, and A. Oprea. 2009. “HAIL: a high-availability and integrity layer for cloud storage”. In: *Proceedings of 2009 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communication Security (CCS 09)*.
- Bowers, K. D., M. van Dijk, A. Juels, A. Oprea, and R. L. Rivest. 2011. “How to Tell If Your Cloud Files Are Vulnerable to Drive Crashes”. In: *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 11)*. ACM. 501–514.
- Boyle, E., K.-M. Chung, and R. Pass. 2016. “Oblivious Parallel RAM and Applications”. In: *Theory of Cryptography*. Ed. by E. Kushilevitz and T. Malkin.
- Brasser, F., T. Frassetto, K. Riedhammer, A.-R. Sadeghi, T. Schneider, and C. Weinert. 2018. “VoiceGuard: Secure and Private Speech Processing”. In: *Interspeech*.
- Brumley, D. and D. Boneh. 2005. “Remote timing attacks are practical”. *Computer Networks*. 48(5): 701–716.
- Bugnion, E., J. Nieh, and D. Tsafirir. 2017. *Hardware and Software Support for Virtualization. Synthesis Lectures on Computer Architecture*. Morgan and Claypool Publishers.
- Butt, S., H. A. Lagar-Cavilla, A. Srivastava, and V. Ganapathy. 2012. “Self-service Cloud Computing”. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 2012)*. Raleigh, NC. 253–264. ISBN: 978-1-4503-1651-4.
- Cash, D., S. Jarecki, C. Jutla, H. Krawczyk, M.-C. Roşu, and M. Steiner. 2013a. “Highly-Scalable Searchable Symmetric Encryption with Support for Boolean Queries”. In: *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2013*. Ed. by R. Canetti and J. A. Garay. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 353–373.
- Cash, D., A. Küpçü, and D. Wichs. 2013b. “Dynamic Proofs of Retrievability via Oblivious RAM”. In: *Advances in Cryptology – EURO-CRYPT 2013*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 279–295.

- Chakraborti, A., A. J. Aviv, S. G. Choi, T. Mayberry, D. S. Roche, and R. Sion. 2019. “rORAM: Efficient Range ORAM with $O(\log 2N)$ Locality”. In: *Proceedings of the 26th ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 19)*.
- Chakraborti, A. and R. Sion. 2019. “ConcurORAM: High-Throughput Stateless Parallel Multi-Client ORAM”. In: *Proceedings of the 26th ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 19)*.
- Chan, T.-H. H., K.-M. Chung, and E. Shi. 2017a. “On the Depth of Oblivious Parallel RAM”. In: *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2017*. Ed. by T. Takagi and T. Peyrin.
- Chan, T.-H. H., Y. Guo, W.-K. Lin, and E. Shi. 2017b. “Oblivious Hashing Revisited, and Applications to Asymptotically Efficient ORAM and OPRAM”. In: *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2017*. Ed. by T. Takagi and T. Peyrin.
- Chang, Y.-C. and M. Mitzenmacher. 2005. “Privacy Preserving Keyword Searches on Remote Encrypted Data”. In: *Applied Cryptography and Network Security*. Ed. by J. Ioannidis, A. Keromytis, and M. Yung. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Chaum, D., C. Crépeau, and I. Damgård. 1988. “Multiparty Unconditionally Secure Protocols (Extended Abstract)”. In: *Proceedings of the 20th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*. ACM. 11–19.
- Chen, B., R. Curtmola, G. Ateniese, and R. Burns. 2010. “Remote Data Checking for Network Coding-based Distributed Storage Systems”. In: *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM Cloud Computing Security Workshop (CCSW 10)*.
- Chen, B., H. Lin, and S. Tessaro. 2016. “Oblivious Parallel RAM: Improved Efficiency and Generic Constructions”. In: *Theory of Cryptography*. Ed. by E. Kushilevitz and T. Malkin. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 205–234.
- Chen, B. and R. Curtmola. 2013. “Towards Self-Repairing Replication-Based Storage Systems Using Untrusted Clouds”. In: *Proceedings of the Third ACM Conference on Data and Application Security and Privacy*. ACM. 377–388.

- Chen, B. and R. Curtmola. 2014. “Auditable Version Control Systems”. In: *Proceedings of the 21th ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS '14)*.
- Chen, B. and R. Curtmola. 2017. “Remote data integrity checking with server-side repair”. *Journal of Computer Security*. 25(6): 537–584.
- Chen, D., H. Yuan, S. Hu, Q. Wang, and C. Wang. 2021. “BOSSA: A Decentralized System for Proofs of Data Retrievability and Replication”. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*. 32(4): 786–798.
- Chen, G., M. Li, F. Zhang, and Y. Zhang. 2019a. “Defeating Speculative-Execution Attacks on SGX with HyperRace”. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE Conference on Dependable and Secure Computing (DSC 19)*.
- Chen, H., I. Chillotti, and L. Ren. 2019b. “Onion Ring ORAM: Efficient Constant Bandwidth Oblivious RAM from (Leveled) TFHE”. In: *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 19)*. Dallas, Texas, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. 491–505. ISBN: 9781450367479.
- Chen, S., F. Liu, Z. Mi, Y. Zhang, R. B. Lee, H. Chen, and X. Wang. 2018. “Leveraging hardware transactional memory for cache side-channel defenses”. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 601–608.
- Chen, S., X. Zhang, M. K. Reiter, and Y. Zhang. 2017. “Detecting privileged side-channel attacks in shielded execution with Déjà Vu”. In: *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security (AsiaCCS 17)*. ACM. 7–18.
- Chen, X., T. Garfinkel, E. C. Lewis, P. Subrahmanyam, C. A. Waldspurger, D. Boneh, J. Dwoskin, and D. R. Ports. 2008. “Overshadow: A Virtualization-based Approach to Retrofitting Protection in Commodity Operating Systems”. In: *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS 2008)*. Seattle, WA. 2–13. ISBN: 978-1-59593-958-6.

