DICE*: A Formally Verified Implementation of DICE Measured Boot

Zhe Tao zhetao@ucdavis.edu

Aseem Rastogi aseemr@microsoft.com Naman Gupta t-nag@microsoft.com Kapil Vaswani kapilv@microsoft.com Aditya V. Thakur avthakur@ucdavis.edu

Microsoft[®] Resear

Establishing Trust in a Remote Device

Send sensitive data to ML accelerators on the cloud

How do we verify that a device is running expected code?

Prevents an attacker from loading unexpected code in boot by

- measuring the boot sequence
- recording the measurements for later attestation

TPM Trusted Platform Module

Unexpected code results in wrong measurement and fails attestation

TPM Trusted Platform Module

But traditional measured boot protocols are not applicable to IoT devices

TPM Trusted Platform Module

But traditional measured boot protocols are not applicable to IoT devices

Because they require a dedicated chip like TPM, which is too expensive in terms of cost, power, or real estate

TPM Trusted Platform Module

Lightweight measured boot for IoT devices proposed by **Trusted Computing Group**.

DICE is becoming [important.](https://trustedcomputinggroup.org/work-groups/dice-architectures/) TCG members like Microsoft, STMicro, Microchip, Micron, NXP, etc. are behind its effort.

DICE is general for scenarios beyond IoT devices, like servers.

DICE implicitly captures TCB as secrets (CDI) derived during boot

Layered structure:

each layer extends the TCB by measuring the upper layer and deriving a new CDI .

UDS Unique Device Secret

UDS Unique Device Secret

UDS Unique Device Secret

UDS Unique Device Secret

DICE implementation is hard to get right because of key derivation, hashes, signatures and X.509 certificates — complex piece of code

National Security Agency | Cybersecurity Advisory

Patch Critical Cryptographic Vulnerability in Microsoft Windows **Clients and Servers**

Summary

NSA has discovered a critical vulnerability (CVE-2020-0601) affecting Microsoft Windows®¹ cryntographia fi The **certificate validation vulnerability** allows an attacker to undermine how Windows verifies cry enable remote code execution. The vulnerability affects Windows 10 and Windows Server 2016 applications that rely on Windows for trust functionality. Exploitation of the vulnerability allows a network connections and deliver executable code while appearing as legitimately trusted entitie validation of trust may be impacted include:

- **HTTPS** connections
- Signed files and emails
- Signed executable code launched as user-mode processes

The vulnerability places Windows endpoints at risk to a broad range of exploitation vectors. NS,

Critical crypto bug leaves Linux, hundreds of apps open to eavesdropping

This GnuTLS bug is worse than the big Apple "goto fail" bug patched last week.

LECVE-2016-2108 Detail

Current Description

The ASN.1 implementation in OpenSSL before 1.0.10 and 1.0.2 before 1.0.2c allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code or cause a denial of service (buffer underflow and memory corruption) via an ANY field in crafted serialized data, aka the "negative zero" issue.

Severity CVSS Version 3.x CVSS Version 2.0

CVSS 3.x Severity and Metrics:

Base Score: 9.8 GRITICAL

Vector: CVSS:3.0/AV:N/AC:L/PR:N/UI:N/S:U/C:H/I:H/A:H

tor strings and CVSS scores. We also display any CVSS information provided within the

DICE is hard to get right because of the complex code and libraries

And bugs like memory errors, misuse of secrets, malleability attacks on X.509, side-channels may leak secrets allowing impersonation attack

But patching the first two layers is either impossible or extremely expensive

UDS Unique Device Secret

DICE is hard to get right because of the complex code and libraries

And bugs like memory errors, misuse of secrets, malleability attacks on X.509, side-channels may leak secrets allowing impersonation attack

But patching the first two layers is either impossible or extremely expensive

UDS Unique Device Secret

DICE is hard to get right because of the complex code and libraries

And bugs like memory errors, misuse of secrets, malleability attacks on X.509, side-channels may leak secrets allowing impersonation attack

