Obliviate: portable, efficient, and crash-consistent secure deletion enforced using the Rust compiler

Eugene Chou, Leo Conrad-Shah Ethan Miller, Darrell Long, Andrew Quinn

Systems need to provide secure deletion

❖ **Secure deletion renders data irrecoverable either physically or computationally**

- ➢ Adversaries cannot recovery securely deleted (erased data)
- \geq Even with direct access to the storage media
- ❖ **Motivated by data autonomy…**
	- $>$ Users should have control over their own data (how it's shared, stored, removed etc.)
- ❖ **And by modern-day data privacy regulations**
	- \triangleright GDPR, CCPA, GDPA, etc.

- ❖ **A system for fine-grained secure deletion on arbitrary storage media**
	- \triangleright All data deletion (including truncates and overwrites) is securely deleted without undue delay
- ❖ **Sole requirement: erasable storage for a small, bounded amount of encryption keys**
- ❖ **Designed to be a portable* interposition layer**
	- \geq Equip any application with transparent secure deletion
- ❖ **Achieves efficient crash consistency using novel principles around encryption key usage**
- ❖ **The first formally-verified secure delete system****

* across POSIX-compliant systems ** when completed

The rest of the talk

❖ **What we've done**

- ➢ Background on secure delete systems
- \geq Obliviate's original design principles

❖ **What we're working on**

➢ Addressing Obliviate's performance with new design principles

❖ **What's coming next**

 \geq Lightweight methods for formally verifying Obliviate

State-art-of-the-art: Large erasable memory_[1]

- ❖ **Hierarchical application of cryptographic erasure**
	- ➢ Deletes cause **O(log n)** change to the key hierarchy
	- ➢ Changes to the hierarchy are commonly batched into **epochs**[2,3]
- ❖ **Secure deletion only requires the ability to erase the root key**
	- \geq Only the root key needs to be stored in truly erasable storage
- ❖ **A** *key management scheme (KMS)* **implements large erasable memory**

[1] Di Crescenzo et. al., "How to Forget a Secret." (STACS '99) [2] Reardon et. al., "Secure Data Deletion From Persistent Media." (CCS '13) [3] Ratliff et. al., "Holepunch: Fast, Secure File Deletion with Crash Consistency (IEEE S&P '24)

Overwrite requires atomic data and KMS update

- ❖ **Encrypted overwrite of data d with key derived from KMS K**
	- \geq End result should be data d' with key derived from KMS K'
	- \triangleright Possible on-disk crash states:
		- 1. KMS, Enc(KMS, d)
		- 2. KMS', Enc(KMS, d) (data corruption!)
		- 3. KMS, Enc(KMS', d') (data corruption!)
		- 4. KMS', Enc(KMS', d)
- ❖ **Existing state-of-the-art secure delete systems resort to journaling for atomicity[1]**
	- \triangleright Or don't support secure delete for overwrites

[1] Reardon et. al., "Secure Data Deletion From Persistent Media." (CCS '13)

^[2] Ratliff et. al., "Holepunch: Fast, Secure File Deletion with Crash Consistency (IEEE S&P '24)

Stability prevents data corruption

❖ **Stable key management scheme principle**

- $>$ A KMS' key space doesn't change during an epoch
- ❖ **Just requires a unique, public IV to be atomically written for each write**
	- ➢ This prevents *key-reuse attacks*

Crash states without stability

- 1. KMS, Enc(KMS, d)
- 2. KMS', Enc(KMS, d) (data corruption!)
- 3. KMS, Enc(KMS', d') (data corruption!)
- 4. KMS', Enc(KMS', d)

Crash states with stability

- 1. KMS, Enc(KMS, d)
- 2. KMS, Enc(KMS, d)
- 3. KMS, Enc(KMS, d')
- 4. KMS', Enc(KMS', d')

7

Atomic sector packing

- **❖** Atomic sector writes are portable across systems_[1]
	- \geq Not guaranteed by specifications, but observed to be true
- ❖ **Idea: logically structure sectors to pack data and metadata together**

- ❖ **Obliviate packs 16B of IV for every 496B of encrypted data**
	- \geq Packing isn't very amenable for use in the Linux block IO layer

Stability comes at a cost due to overwrites

- ❖ **Overwrites during an epoch require re-encryption to uphold secure delete guarantees**
	- ➢ Example:
		- 1. Block *b* is written with key *k* and IV *s*
		- 2. Block *b* is overwritten with key *k* and IV *s'*
	- ➢ Overwritten contents of *b* are still accessible using *k* (IVs are public)
		- Must re-encrypt *b* with a new key *k'*
- ❖ **With stability, epochs incur up to 2x write amplification**

The rest of the talk

- ❖ **What we've done**
	- ➢ Background on secure delete systems
	- \geq Obliviate's original design principles
- ❖ **What we're working on**
	- \geq Addressing Obliviate's performance with new design principles
- ❖ **What's coming next**
	- \geq Lightweight methods for formally verifying Obliviate

Combining stability with single-use keys

- ❖ **Insight: re-encryption during epoch isn't needed if keys are used exactly once**
	- ➢ **Single-use key principle**
- ❖ **Obliviate realizes the single-key use principle using a** *userspace buffer cache*
	- \geq The buffer cache merges writes to sectors
	- \geq This prevents epochs from occurring on each sector overwrite
- ❖ **Why a userspace buffer cache?**
	- ≥ 0 bliviate is implemented as a userspace interposition layer
	- ➢ Storage layers below the VFS don't have enough information for secure deletion
		- **■ To some extent, only** *applications* **have enough information**

The rest of the talk

- ❖ **What we've done**
	- ➢ Background on secure delete systems
	- \geq Obliviate's original design principles
- ❖ **What we're working on**
	- \geq Addressing Obliviate's performance with new design principles
- ❖ **What's coming next**
	- \geq Lightweight methods for formally verifying Obliviate

How do we know Obliviate is correct?