- Chhabra, S., B. Rogers, Y. Solihin, and M. Prvulovic. 2011. “SecureME: A Hardware-software Approach to Full System Security”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS 2011)*. Tucson, AZ. 108–119. ISBN: 978-1-4503-0102-2.
- Chiappetta, M., E. Savas, and C. Yilmaz. 2016. “Real time detection of cache-based side-channel attacks using hardware performance counters”. *Applied Soft Computing*. 49: 1162–1174.
- Chor, B., E. Kushilevitz, O. Goldreich, and M. Sudan. 1998. “Private information retrieval”. *Journal of the ACM*. 45(6).
- Cohen, E., M. Dahlweid, M. Hillebrand, D. Leinenbach, M. Moskal, T. Santen, W. Schulte, and S. Tobies. 2009. “VCC: A Practical System for Verifying Concurrent C”. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Theorem Proving in Higher Order Logics (TPHOLs 2009)*. Munich, Germany. 23–42.
- Colp, P., M. Nanavati, J. Zhu, W. Aiello, G. Coker, T. Deegan, P. Loscocco, and A. Warfield. 2011. “Breaking Up is Hard to Do: Security and Functionality in a Commodity Hypervisor”. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP 2011)*. Cascais, Portugal. 189–202. ISBN: 978-1-4503-0977-6.
- Costanzo, D., Z. Shao, and R. Gu. 2016. “End-to-End Verification of Information-Flow Security for C and Assembly Programs”. In: *Proceedings of the 37th ACM Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI 2016)*.
- “Cryptographic Module Validation Program”. <https://csrc.nist.gov/projects/cryptographic-module-validation-program>.
- Curtmola, R., O. Khan, and R. Burns. 2008a. “Robust Remote Data Checking”. In: *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM Workshop on Storage Security and Survivability (StorageSS)*.
- Curtmola, R., O. Khan, R. Burns, and G. Ateniese. 2008b. “MR-PDP: Multiple-Replica Provable Data Possession”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS 08)*.
- Curtmola, R., J. Garay, S. Kamara, and R. Ostrovsky. 2006. “Searchable symmetric encryption: improved definitions and efficient constructions”. In: *CCS '06: Proceedings of the 13th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*.

- Dall, C. and J. Nieh. 2014. “KVM/ARM: The Design and Implementation of the Linux ARM Hypervisor”. In: *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. 333–348.
- Damgård, I., C. Ganesh, and C. Orlandi. 2019. “Proofs of Replicated Storage Without Timing Assumptions”. In: *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2019*. Springer International Publishing. 355–380.
- Dang, H., E. Purwanto, and E.-C. Chang. 2017. “Proofs of Data Residency: Checking Whether Your Cloud Files Have Been Relocated”. In: *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security (AsiaCCS 17)*. Association for Computing Machinery. 408–422.
- Deswarte, Y., J.-J. Quisquater, and A. Saidane. 2003. “Remote integrity checking”. In: *Proceedings of Conference on Integrity and Internal Control in Information Systems (IICIS’03)*.
- Devadas, S., M. van Dijk, C. W. Fletcher, L. Ren, E. Shi, and D. Wichs. 2016. “Onion ORAM: A Constant Bandwidth Blowup Oblivious RAM”. In: *Theory of Cryptography*. Ed. by E. Kushilevitz and T. Malkin.
- Didier, G. and C. Maurice. 2021. “Calibration Done Right: Noiseless Flush+ Flush Attacks”. In: *Proceedings of the 18th Conference on Detection of Intrusions and Malware & Vulnerability Assessment (DIMVA 2021)*.
- Dijk, M. van, A. Juels, A. Oprea, R. L. Rivest, E. Stefanov, and N. Triandopoulos. 2012. “Hourglass Schemes: How to Prove That Cloud Files Are Encrypted”. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 12)*. ACM. 265–280.
- Dimakis, A. G., B. Godfrey, M. J. Wainwright, and K. Ramchandran. 2007. “Network Coding for Distributed Storage Systems”. In: *INFOCOM*.
- Dimakis, A. G., P. B. Godfrey, Y. Wu, M. O. Wainwright, and K. Ramchandran. 2010. “Network Coding for Distributed Storage Systems”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*.

- Dwork, C. and A. Roth. 2014. *The Algorithmic Foundations of Differential Privacy*. Available at <https://www.cis.upenn.edu/~aaroht/privacybook>. NOW Publishers.
- “ENFORCER Server”. <https://enforcerserver.com/>.
- Erway, C. C., A. K p c , C. Papamanthou, and R. Tamassia. 2009. “Dynamic Provable Data Possession”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 09)*.
- Erway, C. C., A. K p c , C. Papamanthou, and R. Tamassia. 2015. “Dynamic Provable Data Possession”. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur.* 17(4).
- Eskandarian, S. and M. Zaharia. 2019. “ObliDB: Oblivious Query Processing for Secure Databases”. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13(2).
- Etemad, M. and A. K p c . 2013. “Transparent, Distributed, and Replicated Dynamic Provable Data Possession”. In: *Applied Cryptography and Network Security*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 1–18.
- Etemad, M. and A. K p c . 2020. “Generic Dynamic Data Outsourcing Framework for Integrity Verification”. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 53(1).
- Evans, D., V. Kolesnikov, and M. Rosulek. 2018. *A Pragmatic Introduction to Secure Multi-Party Computation*. Available at <http://securecomputation.org>. NOW Publishers.
- Falzon, F., E. A. Markatou, Akshima, D. Cash, A. Rivkin, J. Stern, and R. Tamassia. 2020. “Full Database Reconstruction in Two Dimensions”. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 20)*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN: 9781450370899.
- Filho, D. L. G. and P. S. L. M. Baretto. 2006. “Demonstrating data possession and uncheatable data transfer”. IACR ePrint archive. Report 2006/150, <http://eprint.iacr.org/2006/150>.
- “FIPS 140-2”. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/FIPS_140-2.
- “FIPS 140-3”. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/FIPS_140-3.
- Fletcher, C., M. Naveed, L. Ren, E. Shi, and E. Stefanov. 2015. “Bucket ORAM: Single Online Roundtrip, Constant Bandwidth Oblivious RAM”. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2015/1065.
- “Frequently Asked Questions on seL4”. URL: <https://docs.sel4.systems/projects/sel4/frequently-asked-questions.html>.

- Fuller, B., M. Varia, A. Yerukhimovich, E. Shen, A. Hamlin, V. Gademally, R. Shay, J. D. Mitchell, and R. K. Cunningham. 2017. “SoK: Cryptographically Protected Database Search”. In: *Proceedings of the 2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P 17)*. 172–191.
- Garfinkel, T., B. Pfaff, J. Chow, M. Rosenblum, and D. Boneh. 2003. “Terra: A Virtual Machine-based Platform for Trusted Computing”. In: *Proceedings of the Nineteenth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP 2003)*. Bolton Landing, NY. 193–206. ISBN: 1-58113-757-5.
- Garg, S., P. Mohassel, and C. Papamanthou. 2016. “TWRAM: Efficient Oblivious RAM in Two Rounds with Applications to Searchable Encryption”. In: *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2016*. Ed. by M. Robshaw and J. Katz. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Gentry, C., K. A. Goldman, S. Halevi, C. S. Jutla, M. Raykova, and D. Wichs. 2013. “Optimizing ORAM and Using It Efficiently for Secure Computation”. In: *Proceedings of the 13th Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium (PETS 13)*.
- Godfrey, M. and M. Zulkernine. 2014. “Preventing cache-based side-channel attacks in a cloud environment”. *IEEE transactions on cloud computing*. 2(4): 395–408.
- Goh, E. 2003. “Secure Indexes”. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2003/216. <http://eprint.iacr.org/2003/216/>.
- Goldreich, O. 2004. *Foundations of Cryptography, vol. II: Basic Applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goldreich, O., S. Micali, and A. Wigderson. 1987. “How to Play any Mental Game or A Completeness Theorem for Protocols with Honest Majority”. In: *Proceedings of the 19th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*. ACM. 218–229.
- Goldreich, O. and R. Ostrovsky. 1996. “Software Protection and Simulation on Oblivious RAMs”. *Journal of the ACM*. 43: 431–473.
- Goldwasser, S. and L. A. Levin. 1990. “Fair Computation of General Functions in Presence of Immoral Majority”. In: *Advances in Cryptology—Crypto ’90*. Vol. 537. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 77–93.

