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ABSTRACT
A desired property of secure programs is control flow integrity (CFI): an attacker must not be able to alter how instructions are chained as specified in the program. Numerous techniques try to achieve this property with various trade-offs. But to achieve fine-grained CFI, one is required to extract a precise control flow graph (CFG), describing how instructions are chained together. Unfortunately it is not achievable in general. In this paper, we propose a way to overcome this impossibility result by restricting the instruction set architecture (ISA) semantics. We show that forbidding indirect jumps unlocks a precise CFG extraction for all acceptable programs. We discuss the implications and limitations of the new semantics and argue for the adoption of restricted ISAs for security-related computation.
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1 INTRODUCTION
In the wake of the publication of numerous microarchitectural attacks such as Spectre [11], Meltdown [12] and their variants, the need for the secure execution of programs is blatant. Secure execution in this context refers to the additional information security-related properties that must be guaranteed by the execution model. One such property is the control flow integrity (CFI). Informally, this property should guarantee that an attacker is not able to redirect the control flow, i.e. the order of execution of the instructions in the program. But as we will see in section 4, this property is actually quite difficult to properly enforce. Moreover, guaranteeing CFI requires the defense mechanism to obtain the valid control flow in the form of the control flow graph (CFG). The mechanism is then responsible for comparing the actual control flow with the valid paths in the CFG. Unfortunately, in the real computers that we use every day, extracting the CFG from a binary is a problem impossible to do precisely in general as shown in subsection 2.2. It leaves few possibilities for the defender:

(1) Provides an escaping mechanism to the CFI in order to deal with the holes in our knowledge (but therefore creating a weakness).
(2) Enrich the binary with the necessary metadata to complete the CFG. In some cases, it requires annotation from the developer in the source language.
(3) Restrict the valid programs to the ones where the CFG is easily extractable.

If we are interested in providing CFI at the hardware level, we must be able to run securely all the programs fed to the chip: solution 1 is not acceptable. To comply with the solution 2, the metadata must either be filled manually by the developer or derived automatically by the compiler when possible. A consequence is that to be executed on a secure processor enforcing CFI, the sequence of instructions is not self-sufficient anymore. In addition to the instructions, the processor needs the metadata defining a complete CFG. Some solutions such as HAFIX [5] or CHERI [18] propose to enrich the instruction set architecture (ISA) semantic with new instructions, embedding the metadata in the instructions themselves.

Instead, in this paper, we argue for the third choice: the impossibility to extract efficiently the CFG is due to the presence of indirect jumps in the ISA. If we remove the indirect jumps, the binary now contains all the information to extract the CFG without requiring metadata.

The problem caused by indirect jumps is well known, and numerous works try to circumvent it (see [10, 16] for CFG extraction in the presence of indirect jumps). Yet removing indirect jumps has multiple benefits: first it rejects a class of program (the ones that cannot be converted to direct jumps only) that is insecure by nature. Then the CFG extraction becomes trivial, the binary program holds straightforwardly the necessary information for the CFG reconstruction.

A non-goal is to convert automatically programs written in an ISA with indirect jumps to our new ISA proposal without them. Indeed, as we show in subsection 2.2 and section 5, such a conversion is not possible in general: there are some programs that cannot be converted efficiently to an ISA without indirect jumps. But this impossibility result is actually a feature. Our new ISA rejects programs which contain jumps with an unpredictable destination: unsecure programs if we want to enforce CFI.

Motivation. In this work, we want to provide an ISA allowing easy and precise CFG extraction for all valid programs. As proven in subsection 2.2, this is not possible if the ISA has indirect jumps. This property would allow to easily enforce CFI but also to forbid some forms of obfuscation: a malware packer would have a hard time to hide its payload. Additionally, it would improve the reach and the power of static analysis tools.

Contribution. To allow easy and precise CFG extraction, we propose to remove indirect jumps in the ISA with two new ISAs proposals. In this paper, we start by defining our abstract machine in section 2, followed by the definitions of CFG and CFI. In particular we show, in subsection 2.2, that a particular program with an indirect jump can hide the jump destination.

