PirateShip: Distributed Consensus for (mostly) Trusted Execution Environments

Shubham Mishra, Amaury Chamayou, Natacha Crooks, Heidi Howard, Markus Kuppe







Context: Distributed Trust Ledgers



Consensus Protocols Crash Fault Tolerance (CFT)

2f + 1

Must Trust your replicas:
OCrash,
OBut strictly follow protocol.

Byzantine Fault Tolerance (BFT)





Why not just use BFT, always?



Why?



3f + 1

• More phases! (at least 1 more than CFT protocols)

- Crypto overhead:
 - Signatures
 - MACs

Is there a workaround?

Can we STOP malicious behavior from happening?!

Trusted Execution Environments (TEE)

arm TRUSTZONE

TEEs to rescue

• Integrity

- Attestation proves to the operator that the code running in each replica is the intended one.
- Confidentiality • Hardware protected keys.

n >= 2f + 1

Can get away with using cheap CFT protocols! (with some mods)

Are we done?

SGX-Step: A Practical Attack Framework for Pre Faults in Our Bus: Novel Bus Fault Attack to Break Enclave Execution Control ARM TrustZone

Jo Van Bulck imec-DistriNet, KU Leuven jo.vanbulck@cs.kuleuven.be Frank Piessens imec-DistriNet, KU Leuven frank.piessens@cs.kuleuven.be Raoul Strackx imec-DistriNet, KU Leu raoul.strackx@cs.kuleuw

Nimish Mishra, Anirban Chakraborty, Debdeep Mukhopadhyay Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur nimish.mishra@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in, anirban.chakraborty@iitkgp.ac.in, debdeep@cse.iitkgp.ac.in

Andrin Bertschi

FORESHADOW: Extracting the Keys to the Intel SGX Ki Transient Out-of-Order Execution

WESEE: Using Malicious #VC Interrupts to Break AMD SEV-SNP

Jo Van Bulck¹, Marina Minkin², Ofir Weisse³, Daniel Genkin³, Baris Kasikc Mark Silberstein², Thomas F. Wenisch³, Yuval Yarom⁴, and Raoul

¹imec-DistriNet, KU Leuven, ²Technion, ³University of Michigan ⁴University

One Glitch to Rule Them All: Fau AMD's Secure Encryptic SEVered: Subverting AMD's Virtual Machine Encryption

Benedict Schlüter

Robert Buhren robert.buhren@sect.tu-berlin.de Technische Universität Berlin - SECT

Thilo Krachenfels tkrachenfels@sect.tu-berlin.de Technische Universität Berlin - SECT Mathias Morbitzer, Manuel Huber, Julian Horsch and Sascha Wessel

Supraja Sridhara

Fraunhofer AISEC Garching near Munich, Germany {firstname.lastname}@aisec.fraunhofer.de

rraunnoter 511

Shweta Shinde

What is a realistic model for TEE faults?

What is a realistic model for TEE faults?

What is a realistic model for TEE faults?

ALL nodes affected! Even BFT can't handle this

Platform Fault Tolerance: The better model

Timeline of a TEE platform failure

Timeline of a TEE platform failure

PirateShip goals

Security: Gracefully handle malicious TEEs/platforms. Quickly check/reconcile logs.

• Seamless; no external intervention.

• Performance: Keep overheads wrt CFT as low as possible.

Performance vs Security

Crash Commit

for lower latency

Byz Commit

for better security

Key Idea:

Embedding asynchronous BFT logic inside CFT protocol without sending extra messages

How?

Key Insight:

CFT and BFT protocols are not THAT different!

How?

- Pipelining
- Hash-chaining
- Asynchronous vote counting

Initial Results

Conclusion

- We present the notion of Platform Fault Tolerance to better model TEEbased distributed ledgers.
- We presented PirateShip, a new consensus protocol for TEEs that exhibits CFT-like performance but asynchronously provides BFT guarantees.

Thank you! Questions? shubham_mishra@berkeley.edu