But patching the first two layers is either impossible or extremely expensive

UDS Unique Device Secret

DICE*: A Formally Verified DICE implementation

- Formally sp[ecify DICE specification](https://github.com/verified-HRoT/dice-star)
- Present a verified DICE Engine with a platform-agonal
	- Users can focus on analyzing the platform-specific component
- Present a verified DICE Layer 0
	- Including a verified library for a subset of X.509 which
- Generate verified C implementation and evaluat
	- Comparable to unverified hand-written code in term
- Available at https://github.com/verified-HRoT/d

Verified Properties

- Functional correctness
	- Secrets, keys and certificates are derived as per specification
- Memory safety
	- Buffer overflows, use-after-free, no null dereferences, dangling pointers, etc.
- Confidentiality
	- No secret leakage via outputs, memory, etc.
- Side-channel resistance
	- Free of certain timing- and cache-based side channels
- X.509 certificate security
	- No malleability attacks

Verification Toolchain

- \bullet \mathbf{F}^{\star} :
	- Functional language with effects
	- Dependent type
	- Semi-automated proof via SMT solvers
- Low^{*}: a shallow embedding of C in F^*
	- C-like memory model
	- First Order
	- C-compatible types
- KreMLin: a Low*-C compiler

Provides APIs

• Read UDS

Latch UDS

• Erase stack

HACL^{*}; in verified cryptographic library in E* Enforces the following behavior between the Fine

- Cannot read UDS after yatafang UDS
- Must latch UDS Fluerfctrie reatly ingertect
- · Must erase stackrippfographicalingSecure
	- Side-Channel Resistant

UDS Unique Device Secret

Verifying DICE^{*} Engine: Top-Level Spec

UDS Unique Device Secret

Verifying DICE^{*} Engine: Top-Level Spec

UDS Unique Device Secret

Verifying DICE^{*} Engine: Top-Level Spec

UDS Unique Device Secret

Compound Device Identifier CDI

Verifying $\bf DICE^*$ Engine: Top-Level Spec

$let die-mail()$: Stack dice_return_code (requires λ h \rightarrow uds_is_enabled h) (ensures **λ** h_Ø r h₁ \rightarrow (¬ (uds_is_enabled h₁)) \land stack_is_erased h₁ \land all heap buffers except cdi and ghost state remain same h_{β} h_{1} Λ (r == DICE_SUCCESS \iff (10_image_is_valid (st ()).1₀ h₁ \land cdi_functional_correctness (st ()) h₁)))

Low^{*} allows us to specify the following properties about memory:

- All *heap* buffers,
- which were **alive** at the initial state h_0 ,
- and are **disjoint** with the CDI buffer,
- are still **alive** at the final state h_1
- and are *not modified.*

UDS Unique Device Secret

Verifying $\bf DICE^*$ Engine: Side-Channel Resistance

- DICE^{\star} follows the secret independent coding discipline by reusing the **secret integer model** from **HACL**^{*}
- $HACL^*$ defines secrets as abstract, constant-time integers which
	- can not be used as array indexes
	- can not be branched on because no Boolean comparison operators for them

DICE* Layer O

Derive Asymmetric Key Pairs

 $DevicelD_{pub}$, $DevicelD_{priv} = KDF(CDI_{L0})$

AliasKey_{pub}, AliasKey_{priv} = $KDF(CDI_{L0}, L1)$

Generate Certificates

 $CSR_{DevicelD} = Sign(CreatedCSR(DevicelD_{pub}), DevicelD_{priv})$ $Crt_{AliasKey} = Sign(CreatedCrt (AliasKey_{pub})$, DeviceID_{priv})

> **KDF** Key Derivation Function \mathcal{CSR} **Certificate Signing Request** Crt Certificate

$DICE^{\star}$ Layer 0

Generate Certificates

$$
CSR_{DeviceID} = Sign(CreateCR\Big(DeviceID_{pub}), DeviceID_{priv})
$$

Crt_{AliasKey} = Sign(CreateCrt (AliasKey_{pub}), DeviceID_{priv})

X.509 Certificate Generation Library provides verified serializer primitives and combinators for