The 3 ISAs with varying semantics to express the control flow are described in section 3. We compare the resulting ISAs with a simple benchmark to evaluate the performances and the ability to extract a precise CFG with basic CFG extraction algorithms. Our ISAs are very simple ones, we do not compare them to existing
2 THE MACHINE, CONTROL FLOW GRAPH AND CONTROL FLOW INTEGRITY

2.1 Machine

Our analyzes are performed on an abstract machine representative of the real chips powering most computation today. The elementary instructions that our machine is able to execute are inspired (and simplified) from the RISC-V ISA. Apart from the common architecture described in this section, we will define 3 different ISAs in section 3 for this same machine.

Our machine is a 64-bit RISC processor: addresses, data memory words and registers are 64-bit integers.

The machine has a mutable state composed of registers and data memory. The registers are:

- generic (read/write) registers \(x_1, \cdots, x_{16}\).
- Stack pointer (SP) (read/write) register for the data stack.
- Constant zero and full (read-only) registers. Full is defined such that \(x \oplus \text{full} = \neg x\) (full is the value with all its bits to 1).
- A special register (neither readable nor writable directly), the program counter (PC), that contains the address of the next instruction.

The data memory is finite, as in a real machine, and is word-addressed. Since the memory is finite, the machine is not Turing-complete. But as in real machines, it has no practical implications.

All registers and memory are initialized with a default zero value. A program is a dictionary of instructions: the address (64-bit instructions and data are separated.

Since the memory is finite, the machine is not Turing-complete. Yet at runtime, the control flow is not linear. We want to be able to go forward or back. As a result, in our machine, the control flow is represented as a graph (potentially with cycles): the control flow graph (CFG). In it, nodes are instructions and edges are the legal transitions between instructions. For example, a conditional branch has two possible successors: the node has two outgoing edges in the CFG.

All invalid program addresses, in our machine, are considered aliases for the program entry address (simplification hypothesis for our analysis).

A CFG is always defined for any ISA since the complete digraph (i.e. where all nodes are connected with all the others) is a valid CFG: meaning that all legal control flows follow connected paths in the graph. Therefore, any valid CFG is an overapproximation. The best CFG is the smallest that is still valid for all possible program executions.

 CFG extraction is useful on several counts. If CFG extraction is easy and precise, it allows to obtain more efficient static analysis tools (e.g. dead code elimination can be performed safely and precisely). Additionally, it allows powerful CFI schemes such as instruction set randomization (ISR) [15].

On another hand, it renders obfuscation harder (but possible as seen in section 4): it would be more difficult for malware packers to hide their payload.

The question that naturally arises is: **can the best CFG be extracted from the instructions in general?**

Beyond the fact that the difficulty of precise CFG extraction is related to the reachability problem in programs (undecidable generally), we can simply prove that it is possible to hide the destination of an indirect jumps by using cryptographic hash functions.

**Trapdoor predicates.**

**Definition 2.1.** **Trapdoor predicate** Let \(p : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2\) be a function working on bit vectors of size \(n\) (for a large enough \(n\)). We call \(p\) a trapdoor predicate if \(\exists k \in \mathbb{F}_2^n\) such that:

- \(\forall x \neq k \in \mathbb{F}_2^n, p(x) = 0\).
- \(p(k) = 1\), where \(k\) is a secret value. Meaning that knowing \(p\), there is no better way to find \(k\) than brute-forcing every possible input without additional information (the adversary has negligible advantage otherwise).

Trapdoor predicates can be built from a cryptographic hash function (other constructions are possible, for example by exploiting the SAT problem). Let \(h : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^m\) be a cryptographic hash function.

Then we can define \(p\) for a given secret value \(k \in \mathbb{F}_2^n\) as:

\[
p(x) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } h(x) = h(k) \\
0 & \text{in the other cases}
\end{cases}
\]
A CFI mechanism is responsible for ensuring that only a valid 
operation on two operands (in registers) and place the result in a 
previous and current PC values as shown on Equation 1.

\[ i' = E_k(PC_{prev} || PC || ...) \oplus i \] (1)

Finally, trapdoor predicates that include opaque predicates are not theoretically sound as shown by Zobernig 
et al. [19].

2.3 Control flow integrity

A CFI mechanism is responsible for ensuring that only a valid 
control flow control is taken. For every instruction, it must verify that the 
transition to the next instruction is an edge in the CFG. CFI has an 
estensive literature. A recent review has been published by Burrow 
et al. [4]. Most CFI solutions try to verify that jumps can only reach 
legitimate addresses (forward edges). A special case is the return 
instruction to return from a routine call (backward edges).