- Golle, P., S. Jarecki, and I. Mironov. 2002. “Cryptographic Primitives Enforcing Communication and Storage Complexity.” In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC 02)*. 120–135.
- Golle, P., J. Staddon, and B. Waters. 2004. “Secure conjunctive keyword search over encrypted data”. In: *Proceedings of ACNS*. Springer-Verlag; Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3089. 31–45.
- Gondree, M. and Z. N. Peterson. 2013. “Geolocation of Data in the Cloud”. In: *Proceedings of the Third ACM Conference on Data and Application Security and Privacy*. Association for Computing Machinery. 25–36.
- Goodrich, M. T. and M. Mitzenmacher. 2011. “Privacy-preserving Access of Outsourced Data via Oblivious RAM Simulation”. In: *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP 11)*.
- Goodrich, M. T., M. Mitzenmacher, O. Ohrimenko, and R. Tamassia. 2011. “Oblivious RAM Simulation with Efficient Worst-case Access Overhead”. In: *Proceedings of the 2011 ACM Cloud Computing Security Workshop (CCSW 11)*. 95–100.
- Goodrich, M. T. and J. A. Simons. 2014. “Data-Oblivious Graph Algorithms in Outsourced External Memory”. In: *Combinatorial Optimization and Applications*. Ed. by Z. Zhang, L. Wu, W. Xu, and D.-Z. Du.
- “Google Cloud Key Management”. <https://cloud.google.com/security-key-management>.
- Goyal, V., A. Polychroniadou, and Y. Song. 2021. “Unconditional Communication-Efficient MPC via Hall’s Marriage Theorem”. In: *Advances in Cryptology—Crypto 2021, Part II*. Vol. 12826. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 275–304.
- Gras, B., K. Razavi, H. Bos, and C. Giuffrida. 2018. “Translation leak-aside buffer: Defeating cache side-channel protections with {TLB} attacks”. In: *Proceedings of the 27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*. 955–972.

- Grubbs, P., M.-S. Lacharite, B. Minaud, and K. G. Paterson. 2018. “Pump up the Volume: Practical Database Reconstruction from Volume Leakage on Range Queries”. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*.
- Grubbs, P., T. Ristenpart, and V. Shmatikov. 2017. “Why Your Encrypted Database Is Not Secure”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th Workshop on Hot Topics in Operating Systems*.
- Gruss, D., J. Lettner, F. Schuster, O. Ohrimenko, I. Haller, and M. Costa. 2017. “Strong and efficient cache side-channel protection using hardware transactional memory”. In: *Proceedings of the 26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 17)*. 217–233.
- Gruss, D., C. Maurice, K. Wagner, and S. Mangard. 2016. “Flush+ Flush: a fast and stealthy cache attack”. In: *International Conference on Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment (DIMVA 16)*. Springer. 279–299.
- Gu, R., Z. Shao, H. Chen, J. Kim, J. Koenig, X. Wu, V. Sjöberg, and D. Costanzo. 2019. “Building Certified Concurrent OS Kernels”. *Communications of the ACM*. 62(10): 89–99.
- Gu, R., Z. Shao, H. Chen, X. N. Wu, J. Kim, V. Sjöberg, and D. Costanzo. 2016. “CertiKOS: An Extensible Architecture for Building Certified Concurrent OS Kernels”. In: *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 2016)*. Savannah, GA. 653–669.
- Gullasch, D., E. Bangerter, and S. Krenn. 2011. “Cache games—bringing access-based cache attacks on AES to practice”. In: *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P 11)*. IEEE. 490–505.
- Halderman, J. A., S. D. Schoen, N. Heninger, W. Clarkson, W. Paul, J. A. Calandrino, A. J. Feldman, J. Appelbaum, and E. W. Felten. 2009. “Lest we remember: cold-boot attacks on encryption keys”. *Communications of the ACM*. 52(5): 91–98.
- “Hardware Security Module (HSM)”. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hardware_security_module.

- Hastings, M., B. Hemenway, D. Noble, and S. Zdancewic. 2019. “SoK: General Purpose Compilers for Secure Multi-Party Computation”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P 19)*. IEEE. 1220–1237.
- Hazay, C. and Y. Lindell. 2010. *Efficient Secure Two-Party Protocols: Techniques and Constructions*. Springer.
- He, Y., Y. Xu, X. Jia, S. Zhang, P. Liu, and S. Chang. 2020. “EnclavePDP: A General Framework to Verify Data Integrity in Cloud Using Intel SGX”. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses (RAID 2020)*. USENIX Association. 195–208.
- Heiser, G. and B. Leslie. 2010. “The OKL4 Microvisor: Convergence Point of Microkernels and Hypervisors”. In: *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Asia-Pacific Workshop on Workshop on Systems (APSys 2010)*. New Delhi, India. 19–24. ISBN: 978-1-4503-0195-4.
- Hetzelt, F. and R. Bühren. 2017. “Security analysis of encrypted virtual machines”. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*. 52(7): 129–142.
- Hoang, T., J. Guajardo, and A. A. Yavuz. 2020. “MACAO: A Maliciously-Secure and Client-Efficient Active ORAM Framework”. In: *Proceedings of the 27th ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 20)*.
- Hoang, T., C. D. Ozkaptan, A. A. Yavuz, J. Guajardo, and T. Nguyen. 2017. “S³ORAM: A Computation-Efficient and Constant Client Bandwidth Blowup ORAM with Shamir Secret Sharing”. In: *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 17)*. Dallas, Texas, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. 491–505. ISBN: 9781450349468.
- Hoang, T., M. O. Ozmen, Y. Jang, and A. A. Yavuz. 2018. “Hardware-Supported ORAM in Effect: Practical Oblivious Search and Update on Very Large Dataset”. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies (PETS 18)*. 2019: 172–191.