- ❖ **Problem: computationally intractable to determine if data has been securely deleted**
	- \geq Black-box testing can't be done
	- \geq We don't know if the implementation matches a correct specification
- ❖ **Idea: provide correctness by construction**
	- \geq Step 1: proof-of-concept leveraging strong typing for assurances
	- \geq Step 2: more powerful formal methods

Enforcing correct key usage with types

- ❖ **Rust's type system can be used to encode the run-time state of an object in its type**
	- ➢ This is the *typestate pattern*
	- $>$ Incurs no run-time overhead due to Rust's promise of zero-cost abstractions
- ❖ **Goal: use typestate as a lightweight method to verify key components of secure deletion**
	- ➢ The Rust compiler can guarantee *compile-time* correctness of things like:
		- Only encrypting data using a key that hasn't been used
		- Only writing encrypted data
		- Disallowing copying of keys that haven't been used

```
#[derive(Clone, Copy)]
pub struct UsedOnce;
pub struct AffineKey<S, const KEY_SIZE: usize> {
    bytes: [u8; KEY_SIZE],
    _state: PhantomData<S>,
impl<const KEY_SIZE: usize> AffineKey<UsedNever, KEY_SIZE> {
    pub const fn from_rng(mut rng: impl CryptoRngExt) -> Self {
        Self {
            bytes: rng.gen_bytes(),
            _state: PhantomData,
    pub const fn consume(self) -> AffineKey<UsedOnce, KEY_SIZE> {
        AffineKey {
            bytes: self.bytes,
            _state: PhantomData,
```
pub struct UsedNever;

zero-sized state types for an AffineKey

```
#[derive(Clone, Copy)]
pub struct UsedOnce;
```

```
pub struct AffineKey<S, const KEY_SIZE: usize> {
    bytes: [u8; KEY_SIZE],
    _state: PhantomData<S>,
```

```
impl<const KEY_SIZE: usize> AffineKey<UsedNever, KEY_SIZE> {
    pub const fn from_rng(mut rng: impl CryptoRngExt) -> Self {
        Self {
```

```
bytes: rng.gen_bytes(),
_state: PhantomData,
```

```
pub const fn consume(self) -> AffineKey<UsedOnce, KEY_SIZE> {
   AffineKey {
       bytes: self.bytes,
       _state: PhantomData,
```



```
pub trait AffineCrypter<const KEY_SIZE: usize> {
   type Error;
   fn encrypt(
       key: AffineKey<UsedNever, KEY_SIZE>,
       data: 6mut [u8],
    ) -> Result<AffineKey<UsedOnce, KEY_SIZE>, Self::Error>;
```
fn decrypt(key: AffineKey<UsedOnce, KEY_SIZE>, data: &mut [u8]) -> Result<(), Self::Error>;

 $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{G}_\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{G}_\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{G}_\mathcal{S}$

Empirical results of using typestate (as of now)

- ❖ **Caught a logic error when placing data into the buffer cache**
	- \geq Forgot to decrypt sector before buffering it
	- $>$ Manifested as a compiler error reporting mismatched types
		- E.g., expected Sector<Plaintext>, found Sector<Ciphertext>
- ❖ **Type-driven design of key management scheme update**
	- \geq Obliviate KMS: copy-on-write B+-tree
	- \geq Batch update was designed to enforce that updated nodes are only paged to disk once
		- A natural consequence of having single-use keys

Covering the "proof gap"

- ❖ **Typestate cannot enforce correctness of all aspects of Obliviate**
	- \geq But it does provide a lot of coverage
- ❖ **Kani (https://github.com/model-checking/kani)**
	- \geq Model-checking to see if functions meet their intended specification
- ❖ **Verus (https://github.com/verus-lang/verus)**
	- \geq For more complex theorem proving
- ❖ **Goal: minimize the proof gap needed to be covered by Kani/Verus**

Goals for 2024 - 2025

❖ **Submissions to:**

- \triangleright ATC $'25$
- \geq ???
- ❖ **Future work:**
	- ➢ Applying model checking and proof checking to Obliviate
	- \geq Potential application of Obliviate to single-level stores

Conclusion

❖ **Obliviate is a system for portable fine-grained secure deletion**

- ➢ All data deletion (including truncates and overwrites) is securely deleted
- \geq Works on any application, and on any storage media
- ❖ **Sole requirement: erasable storage for a small, bounded amount of encryption keys**
- ❖ **Achieves efficient crash consistency using novel principles around key usage**
- ❖ **The (hopefully soon-to-be) first formally-verified secure delete system**

Thanks for listening!

Questions?

email: euchou@ucsc.edu

And thanks to all the sponsors!