Abadi et al. [1] show software CFI implementations: they propose code snippets to replace dangerous instructions (indirect jumps) in order to guarantee CFI.

Tice et al. [17] demonstrate a software solution that leverages the compiler to automatically insert the appropriate protections at jump sites (forward edges only). In particular, they tackle the problem caused by virtual method tables, necessary in some programming languages (e.g., C++) to enforce runtime polymorphism: a dispatcher is necessary there.

Backward edges (e.g., return instruction) are traditionally protected with a shadow stack [8]: the call stack is duplicated. On a return instruction, the return address on both stacks are read then compared. If they differ, an alarm is triggered. Another possibility explored by Davi et al. [5, 6] is to add instructions to the ISA for the sole purpose of validating function calls and returns. On any indirect function call, the processor switch to a particular state. The next instruction must be a special CFIBR label instruction in order to continue execution. The label is used to keep track of which functions are currently executing.

Another common solution proposed in the context of CFI is the use of a shadow stack, a second stack that duplicates the return addresses of the main stack. Upon a function return, both return addresses from the two stacks are compared before the backward indirect jump. This countermeasure is actually a duplication countermeasure, there is no added semantic in the program and there is no way to validate the return address against a truth value. As such it is only useful in some specific attack scenarios and is not a general solution for CFI.

To resist stronger attacker models, hardware CFI becomes necessary. SOFLA [15] proposes such a solution with an instruction set randomization (ISR) scheme: instructions are encrypted with a value representing the corresponding edge in the CFG. More precisely, instructions are encrypted at program startup using the previous and current PC values as shown on Equation 1.

\[ i' = E_k(PC_{prev} || PC || ...) \oplus i \] (1)

Effectively, the CFG edge is encoded in the encrypted instruction and must be valid for decryption. The difficulty arises when two predecessors (thus two edges) are possible for one instruction. Then a hack is proposed to overcome this difficulty.

Hiscock et al. [9] explore how to properly implement an ISR scheme to ensure CFI by discussing and proposing encryption strategies.

For all these propositions, the system must be able to check the control flow with respect to a predetermined CFG. Since trapdoor predicates do not allow this in general, in the next section we propose to modify the ISA semantic to allow easy and precise CFG extraction for all programs.

3 SEMANTICS

The key point that forbid easy and precise CFG extraction is the presence of indirect jumps whose destinations are not statically predictable. Indirect jumps are mostly present in two forms: forward edges (jump x0) where we jump to the address present in a register, and backward edges (return) where we jump to the address following the last procedure call.

A radical solution to our problem is therefore to forbid indirect jumps (both forward and backward). Yet it is possible to handle indirect backward jumps in a statically predictable way, allowing as a consequence a more versatile ISA.

In this section, we will describe and test 3 ISAs:

- ISA1 allows indirect jumps.
- ISA2: similar to ISA1 without indirect jumps.
- ISA3: building on ISA2, a restricted indirect jump is authorized in the form of a call/return semantic with a dedicated return stack, also called "call stack".

The source code for our implementation and our results can be found on the git repository at https://gitlab.com/Artefaritaj/simple_risc.

Here is a short description of the instructions:

- Integer arithmetic instructions: perform an arithmetic operation on two operands (in registers) and place the result in a register. Operations are: +, −, @, ∧, ∨, ∥, mod, <<, >>.
Conditional branches: evaluate the condition among $\neq$, $\leq$, $<$, $\geq$, $>$ between two registers. If the condition is valid, jump to the specified address if not follow the usual control flow.

- Direct jump: goto the specified address for the next instruction.
- Call: direct jump to specified address and store the value of PC in a register (x14 for ISAv1) or a dedicated stack (ISAv3).
- Return: jump to the address popped from the dedicated return stack (ISAv3 only).
- Indirect jump: go to the address present in the given register (ISAv1 only).
- Direct load/direct store: load or store a data in memory to/from a register.
- Indirect load/indirect store: load or store a data in memory at address in a register to/from another register.
- Load immediate: set the value of the given register (source of constants).
- Register move: copy a register into another.
- Non-deterministic: load a non-deterministic value into a register. The semantic does not specify the source: it can be either user input, result of a true random number generator, etc.
- Halt: terminate the computation.