- Hofmann, O. S., S. Kim, A. M. Dunn, M. Z. Lee, and E. Witchel. 2013. “InkTag: Secure Applications on an Untrusted Operating System”. In: *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS 2013)*. Houston, TX. 265–278. ISBN: 978-1-4503-1870-9.
- Hua, Z., J. Gu, Y. Xia, H. Chen, B. Zang, and Haibing. 2017. “vTZ: Virtualizing ARM Trustzone”. In: *Proceedings of the 26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 2017)*. Vancouver, BC, Canada. 541–556. ISBN: 978-1-931971-40-9.
- Huang, Y., J. Katz, and D. Evans. 2012. “Quid-Pro-Quo-tocols: Strengthening Semi-honest Protocols with Dual Execution”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy 2012 (S&P 12)*. IEEE Computer Society. 272–284.
- Hubert Chan, T.-H. and E. Shi. 2017. “Circuit OPRAM: Unifying Statistically and Computationally Secure ORAMs and OPRAMs”. In: *Theory of Cryptography*. Ed. by Y. Kalai and L. Reyzin.
- Inci, M. S., B. Gulmezoglu, G. Irazoqui, T. Eisenbarth, and B. Sunar. 2016. “Cache attacks enable bulk key recovery on the cloud”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems*. Springer. 368–388.
- Intel. 2014. “Intel Software Guard Extensions Programming Reference”. <https://software.intel.com/sites/default/files/managed/48/88/329298-002.pdf>.
- Intel. 2017. “Overview of Intel Protected File System Library Using Software Guard Extensions ”. <https://software.intel.com/en-us/articles/overview-of-intel-protected-file-system-library-using-software-guard-extensions>.
- Intel. 2021. “Intel Trust Domain CPU Architectural Extensions”. <https://software.intel.com/content/dam/develop/external/us/en/documents-tps/intel-tdx-cpu-architectural-specification.pdf>.
- Intel Corporation. 2014. “Intel Software Guard Extensions Programming Reference”. <https://software.intel.com/sites/default/files/managed/48/88/329298-002.pdf>.

- Irazoqui, G., T. Eisenbarth, and B. Sunar. 2015. “S \$ A: A shared cache attack that works across cores and defies VM sandboxing—and its application to AES”. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P 15)*. IEEE. 591–604.
- Irazoqui, G., M. S. Inci, T. Eisenbarth, and B. Sunar. 2014. “Wait a minute! A fast, Cross-VM attack on AES”. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 International Workshop on Recent Advances in Intrusion Detection*. Springer. 299–319.
- Ishai, Y. and E. Kushilevitz. 2004. “On the Hardness of Information-Theoretic Multiparty Computation”. In: *Advances in Cryptology—Eurocrypt 2004*. Vol. 3027. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 439–455.
- Johnson, S. 2018. “Intel SGX and Side-Channels”. <https://software.intel.com/en-us/articles/intel-sgx-and-side-channels>.
- Juels, A. and B. S. Kaliski. 2007. “PORs: Proofs of Retrievability for Large Files”. In: *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communication Security (CCS 07)*.
- Kamara, S., C. Papamanthou, and T. Roeder. 2012. “Dynamic Searchable Symmetric Encryption”. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*.
- Kaplan, D. 2017. “Protecting VM register state with SEV-ES”. <https://www.amd.com/system/files/TechDocs/Protecting%20VM%20Register%20State%20with%20SEV-ES.pdf>.
- Kaplan, D., J. Powell, and T. Woller. 2016. “AMD memory encryption”. *White paper*.
- Kellaris, G., G. Kollios, K. Nissim, and A. O’Neill. 2016. “Generic Attacks on Secure Outsourced Databases”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 1329–1340.
- Keller, E., J. Szefer, J. Rexford, and R. B. Lee. 2010. “NoHype: Virtualized Cloud Infrastructure Without the Virtualization”. In: *Proceedings of the 37th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA 2010)*. Saint-Malo, France. 350–361. ISBN: 978-1-4503-0053-7.

- Kelsey, J., B. Schneier, D. Wagner, and C. Hall. 1998. “Side channel cryptanalysis of product ciphers”. In: *Proceedings of the 1998 European Symposium on Research in Computer Security (ESORICS 98)*. Springer. 97–110.
- Kida, L. S., S. Desai, A. Trivedi, R. Lal, V. Scarlata, and S. K. Ghosh. 2020. “HCC: 100 Gbps AES-GCM Encrypted Inline DMA Transfers Between SGX Enclave and FPGA Accelerator”. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Information and Communications Security (ICICS 20)*.
- Kim, T., M. Peinado, and G. Mainar-Ruiz. 2012. “{STEALTHMEM}: System-level protection against cache-based side channel attacks in the cloud”. In: *Proceedings of the 21st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 12)*. 189–204.
- Kim, Y., R. Daly, J. Kim, C. Fallin, J. H. Lee, D. Lee, C. Wilkerson, K. Lai, and O. Mutlu. 2014. “Flipping bits in memory without accessing them: An experimental study of DRAM disturbance errors”. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*. 42(3): 361–372.
- Kivity, A., Y. Kamay, D. Laor, U. Lublin, and A. Liguori. 2007. “KVM: the Linux Virtual Machine Monitor”. In: *In Proceedings of the 2007 Ottawa Linux Symposium (OLS 2007)*. Ottawa, ON, Canada.
- Klein, G., J. Andronick, K. Elphinstone, T. Murray, T. Sewell, R. Kolanski, and G. Heiser. 2014. “Comprehensive Formal Verification of an OS Microkernel”. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*.
- Klein, G., J. Andronick, M. Fernandez, I. Kuz, T. Murray, and G. Heiser. 2018. “Formally Verified Software in the Real World”. *Communications of the ACM*.
- Klein, G., K. Elphinstone, G. Heiser, J. Andronick, D. Cock, P. Derrin, D. Elkaduwe, K. Engelhardt, R. Kolanski, M. Norrish, T. Sewell, H. Tuch, and S. Winwood. 2009. “seL4: Formal Verification of an OS Kernel”. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP 2009)*. Big Sky, MT. 207–220.
- Kocher, P. C. 1996. “Timing attacks on implementations of Diffie-Hellman, RSA, DSS, and other systems”. In: *Annual International Cryptology Conference*. Springer. 104–113.