- (Most of) ASN.1 constructs
- (A fragment of) X.509 messages
- KDF Key Derivation Function
- CSR Certificate Signing Request
- Crt Certificate

DICE* Layer O

Derive Asymmetric Key Pairs

 $DeviceID_{pub}$, $DeviceID_{priv} =$ $KDF(CDI_{L0})$ AliasKey_{pub}, AliasKey_{priv} = KDF (CDI_{L0}, L₁)

Generate Certificates

 $\begin{aligned} GSR_{DeviceID} = & \begin{cases} Sign(CreatedCSR(DeviceID_{pub}), DeviceID_{priv}) \\ \end{cases} \\ \begin{aligned} Crt_{AliasKey} = & Sign(Creactect(Alias Key_{pub}), DeviceID_{priv}) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$

KDF Key Derivation Function CSR **Certificate Signing Request** Crt Certificate

- We reuse the secure parser and serializer model from LowParse for specification
- We verify properties such as our serializers are injective

$$
\forall m_1, m_2. s(m_1) = s(m_2) \Rightarrow m_1 = m_2
$$

• X.509 certificates are encoded into ASN.1

• X.509 certificates are encoded into ASN.1 Tag-

Tag

• X.509 certificates are encoded into ASN.1 Tag-Length-

• X.509 certificates are encoded into ASN.1 Tag-Length-Value (TLV) format

- X.509 certificates are encoded into ASN.1 Tag-Length-Value (TLV) format
	- where the length field specifies the size of the value field
- But the length field is also variable size!

When Length ≥ 128

- The low-level forward serializer from **LowParse** needs to calculate the size of value field ahead.
- Hence needs multiple passes to serialize an ASN.1 message, which is inefficient.

- We implement a verified low-level backward serializer, which serializes an ASN.1 message in one pass
	- even in the presence of nested TLV messages.

DICE* Implementation

 $7,677$ F^{\star} LoC 5,051 **C** LoC

 DICE^{\star} Layer 0 $\left| \begin{array}{cc} 7.677 \text{ F}^{\star} \text{ Loc} \\ 7.671 \text{ C} \end{array} \right| \times 509$ Certificate Generation Library

 $16,564$ F^{\star} LoC

DICE^{*} Engine

533 F^{\star} LoC 205 **C** LoC

Platform-Agnostic Interface

 \sim 25k lines of \mathbf{F}^* code and proof \sim 5K lines of generated C code

DICE* Implementation

```
dice_return_code dice_main()
HWState\_state s = st();bool b = authenticate_l0_image(s.l0);dice_return_code r;
if (b)KRML_CHECK_SIZE(sizeof (uint8_t), uds_len);
  uint8_t uds|uds_len];memset(uds, 0U, uds_len * sizeof (uint8_t));
   read\_uds(uds);uint8_t uds_digest[320];memset(uds_digest, 0U, (uint32_t)32U * sizeof (uint8_t));
   uint8_t 10_digest[320];memset(10_digest, 0\cup, (uint32_t)32\cup * sizeof (uint8_t));
   Hac1_Hash_SHA2_hash_256(uds, uds_len, uds_digest);Hacl_Hash_SHA2_hash_256(s.10.10_binary, s.10.10_binary_size, 10_digest);
   Hacl_HMAC_compute_sha2_256(s.cdi, uds_digest, (uint32_t)32U, 10_digest,
   zeroize(uds_{\text{-}}len,uds);r = DICE-SUCCES;else
   r = DICE\_ERROR;disable\_uds();
platform\_zeroize\_stack();
 return r;
```
https://github.com/verified-HRoT/dice-star/tree/main

• We show that the C implementation generated from $DICE^*$ is comparable to the unverified hand-written one

• We show that the C implementation generated from $DICE^*$ is comparable to the unverified hand-written one in terms of both **boot time**

• We show that the C implementation generated from $DICE^*$ is comparable to the unverified hand-written one in terms of both **boot time** and **binary size**.

DICE*: A Formally Verified DICE implementation

https://github.com/verified-HRoT/dice-star

As N $\mathsf K$ Adit