The push and pop instructions are also used and are pseudo-instructions developed as several machine instructions to do stack operations.

In this paper, we will change the ISA semantic by adding or removing instructions in order to enforce security properties at the ISA level.

### 3.1 Benchmarks

After defining our three ISAs, we want to verify that our new proposals achieve our goal of easy and precise static CFG extraction. At the same time, we measure the performance differences for two benchmarks:

- An Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) encryption is a simple program with an interesting instruction mix. The execution requires a lot of memory accesses and many arithmetic operations (cf. Table 1).
- A theoretical analysis of a dispatcher pattern. Dispatchers are the main argument to keep indirect jumps: we will analyze the penalty incurred by ISAv2 and ISAv3.

#### 3.1.1 AES

**Implementation.** This benchmark is an AES encryption (symmetric cryptography algorithm), encoded by hand in an assembly language. The instruction mix for ISAv1, ISAv2 and ISAv3 can be seen on Table 1.

The (naive) implementation is done in our own assembly language corresponding to the 3 ISAs. This assembly language is also used for listings 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7. Instructions map quite directly to their defining semantic. The @ symbol is used as an optional hint that we are using the value at the address present in the register. # is used to denote literal values. Finally, ! is used to denote global symbols (by default, symbols are defined only in their file).

#### Listing 2: Xtimes assembly implementation (AES subfunction) with ISAv1.

```assembly
1    //x1 byte value to modify
2    !xtimes:
3    // save context
4    push x2, x4
5    // x1=x1+x2
6    load x4, #0x1
7    sla x1, x1, x4
8    // test modulo
9    load x4, #0x100
10   and x2, x1, x4
11   beq end, x2, zero
12   sub_modulo:
13    load x4, #0x1
14    sla x1, x1, x4
15    push x2, x4
16    // restore context
17    pop x4, x2
18    //return
19    jump x14
```

**Results.** For the three ISAs, we evaluate their performance and the size of the CFG that can be extracted without annotation, shown on Table 2. For the ISAv2, all the return instructions have been replaced by dispatchers (cf. subsubsection 3.1.2), another possibility would be to inline everything but this latter solution cannot be scaled to any program.

The performance is evaluated as the mean and the standard deviation for 10,000 AES executions. The CFG extraction is done with 2 different algorithms:

- Structural: the successors to an instruction are all the ones that can be reached according to the instruction semantic. The CFG is deduced from the structure of the program, not the data content. In particular, the successors to an indirect jump are all the instructions in the program. The extraction algorithm is described in algorithm 1.
- Tracking: it is possible to extract precisely the CFG with the ISAv3 call/stack semantic. In addition to the structural information, we track the return stack and compute all edges for all stack states. In other words, if the same procedure is called from 2 different locations, the return instruction will jump to 2 different addresses that can be determined if we track the whole return stack in our CFG analysis. The extraction algorithm is described in algorithm 2 and algorithm 3.

It is often possible to have a better CFG extraction algorithm in the presence of indirect jumps, for example Kinder et al. in [10] propose a (complex) solution to the problem. Balakrishnan et al. [2] propose quite a complete toolsuite for static analysis in general and CFG extraction in particular. Yet these solutions are, of course, non-general: they cannot deal with the snippet presented in subsection 2.2. The lesson being that the presented snippet should be rejected in the context of secure execution.

Our CFG extraction algorithms are simpler than the one proposed by Kinder et al.: only a simple control flow analysis is performed. A data-flow analysis may improve a bit the accuracy of the extracted CFG if some branch conditions are always true or always
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Table 1: Instruction mix for one AES run for each ISA. *A return instruction is an indirect jump.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ISAv1</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>ISAv2</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>ISAv3</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>10011</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>9978</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>9825</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoadImmediate</td>
<td>5232</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>6767</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>5218</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndirectLoad</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndirectStore</td>
<td>2464</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2441</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2368</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DirectJump</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndirectJump*</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConditionalBranch</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RegisterMove</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonDeterministic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22615</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24609</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>22223</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

false. But such a case would represent a failure of the compiler: it should have detected this invariant and simplified the program accordingly.