- Koschel, J., C. Giuffrida, H. Bos, and K. Razavi. 2020. “TagBleed: Breaking KASLR on the Isolated Kernel Address Space using Tagged TLBs”. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE. 309–321.
- Kushilevitz, E., S. Lu, and R. Ostrovsky. 2012. “On the (in)Security of Hash-based Oblivious RAM and a New Balancing Scheme”. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 12)*.
- Leinenbach, D. and T. Santen. 2009. “Verifying the Microsoft Hyper-V hypervisor with VCC”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th International Symposium on Formal Methods (FM 2009)*. Eindhoven, The Netherlands. 806–809.
- Leontiadis, I. and R. Curtmola. 2018. “Secure Storage with Replication and Transparent Deduplication”. In: *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM Conference on Data and Application Security and Privacy*. Association for Computing Machinery. 13–23.
- Leontiadis, I. and R. Curtmola. 2019. “Auditable Compressed Storage”. In: *International Conference on Information Security*. Springer International Publishing. 67–86.
- Li, L. and L. Lazos. 2020. “Proofs of Physical Reliability for Cloud Storage Systems”. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*. 31(5): 1048–1065.
- Li, L. and A. Datta. 2017. “Write-Only Oblivious RAM-Based Privacy-Preserved Access of Outsourced Data”. *Int. J. Inf. Secur.*
- Li, S.-W., J. S. Koh, and J. Nieh. 2019. “Protecting Cloud Virtual Machines from Hypervisor and Host Operating System Exploits”. In: *Proceedings of the 28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 2019)*. Santa Clara, CA. 1357–1374.
- Li, S.-W., X. Li, R. Gu, J. Nieh, and J. Z. Hui. 2021a. “A Secure and Formally Verified Linux KVM Hypervisor”. In: *Proceedings of the 42nd IEEE Symposium on Security & Privacy (IEEE SP 2021)*. San Francisco, CA. 1782–1799.
- Li, S.-W., X. Li, R. Gu, J. Nieh, and J. Z. Hui. 2021b. “Formally Verified Memory Protection for a Commodity Multiprocessor Hypervisor”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 2021)*. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. 3953–3970.

- Lindell, Y. 2021. “Secure multiparty computation”. *Communications of the ACM*. 64(1): 86–96.
- Lindell, Y. and B. Pinkas. 2008. “Secure Multiparty Computation for Privacy-Preserving Data Mining”. Available at <https://eprint.iacr.org/2008.001>.
- Lindemann, J. and M. Fischer. 2018. “A Memory-Deduplication Side-Channel Attack to Detect Applications in Co-Resident Virtual Machines”. In: *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*. ISBN: 9781450351911.
- Liu, C., L. Zhu, M. Wang, and Y.-a. Tan. 2014a. “Search pattern leakage in searchable encryption: Attacks and new construction”. *Inf. Sci.* 265: 176–188.
- Liu, F., Q. Ge, Y. Yarom, F. Mckeen, C. Rozas, G. Heiser, and R. B. Lee. 2016. “Catalyst: Defeating last-level cache side channel attacks in cloud computing”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 IEEE international symposium on high performance computer architecture (HPCA 16)*. IEEE. 406–418.
- Liu, F., Y. Yarom, Q. Ge, G. Heiser, and R. B. Lee. 2015a. “Last-level cache side-channel attacks are practical”. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (S&P 15)*. IEEE. 605–622.
- Liu, F., L. Ren, and H. Bai. 2014b. “Mitigating cross-VM side channel attack on multiple tenants cloud platform.” *J. Comput.* 9(4): 1005–1013.
- Liu, Y., T. Zhou, K. Chen, H. Chen, and Y. Xia. 2015b. “Thwarting Memory Disclosure with Efficient Hypervisor-enforced Intra-domain Isolation”. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 2015)*. Denver, CO. 1607–1619. ISBN: 978-1-4503-3832-5.
- Maffei, M., G. Malavolta, M. Reinert, and D. Schröder. 2017. “Maliciously Secure Multi-Client ORAM”. In: *Applied Cryptography and Network Security*. Ed. by D. Gollmann, A. Miyaji, and H. Kikuchi.
- Magouryk, C. 2021. “Arm-based cloud computing is the next big thing: Introducing Arm on Oracle Cloud Infrastructure”. <https://blogs.oracle.com/cloud-infrastructure/post/arm-based-cloud-computing-is-the-next-big-thing-introducing-arm-on-oracle-cloud-infrastructure>.

- Markettos, A., C. Rothwell, B. Gutstein, A. Pearce, P. Neumann, S. Moore, and R. Watson. 2019. “Thunderclap: Exploring vulnerabilities in Operating System IOMMU protection via DMA from untrustworthy peripherals”. In: *Proceedings of the ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 19)*.
- Martin, R., J. Demme, and S. Sethumadhavan. 2012. “Timewarp: Rethinking timekeeping and performance monitoring mechanisms to mitigate side-channel attacks”. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 39th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA 12)*. IEEE. 118–129.
- McCune, J. M., Y. Li, N. Qu, Z. Zhou, A. Datta, V. Gligor, and A. Perrig. 2010. “TrustVisor: Efficient TCB Reduction and Attestation”. In: *Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP 2010)*. Oakland, CA. 143–158.
- “Microsoft Azure Key Vault”. <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/services/key-vault/>.
- Ta-Min, R., L. Litty, and D. Lie. 2006. “Splitting Interfaces: Making Trust Between Applications and Operating Systems Configurable”. In: *Proceedings of the 7th Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 2006)*. Seattle, WA. 279–292. ISBN: 1-931971-47-1.
- Moon, S.-J., V. Sekar, and M. K. Reiter. 2015. “Nomad: Mitigating arbitrary cloud side channels via provider-assisted migration”. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 15)*. 1595–1606.
- Murray, D. G., G. Milos, and S. Hand. 2008. “Improving Xen Security Through Disaggregation”. In: *Proceedings of the 4th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS International Conference on Virtual Execution Environments (VEE 2008)*. Seattle, WA. 151–160. ISBN: 978-1-59593-796-4.
- Nayak, K., C. W. Fletcher, L. Ren, N. Chandran, S. Lokam, E. Shi, and V. Goyal. 2017. “HOP: Hardware makes Obfuscation Practical”. In: *Proceedings of the 2017 ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 17)*.

- Nayak, K. and J. Katz. 2016. “An Oblivious Parallel RAM with $O(\log^2 N)$ Parallel Runtime Blowup”. *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive*. 2016: 1141.
- Nguyen, A., H. Raj, S. Rayanchu, S. Saroiu, and A. Wolman. 2012. “Delusional Boot: Securing Hypervisors Without Massive Re-engineering”. In: *Proceedings of the 7th ACM European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys 2012)*. Bern, Switzerland. 141–154. ISBN: 978-1-4503-1223-3.
- Oberhauser, J., R. L. de Lima Chehab, D. Behrens, M. Fu, A. Paolillo, L. Oberhauser, K. Bhat, Y. Wen, H. Chen, J. Kim, and V. Vafeiadis. 2021. “VSync: Push-Button Verification and Optimization for Synchronization Primitives on Weak Memory Models”. In: *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS 2021)*. Detroit, MI.
- Ohrimenko, O., F. Schuster, C. Fournet, A. Mehta, S. Nowozin, K. Vaswani, and M. Costa. 2016. “Oblivious Multi-Party Machine Learning on Trusted Processors”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 16)*.
- Osvik, D. A., A. Shamir, and E. Tromer. 2006. “Cache attacks and countermeasures: the case of AES”. In: *Cryptographers’ track at the RSA conference*. Springer. 1–20.
- Owens, R. and W. Wang. 2011. “Non-Interactive OS Fingerprinting through Memory de-Duplication Technique in Virtual Machines”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th IEEE International Performance Computing and Communications Conference*.
- Oya, S. and F. Kerschbaum. 2021. “Hiding the Access Pattern is Not Enough: Exploiting Search Pattern Leakage in Searchable Encryption”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*.
- Paccagnella, R., L. Luo, and C. W. Fletcher. 2021. “Lord of the Ring (s): Side Channel Attacks on the {CPU} On-Chip Ring Interconnect Are Practical”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*.
- Page, D. 2005. “Partitioned cache architecture as a side-channel defence mechanism”.