Data: E: Address (entry address), P: Dictionary<Address, Instruction> (program)

Result: CFG: Graph<Address> (control flow graph)

/* list of addresses to analyze */
addresses_buffer ← [E];

/* addresses already analyzed */
analyzed ← {};

while addresses_buffer is not empty do

    /* we now analyze instruction at new address */
    current_address ← pop from addresses_buffer;
    push current_address to analyzed;

    /* find successors, the set of addresses that can follow this address. Here the successors are chosen according to the nature of the instruction only (branches have 2 successors, etc.). */

    successors ← successor_analysis(program P, current_address);

    for successor ∈ successors do

        /* The add edge method adds nodes too if necessary */
        add edge to CFG: current_address → successor;
    end

    successors_to_analyze ← filter successors to keep only addresses not in analyzed;
    append successors_to_analyze to addresses_buffer;
end

return CFG;

Algorithm 1: Structural CFG extraction algorithm.

On Table 2, we show the implementations performances and the CFG nodes and edges coverage. The CFG nodes (respectively edges) coverage is the ratio of nodes (resp. edges) in the CFG that are touched during one execution. E.g. an edges coverage of 6.4% means that only 6.4% of the edges have effectively been followed during one execution: the CFG is imprecise in this case. In our case, it means that numerous instruction transitions are considered valid where they should not. On the performance side, we observe that ISAv2 is slower. Indeed, for all returns from procedures we have a small dispatcher to jump back to the correct location. ISAv1 is a bit slower than ISAv3 since the stack handling (push and pop) is explicit instead of implicit in ISAv3.

For CFG extraction, we note that the structural extraction is imprecise for ISAv1 and ISAv3. In the latter case, the problem comes from the return instructions: the algorithm cannot infer where they jump and assume that all instructions are potential successors. In these two cases, we can say that static CFG extraction is impractical. But for ISAv2 with structural extraction and ISAv3 with tracking extraction, the CFG is extremely precise. For ISAv2 the coverage is not perfect since, because of the semantic of the ISA, unreachable halt instructions must be added to deal with error cases.

This benchmark showcases the advantages for our ISAv2 and ISAv3 proposals: the CFG is extractable with a 9% loss of performance for ISAv2 or a 2% gain of performances for ISAv3.

3.1.2 Dispatcher. A dispatcher is an instruction pattern where a particular control flow is chosen depending on a data value. This pattern is used to call functions in a library, as a result of a system call or as a way to implement runtime polymorphism in object-oriented languages. This pattern is particularly dangerous with respect to information security as we will see in section 4. It often relies on indirect jumps for an efficient implementation, therefore we expect that our ISA proposals will have varying dispatcher implementations.

Listing 3: ISAv1 dispatcher pattern

```plaintext
1 //x1 contains the address to branch to
2 //may be the result of pointer arithmetic)
3 call x1
4 dispatcher_end:
5 //continue
6
7 //...
8 proc:
9 push x14
```
**Data:** E: Address (entry address), P: Dictionary<Address, Instruction> (program)

**Result:** CFG: Graph<Address> (control flow graph)

/* list of pairs (address to analyze, corresponding ReturnStack) */
addresses_buffer ← [(E, empty ReturnStack)];

/* find successors, the set of pairs (addresses, corresponding return stack) that can follow this (address, return stack) pair. Here the successors are chosen according to the nature of the instruction and the values in the return stack. */
successors ← successor_analysis(program P, current_address, current_stack);

for (succ_address, succ_stack) ∈ successors do
    /* The add edge method adds nodes too if necessary */
    add edge to CFG: current_address → successor;
end

successors_to_analyze ← filter successors to keep only pairs (address, stack) such that (hash(add) ⊕ hash(stack)) is not in analyzed;
append successors_to_analyze to addresses_buffer;
end

return CFG;

**Algorithm 2:** Tracking CFG extraction algorithm, uses Algorithm 3 for ReturnStack hashing.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISAv1</th>
<th>structural</th>
<th>22635.0</th>
<th>24.1</th>
<th>778</th>
<th>99.6%</th>
<th>12437</th>
<th>6.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISAv2</td>
<td>structural</td>
<td>24605.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAv3</td>
<td>structural</td>
<td>22230.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>11942</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAv3</td>
<td>tracking</td>
<td>22230.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Evaluating ISAs performances and CFG coverage for an AES implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch logic (red)</th>
<th>Call logic (green)</th>
<th>Return logic (blue)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISAv1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 · p + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAv2</td>
<td>2 · p</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 · p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAv3</td>
<td>2 · p</td>
<td>2 · p</td>
<td>5 · p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Dispatcher instruction count (for p > 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch latency (red)</th>
<th>Call latency (green)</th>
<th>Return latency (blue)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISAv1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAv2</td>
<td>2 · ⌈log₂(p)⌉ + 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAv3</td>
<td>2 · ⌈log₂(p)⌉ + 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Dispatcher latency**

The branch latency, a measure of the time taken to call a particular procedure, is shown in Table 4. The value for ISAv2 and ISAv3 can be proven by recurrence. Indeed, for a given p the branching can be done by using a branch (2 instructions) and the 2 patterns for $\left\lfloor \frac{p}{2} \right\rfloor$ and $\left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil$. As a consequence $Latency(p) = 2 + Latency \left( \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil \right)$. If we admit that $\forall l < p$, the relation $Latency(l) = 2 \cdot \left\lfloor \log_2(l) \right\rfloor + 1$ holds (manually verified for the firsts l), then

$Latency(p) = 2 + 1 + 2 \cdot \left\lfloor \log_2 \left( \frac{p}{2} \right) \right\rfloor$.

$Latency(p) = 1 + 2 \cdot \left( 1 + \left\lfloor \log_2(p) - 1 \right\rfloor \right)$.

$Latency(p) = 1 + 2 \cdot \left\lfloor \log_2(p) \right\rfloor$.

3.2 Branching

In order to meet a better trade-off between performances and CFG discoverability, a new instruction may be added: the n-fanout conditional branch.

**Listing 6: n-fanout conditional branch illustration**

```
1   nbranch x1, #3
2   jump proc1
3   jump proc2
4   jump proc3
5   jump error_handling
```

The deciding register is expected to hold an integer value $i$ in $[0, n−1]$ ($n$ being the constant literal present in the instruction). An implicit jump is performed to the address: $AddressOffset(branch) + i + 1$. If the register holds an illegal value, we jump to the error handling address at $AddressOffset(branch) + 1 + n$. A usage example can be found on Listing 6.

With this new instruction, the latency is now $O(\log_2(p))$, where $n$ can be chosen equal to $p$ to minimize latency.

4 LIMITS OF CONTROL FLOW INTEGRITY

The ability to precisely extract any CFG limits the reach of virtualization as a defense mechanism: the virtual machine inner mechanisms cannot be hidden. But as demonstrated in this section, it is still possible to hide the control flow in the data domain.

4.1 Virtual machines

Guaranteeing CFI is particularly important to mitigate Return-Oriented Programming (ROP) attacks [14] where an attacker modifies the control flow from a valid program to obtain a malicious behavior. The trouble is CFI is not enough. Indeed, the existence of emerging virtual machines, in particular weird machines [7], limits the guarantees that CFI can offer. An illustration, valid with all our ISAs, can be seen on Listing 7.
Virtual machines, then properly removing indirect jumps restrict memory accesses to restrict their reach: data inside the ISA. The instructions below should replace indirect memory accesses is a lot more constraining. But removing entirely generates lots of indirect memory accesses making the behavior of the program harder to statically predict. Even if CFI is guaranteed, we cannot enforce any security properties to the VM are in fact in data memory and indirect jumps are jumps (it can be written with any of the three ISA). Yet the instructions in data memory, she can hijack the VM control flow. A possible conclusion would be that since Harvard architectures can be converted to von Neumann architectures (and reciprocally) via virtual machines, then properly removing indirect jumps requires removing indirect (data) memory accesses. Non-coincidentally, for safety-critical application the use of the dynamic heap allocation is forbidden (e.g. when a new byte has arrived on the serial bus, an interrupt is raised that divert the control flow to a dedicated subroutine, whatever the previous instruction was). A trap is a special interrupt caused by an instruction: the trap instruction divert the control flow to an implementation-defined location. Traps are notably used to transfer control from the user land to the kernel.

These mechanisms are not captured by our models but neither are they by most CFI mechanisms presented in subsection 2.3. Modeling the security of these control transfers is a major hurdle that has yet to be achieved. For example, how can we ensure CFI in the presence of the page-fault weird machine [3]? Another limitation is our use of a Harvard architecture. Even if it is well known that the distinction between von Neumann and Harvard architectures has little relevance theoretically, we have no ways to modify the instructions in our machine after the initial program write. As such it is not possible to install new programs after the initial programming. Quite limiting for a general-purpose computer. The reason being that any instruction modification has the potential to break CFI and is harder to model.