- Page, D. 2002. “Theoretical use of cache memory as a cryptanalytic side-channel.” *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.* 2002(169): 1–23.
- Pappas, V., F. Krell, B. Vo, V. Kolesnikov, T. Malkin, S. G. Choi, W. George, A. Keromytis, and S. Bellovin. 2014. “Blind Seer: A Scalable Private DBMS”. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P 14)*.
- Patel, S., G. Persiano, M. Raykova, and K. Yeo. 2018. “PanORAMa: Oblivious RAM with Logarithmic Overhead”. In: *IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 18)*.
- Percival, C. 2005. “Cache missing for fun and profit”.
- Pessl, P., D. Gruss, C. Maurice, M. Schwarz, and S. Mangard. 2016. “DRAMA: Exploiting Dram Addressing for Cross-Cpu Attacks”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th USENIX Conference on Security Symposium. SEC’16*. Austin, TX, USA: USENIX Association. 565–581. ISBN: 9781931971324.
- Peterson, Z. N. J., M. Gondree, and R. Beverly. 2011. “A Position Paper on Data Sovereignty: The Importance of Geolocating Data in the Cloud”. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd USENIX Conference on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing*.
- Pinkas, B. and T. Reinman. 2010. “Oblivious RAM Revisited”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference on Advances in Cryptology (CRYPTO 10)*.
- Popa, R. A., C. M. S. Redfield, N. Zeldovich, and H. Balakrishnan. 2011. “CryptDB: Protecting Confidentiality with Encrypted Query Processing”. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*.
- Protocol Labs. 2017a. “Filecoin: A decentralized storage network”. <https://filecoin.io/filecoin.pdf>.
- Protocol Labs. 2017b. “Proof of replication”. <https://filecoin.io/proof-of-replication.pdf>.
- Rabin, T. and M. Ben-Or. 1989. “Verifiable Secret Sharing and Multi-party Protocols with Honest Majority”. In: *Proceedings of the 21st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*. ACM. 73–85.

- Razavi, K., B. Gras, E. Bosman, B. Preneel, C. Giuffrida, and H. Bos. 2016. “Flip feng shui: Hammering a needle in the software stack”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 16)*. 1–18.
- Ren, L., C. Fletcher, A. Kwon, E. Stefanov, E. Shi, M. van Dijk, and S. Devadas. 2015. “Constants Count: Practical Improvements to Oblivious RAM”. In: *Proceedings of the 24th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 15)*.
- Ren, L., X. Yu, C. W. Fletcher, M. van Dijk, and S. Devadas. 2013. “Design Space Exploration and Optimization of Path Oblivious RAM in Secure Processors”.
- Riley, R., X. Jiang, and D. Xu. 2008. “Guest-Transparent Prevention of Kernel Rootkits with VMM-Based Memory Shadowing”. In: *Proceedings of the 11th International Symposium on Recent Advances in Intrusion Detection (RAID 2008)*. Cambridge, MA. 1–20. ISBN: 978-3-540-87402-7.
- Ristenpart, T., E. Tromer, H. Shacham, and S. Savage. 2009. “Hey, you, get off of my cloud: exploring information leakage in third-party compute clouds”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*. 199–212.
- Roche, D. S., A. Aviv, S. G. Choi, and T. Mayberry. 2017. “Deterministic, Stash-Free Write-Only ORAM”. In: *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 17)*.
- Sahin, C., V. Zakhary, A. E. Abbadi, H. Lin, and S. Tessaro. 2016. “Tao-Store: Overcoming Asynchronicity in Oblivious Data Storage”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P 16)*.
- Sasy, S., S. Gorbunov, and C. W. Fletcher. 2018. “ZeroTrace: Oblivious Memory Primitives from Intel SGX”. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 18)*.

- Schwarz, T. S. J. and E. L. Miller. 2006. “Store, Forget, and Check: Using Algebraic Signatures to Check Remotely Administered Storage.” In: *Proceedings of the 2006 IEEE International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS 06)*. IEEE Computer Society.
- Sebe, F., A. Martinez-Balleste, Y. Deswarte, J. Domingo-Ferrer, and J.-J. Quisquater. 2004. “Time-Bounded Remote File Integrity Checking”. *Tech. rep.* No. 04429. LAAS.
- “Security Requirements for Cryptographic Modules”. <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov>.
- “seL4 Reference Manual Version 11.0.0”. 2019. Data61.
- “seL4 Supported Platforms”. URL: <https://docs.sel4.systems/Hardware>.
- Seshadri, A., M. Luk, N. Qu, and A. Perrig. 2007. “SecVisor: A Tiny Hypervisor to Provide Lifetime Kernel Code Integrity for Commodity OSes”. In: *Proceedings of 21st ACM SIGOPS Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP 2007)*. Stevenson, WA. 335–350. ISBN: 978-1-59593-591-5.
- Shacham, H. and B. Waters. 2008. “Compact Proofs of Retrievability”. In: *Proceedings of the Annual International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security (Asiacrypt 2008)*.
- Shacham, H. and B. Waters. 2013. “Compact Proofs of Retrievability”. *J. Cryptol.* 26(3): 442–483.
- Shah, M., M. Baker, J. C. Mogul, and R. Swaminathan. 2007. “Auditing to Keep Online Storage Services Honest”. In: *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Hot Topics in Operating Systems (HotOS XI)*. Usenix.
- Shah, M. A., R. Swaminathan, and M. Baker. 2008. “Privacy-Preserving Audit and Extraction of Digital Contents”. *ePrint Archive Report*. (2008/186).
- Shen, J., F. Guo, X. Chen, and W. Susilo. 2020. “Secure Cloud Auditing with Efficient Ownership Transfer”. In: *Computer Security – ESORICS 2020*. Springer International Publishing. 611–631.
- Shi, E. 2020. “Path Oblivious Heap: Optimal and Practical Oblivious Priority Queue”. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P 20)*.