4.2 Pointing our model simplifications

The machines presented in sections 2 and 3 are simplified versions of actual machines. In particular, real machines implement mechanisms where the control flow is not defined by instructions: interrupts and traps. An interrupt is a change of control flow due to an external event: e.g. when a new byte has arrived on the serial bus, a trap is raised that divert the control flow to a dedicated subroutine, whatever the previous instruction was. A trap is a special interrupt caused by an instruction: the trap instruction divert the control flow to an implementation-defined location. Traps are notably used to transfer control from the user land to the kernel.

These mechanisms are not captured by our models but neither are they by most CFI mechanisms presented in subsection 2.3. Modeling the security of these control transfers is a major hurdle that has yet to be achieved. For example, how can we ensure CFI in the presence of the page-fault weird machine [3]?

Another limitation is our use of a Harvard architecture. Even if it is well known that the distinction between von Neumann and Harvard architectures has little relevance theoretically, we have no ways to modify the instructions in our machine after the initial program write. As such it is not possible to install new programs after the initial programming. Quite limiting for a general-purpose computer. The reason being that any instruction modification has the potential to break CFI and is harder to model.

4.2 Pointing our model simplifications

The machines presented in sections 2 and 3 are simplified versions of actual machines. In particular, real machines implement mechanisms where the control flow is not defined by instructions: interrupts and traps. An interrupt is a change of control flow due to an external event: e.g. when a new byte has arrived on the serial bus, a trap is raised that divert the control flow to a dedicated subroutine, whatever the previous instruction was. A trap is a special interrupt caused by an instruction: the trap instruction divert the control flow to an implementation-defined location. Traps are notably used to transfer control from the user land to the kernel.

These mechanisms are not captured by our models but neither are they by most CFI mechanisms presented in subsection 2.3. Modeling the security of these control transfers is a major hurdle that has yet to be achieved. For example, how can we ensure CFI in the presence of the page-fault weird machine [3]?

Another limitation is our use of a Harvard architecture. Even if it is well known that the distinction between von Neumann and Harvard architectures has little relevance theoretically, we have no ways to modify the instructions in our machine after the initial program write. As such it is not possible to install new programs after the initial programming. Quite limiting for a general-purpose computer. The reason being that any instruction modification has the potential to break CFI and is harder to model.

5 ACCEPTED AND REJECTED PROGRAMS

In order to express a program with ISAv2 or ISAv3, CFG extraction has to be performed at compilation (or conversion) time. In our new ISAs, the new program will reflect the quality of the prior CFG extraction. In order to read the snippet shown in Listing 1 in an ISA without indirect jumps. If the program has size n instructions, we can write the new version by first computing the destination address as in the initial version, then dispatching on this address. As shown in Table 3, the new program will have at least size 3 ⋅ n instructions with ISAv2 and ISAv3 (n for the initial version, 2 ⋅ n to be able to

```plaintext
Listing 7: subleq virtual machine
1 // data memory is filled with user-defined values
2 // initialization
3 // virtual program counter
4 // VPC(x12) = 0
5 load x13, #0
6 //exec one subleq instruction
7 subleq:
8 //read operands from data memory
9 move x1, x13
10 load x15, #1
11 add x13, x13, x15
12 move x2, x13
13 add x13, x13, x15
14 move x3, x13
15 //increment for next instruction
16 //if no jump
17 add x13, x13, x15
18 //subleq execution
19 load x4, #0
20 load x5, #0
21 sub x6, x5, x4
22 store x2, x6
23 ble ijump, x6, x0
24 //start next instruction
25 jump subleq
26 //virtual indirect jump
27 ijump:
28 move x13, x3
29 //start next instruction
30 jump subleq
```

Subleq machines have been proven to be universal computers [13]. Our subleq VM has a simple control flow with only direct jumps (it can be written with any of the three ISA). Yet the instructions to the VM are in fact in data memory and indirect jumps are performed in the data domain. This program is an example where even if CFI is guaranteed, we cannot enforce any security property as a result. In other words, security properties such as CFI are not automatically transposed in the virtual machine: if an attacker replace a word in data memory, she can hijack the VM control flow. A possible conclusion would be that since Harvard architectures can be converted to von Neumann architectures (and reciprocally) via virtual machines, then properly removing indirect jumps requires removing indirect (data) memory accesses. Non-coincidentally, for safety-critical application the use of the dynamic heap allocation is forbidden (e.g. the rule 20.4 of MISRA-C:2004) since that generates lots of indirect memory accesses making the behavior of the program harder to statically predict. But removing entirely indirect memory accesses is a lot more constraining.

To respect our design principle that the ISA must intrinsically contain the semantic information about the control flow, pointers used for direct memory accesses must be augmented with metadata inside the ISA. The instructions below should replace indirect memory accesses to restrict their reach:

- BoundedIndirectLoad Rd, Rs, B1, B2: load the value present in memory at address contained Rs in register Rd if the address is between the bounds B1 and B2 (being literal values).
- BoundedIndirectWrite Rd, Rs, B1, B2: same principle but store at address Rd the value register Rs.

This is a proposition present in CHERI [18]. Unfortunately, these new instructions may mitigate the power of emerging virtual machines but do not allow to strictly enforce CFI.
branch to all initial instructions). We still do not know the secret value that provokes a different branching destination or what that new destination is. But in this new version, the structure of the program makes explicit all possible branches.

All programs can therefore be converted to the new ISAs, if and only if their size is finite and the memory layout is known (we consider only jumps to valid instruction addresses). But not all conversions are efficient. Equivalently for a new program, it can be expressed in the new ISAs if all its instructions are known at compile time.

In particular, virtual method tables can be written with ISAv2 and ISAv3. These tables are used in Object-Oriented languages to deal with dynamic dispatch: depending on the caller’s type, a different function (at a dedicated address) is called. Virtual method tables can be replaced with dispatchers since all destinations are known at compile time.

Rejected programs. They are programming patterns where extracting a complete CFG is impossible at compile time. An example would be an application able to dynamically load plugins for additional functionality. When the application is compiled, the plugin instructions are not known. If we forbid indirect jumps, the application cannot divert the control flow to the plugin. Similarly, the kernel cannot launch a new application not known when we compile it. We must recompile our kernel for each new application added. In fact, the question is how to execute a program after compilation, since the new program was not known before.

From a security standpoint, these are dangerous patterns. For example, executing a plugin program is equivalent to execute unknown instructions from the application context.

Indirect jumps are needed. Launching a new unknown application from the kernel seems to be more acceptable than launching a plugin from an application. This is because in the former case, we change the execution context: the application has fewer privileges than the kernel.

Finally, these examples give the solution to our problem. Indirect jumps are absolutely required to get non-trivial functionalities. But an indirect jump is also equivalent to switching to a new security domain. As a consequence in a secure ISA, if we want to remove indirect jumps as in our new ISAs, we must also introduce hardware security domains. What is instruction and what is data is tied to the security domain, so that switching domain allows transferring data into instruction memory. With this new feature, an indirect jump can be authorized when switching to a new context. The new jump would not be directly to a particular instruction, but to the new security domain entry point, able to verify the validity of the new control flow.

With this mechanism, an application can launch a plugin, but in a new security domain. Compilation is possible, but launching a new application is done in a new security domain.

6 CONCLUSION

In order to execute secure programs, our computation model must guarantee specific security properties. Control flow integrity (CFI) is a critical property preventing the attacker from altering the program control flow. Yet to ensure this property, we have shown that the system must be able to extract the CFG which is not possible in general because of the existence of trapdoor predicates.

As a consequence, in order to execute generic programs and still ensure CFI, we need to modify the computational model to allow easy and precise CFG extraction. We compare 3 ISAs: one with indirect jumps, one without and a last ISA allowing a restricted form of indirect jumps. We show that an AES encryption can be performed in the new ISAv3 without loss of performance but allowing CFG extraction. Yet we show that an efficient dispatcher pattern requires a forward indirect jump. Our new ISA proposals incur a performance penalty for high-fanout control flows. Finally, we have shown that because of the existence of emerging VMs, the CFI property cannot be properly guaranteed without greater constraints on indirect memory transfers. This negative result suggests that the CFI property, even if improving the system security, is no silver bullet.

Finding how to prevent the emergence of VMs would go a long way to ensure the security of our computers.
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