- Shi, E., T.-H. H. Chan, E. Stefanov, and M. Li. 2011a. “Oblivious RAM with $O((\text{Log}n)^3)$ Worst-case Cost”. In: *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on The Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security (ASIACRYPT 11)*.
- Shi, E., E. Stefanov, and C. Papamanthou. 2013. “Practical Dynamic Proofs of Retrievability”. In: *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer & Communications Security (CCS 13)*. ACM. 325–336.
- Shi, J., X. Song, H. Chen, and B. Zang. 2011b. “Limiting cache-based side-channel in multi-tenant cloud using dynamic page coloring”. In: *Proceedings of the 2011 IEEE/IFIP 41st International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks Workshops (DSN-W)*. IEEE. 194–199.
- Shi, L., Y. Wu, Y. Xia, N. Dautenhahn, H. Chen, B. Zang, and J. Li. 2017. “Deconstructing Xen”. In: *24th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 2017)*. San Diego, CA.
- Shih, M.-W., M. Kumar, T. Kim, and A. Gavrilovska. 2016. “S-NFV: Securing NFV States by Using SGX”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM International Workshop on Security in Software Defined Networks & Network Function Virtualization (SDN-NFV Security 2016)*. New Orleans, LA. 45–48. ISBN: 978-1-4503-4078-6.
- Shinagawa, T., H. Eiraku, K. Tanimoto, K. Omote, S. Hasegawa, T. Horie, M. Hirano, K. Kourai, Y. Oyama, E. Kawai, K. Kono, S. Chiba, Y. Shinjo, and K. Kato. 2009. “BitVisor: A Thin Hypervisor for Enforcing I/O Device Security”. In: *Proceedings of the 2009 ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS International Conference on Virtual Execution Environments (VEE 2009)*. Washington, DC. 121–130. ISBN: 978-1-60558-375-4.
- Siemens. 2019. “jailhouse - Linux-based partitioning hypervisor”. <https://github.com/siemens/jailhouse>.
- Song, D. X., D. Wagner, and A. Perrig. 2000. “Practical Techniques for Searches on Encrypted Data”. In: *SP '00: Proceedings of the 2000 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P 2000)*. IEEE Computer Society.

- Sprabery, R., K. Evchenko, A. Raj, R. B. Bobba, S. Mohan, and R. H. Campbell. 2017. “A novel scheduling framework leveraging hardware cache partitioning for cache-side-channel elimination in clouds”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.09538*.
- Stefanov, E., M. van Dijk, A. Juels, and A. Oprea. 2012. “Iris: A Scalable Cloud File System with Efficient Integrity Checks”. In: *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC 12)*. ACM. 229–238.
- Stefanov, E., M. van Dijk, E. Shi, C. Fletcher, L. Ren, X. Yu, and S. Devadas. 2013. “Path ORAM: An Extremely Simple Oblivious RAM Protocol”. In: *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer & Communications Security (CCS 13)*.
- Steinberg, U. and B. Kauer. 2010. “NOVA: A Microhypervisor-based Secure Virtualization Architecture”. In: *Proceedings of the 5th European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys 2010)*. Paris, France. 209–222. ISBN: 978-1-60558-577-2.
- Strackx, R. and F. Piessens. 2012. “Fides: Selectively Hardening Software Application Components Against Kernel-level or Process-level Malware”. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 2012)*. Raleigh, NC. 2–13. ISBN: 978-1-4503-1651-4.
- Suzaki, K., K. Iijima, T. Yagi, and C. Artho. 2011. “Memory Deduplication as a Threat to the Guest OS”. In: *Proceedings of the Fourth European Workshop on System Security*.
- Tao, R., J. Yao, X. Li, S.-W. Li, J. Nieh, and R. Gu. 2021. “Formal Verification of a Multiprocessor Hypervisor on Arm Relaxed Memory Hardware”. In: *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP 2021)*. Virtual Event, Germany. 866–881.
- TrendForce. 2021. “Intel Responds to AMD’s Challenge with Ice Lake CPUs as Competition in Server Market Intensifies”. <https://www.trendforce.com/presscenter/news/20210318-10723.html>.
- Tromer, E., D. A. Osvik, and A. Shamir. 2010. “Efficient cache attacks on AES, and countermeasures”. *Journal of Cryptology*. 23(1): 37–71.

- Tsai, C.-C., K. S. Arora, N. Bandi, B. Jain, W. Jannen, J. John, H. A. Kalodner, V. Kulkarni, D. Oliveira, and D. E. Porter. 2014. “Cooperation and Security Isolation of Library OSEs for Multi-process Applications”. In: *Proceedings of the 9th European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys 2014)*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands. 9:1–9:14. ISBN: 978-1-4503-2704-6.
- Tsunoo, Y., T. Saito, T. Suzaki, M. Shigeri, and H. Miyauchi. 2003. “Cryptanalysis of DES implemented on computers with cache”. In: *Proceedings of the 2003 International Workshop on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems*. Springer. 62–76.
- Varadarajan, V., T. Ristenpart, and M. Swift. 2014. “Scheduler-based defenses against cross-VM side-channels”. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 14)*. 687–702.
- Varadarajan, V., Y. Zhang, T. Ristenpart, and M. Swift. 2015. “A placement vulnerability study in multi-tenant public clouds”. In: *Proceedings of the 24th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 15)*. 913–928.
- Vasudevan, A., S. Chaki, L. Jia, J. McCune, J. Newsome, and A. Datta. 2013. “Design, Implementation and Verification of an eXtensible and Modular Hypervisor Framework”. In: *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP 2013)*. San Francisco, CA. 430–444. ISBN: 978-0-7695-4977-4.
- Vasudevan, A., S. Chaki, P. Maniatis, L. Jia, and A. Datta. 2016. “überSpark: Enforcing Verifiable Object Abstractions for Automated Compositional Security Analysis of a Hypervisor”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 2016)*. Austin, TX. 87–104. ISBN: 978-1-931971-32-4.
- Vaucher, S., R. Pires, P. Felber, M. Pasin, V. Schiavoni, and C. Fetzer. 2018. “SGX-Aware Container Orchestration for Heterogeneous Clusters”. In: *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS 18)*.
- Wan, J., Y. Bi, Z. Zhou, and Z. Li. 2021. “Volcano: Stateless Cache Side-channel Attack by Exploiting Mesh Interconnect”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.04533*.

- Wang, W., G. Chen, X. Pan, Y. Zhang, X. Wang, V. Bindshaedler, H. Tang, and C. A. Gunter. 2017. “Leaky Cauldron on the Dark Land: Understanding Memory Side-Channel Hazards in SGX”. In: *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*.
- Wang, X., H. Chan, and E. Shi. 2015a. “Circuit ORAM: On Tightness of the Goldreich-Ostrovsky Lower Bound”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Cloud and Computer Security (CCS 15)*.
- Wang, X., A. J. Malozemoff, and J. Katz. 2016. “EMPToolkit: Efficient MultiParty computation toolkit”. Available at <https://github.com/emp-toolkit>.
- Wang, X., Y. Chen, Z. Wang, Y. Qi, and Y. Zhou. 2015b. “SecPod: A Framework for Virtualization-based Security Systems”. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 2015)*. Santa Clara, CA. 347–360. ISBN: 978-1-931971-225.
- Wang, Z. and R. B. Lee. 2007. “New cache designs for thwarting software cache-based side channel attacks”. In: *Proceedings of the 34th annual international symposium on Computer architecture*. 494–505.
- Wang, Z. and R. B. Lee. 2008. “A novel cache architecture with enhanced performance and security”. In: *2008 41st IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*. IEEE. 83–93.
- Wang, Z., X. Jiang, W. Cui, and P. Ning. 2009. “Countering Kernel Rootkits with Lightweight Hook Protection”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 2009)*. Chicago, IL. 545–554. ISBN: 978-1-60558-894-0.
- Wang, Z., C. Wu, M. Grace, and X. Jiang. 2012. “Isolating Commodity Hosted Hypervisors with HyperLock”. In: *Proceedings of the 7th ACM European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys 2012)*. Bern, Switzerland. 127–140. ISBN: 978-1-4503-1223-3.
- Watson, G. J., R. Safavi-Naini, M. Alimomeni, M. E. Locasto, and S. Narayan. 2012. “LoSt: Location Based Storage”. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Cloud Computing Security Workshop (CCSW 12)*. Association for Computing Machinery. 59–70.
- Werner, M., T. Unterluggauer, L. Giner, M. Schwarz, D. Gruss, and S. Mangard. 2019. “Scattercache: Thwarting cache attacks via cache set randomization”. In: *Proceedings of the 28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*. 675–692.

- Williams, P. and R. Sion. 2008. “Usable PIR”. In: *Proceedings of the 2008 ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 08)*.
- Williams, P. and R. Sion. 2012. “Single Round Access Privacy on Outsourced Storage”. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communication Security (CCS 12)*. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN: 9781450316514.
- Williams, P., R. Sion, and B. Carbunar. 2008. “Building Castles out of Mud: Practical Access Pattern Privacy and Correctness on Untrusted Storage”. In: *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 08)*.
- Williams, P., R. Sion, and A. Tomescu. 2012. “PrivateFS: A Parallel Oblivious File System”. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 12)*.
- Wu, C., Z. Wang, and X. Jiang. 2013. “Taming Hosted Hypervisors with (Mostly) Deprivileged Execution.” In: *20th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 2013)*. San Diego, CA.
- Wu, Z., Z. Xu, and H. Wang. 2012. “Whispers in the Hyper-space: High-speed Covert Channel Attacks in the Cloud”. In: *21st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 12)*.
- Xiao, J., Z. Xu, H. Huang, and H. Wang. 2013. “Security Implications of Memory Deduplication in a Virtualized Environment”. In: *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks. DSN '13*.
- Xiao, Y., X. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and R. Teodorescu. 2016. “One bit flips, one cloud flops: Cross-vm row hammer attacks and privilege escalation”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th USENIX security symposium (USENIX security 16)*. 19–35.
- Xu, Z., H. Wang, and Z. Wu. 2015. “A measurement study on co-residence threat inside the cloud”. In: *Proceedings of the 24th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 15)*. 929–944.

- Yang, J. and K. G. Shin. 2008. “Using Hypervisor to Provide Data Secrecy for User Applications on a Per-page Basis”. In: *Proceedings of the 4th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS International Conference on Virtual Execution Environments (VEE 2008)*. Seattle, WA. 71–80. ISBN: 978-1-59593-796-4.
- Yao, A. C.-C. 1986. “How to Generate and Exchange Secrets”. In: *Proceedings of the 27th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE Computer Society. 162–167.
- Yarom, Y. and K. Falkner. 2014. “FLUSH+ RELOAD: A high resolution, low noise, L3 cache side-channel attack”. In: *23rd {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 14)*. 719–732.
- Yu, J., L. Hsiung, M. E. Hagg, and C. W. Fletcher. 2019. “Data Oblivious ISA Extensions for Side Channel-Resistant and High Performance Computing”. In: *Proceedings of the Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 19)*.
- Zhang, F., J. Chen, H. Chen, and B. Zang. 2011a. “CloudVisor: Retrofitting Protection of Virtual Machines in Multi-tenant Cloud with Nested Virtualization”. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP 2011)*. Cascais, Portugal. 203–216. ISBN: 978-1-4503-0977-6.
- Zhang, T., Y. Zhang, and R. B. Lee. 2016. “Cloudradar: A real-time side-channel attack detection system in clouds”. In: *International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions, and Defenses*. Springer. 118–140.
- Zhang, Y., A. Juels, A. Oprea, and M. K. Reiter. 2011b. “Homealone: Co-residency detection in the cloud via side-channel analysis”. In: *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P 11)*. IEEE. 313–328.
- Zhang, Y., A. Juels, M. K. Reiter, and T. Ristenpart. 2012. “Cross-VM side channels and their use to extract private keys”. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security (CCS 12)*. 305–316.
- Zhang, Y., A. Juels, M. K. Reiter, and T. Ristenpart. 2014. “Cross-tenant side-channel attacks in PaaS clouds”. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 990–1003.

- Zhang, Y. and M. K. Reiter. 2013. “Düppel: Retrofitting commodity operating systems to mitigate cache side channels in the cloud”. In: *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC conference on Computer & communications security (CCS 13)*. 827–838.
- Zhou, Z., M. K. Reiter, and Y. Zhang. 2016. “A software approach to defeating side channels in last-level caches”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 871–882.
- Zhou, Z., V. D. Gligor, J. Newsome, and J. M. McCune. 2012. “Building verifiable trusted path on commodity x86 computers”. In: *Proceedings of the 33rd IEEE symposium on security and privacy (IEEE S&P 12)*. 616–630.
- Zhou, Z., M. Yu, and V. D. Gligor. 2014. “Dancing with Giants: Wimpy Kernels for On-Demand Isolated I/O”. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP 2014)*. San Jose, CA. 308–323. ISBN: 978-1-4799-4686-0.
- Zhu, M., B. Tu, W. Wei, and D. Meng. 2017. “HA-VMSI: A Lightweight Virtual Machine Isolation Approach with Commodity Hardware for ARM”. In: *Proceedings of the 13th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS International Conference on Virtual Execution Environments (VEE 2017)*. Xi’an, China. 242–256. ISBN: 978-1-4503-4948-2.