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Abstract

With databases being a critical component in many applications, there is significant interest in outsourcing them securely. Hardware enclaves offer a strong practical foundation towards this goal by promising secure execution, but they still suffer from access pattern leaks that can reveal a great deal of information. The naïve way to address this issue—using generic Oblivious RAM (ORAM) primitives beneath a database—adds prohibitive overhead.

Despite a flurry of recent work on the subject, the goal of a general-purpose oblivious SQL database has remained out of reach. Systems like Opaque and Cipherbase support complex oblivious SQL queries but only for analytic queries that require scanning all the data. On the other hand, POSUP and Oblix support oblivious index lookups, but do not address the security or performance challenges of running general-purpose SQL queries over their indexes. The key missing ingredients are query processing algorithms that work efficiently regardless of query selectivity.

In this paper, we introduce such algorithms and an engine design, ObliDB, that can support both kinds of workloads. ObliDB leverages a diverse array of new oblivious physical operators to accelerate oblivious SQL queries, giving up to order of magnitude speedups over naïve ORAM. ObliDB supports a broad range of queries, including aggregation, joins, insertions, deletions and point queries. On analytics workloads, ObliDB ranges from competitive to 19× faster than previous oblivious, enclave-based systems designed only for analytics, such as Opaque, and comes within 2.6× of Spark SQL, which provides no security guarantees. In addition, ObliDB supports point queries with 3–10ms latency, which is 7–22× faster than previous encryption-based oblivious systems that support point queries.

1 Introduction

Many organizations outsource their databases to the public cloud to take advantage of its cost efficiency, high availability and convenience. Due to the sensitivity of this data, however, both users and cloud providers would like strong security guarantees, ideally protecting against both external attackers and insiders that breach the cloud provider’s security [13] [18] [64].

One of the most promising practical approaches to increase security is hardware enclaves such as Intel SGX [21]. Enclaves are already available on many recent CPUs [6] [21] and will soon be offered on Microsoft’s public cloud [54], making them a powerful technology to investigate for secure database hosting.

Unfortunately, although enclaves are powerful, they leave open one key threat: access pattern attacks. Applications that use an enclave to manage large amounts of data must still access data through the OS (e.g., to read new memory pages into the enclave or access the disk), which means that an attacker that controls the OS can see the pattern of addresses being accessed. This leaks a great deal of information and allows attackers to learn details of both the data itself and users’ queries on the data [33] [47] [67].

The special case of encrypted databases also has a long history of surprising leakage at the hands of access pattern attacks [2] [19] [30] [33] [37] [41] [50] [68].

Some systems, such as Cipherbase [4] and Opaque [69], have proposed oblivious execution schemes that do not leak access patterns, but these schemes are limited to analytics workloads that scan entire tables. They are not efficient for more general, transactional workloads that also include point queries. On the other hand, POSUP [34] and Oblix [44] explore oblivious searchable indexes over encrypted data, but do not handle general queries running
over these indexes – a feature that, if implemented na"ıvely, can compromise both security and performance. Specifically, na"ıvely running standard database query operators over one of these oblivious indexes would still leak information about the data due to accesses to scratch space outside of the index. In addition, the performance overhead of making all accesses through the oblivious index can be significant.

This paper introduces a series of oblivious query processing algorithms that work efficiently over both entire datasets and small subsets of data, filling the gap between prior work and general-purpose SQL databases. Often the direct port of a standard operator into an oblivious, enclave-based version is not only slow but also inherently leaky. Our algorithms take advantage of knowledge about query selectivity to maintain obliviousness while outperforming na"ıve translations of standard techniques to ORAM. For example, we offer four oblivious SELECT algorithms that vary their interaction with trusted/untrusted memory to achieve obliviousness while optimizing performance for different settings. Our algorithms only leak which query plan was selected and the size of the output data, the same information as Opaque’s oblivious mode [69].

In order to demonstrate the effectiveness of our new algorithms, we also introduce a new database engine design, ObliDB, that uses our oblivious algorithms to support both transactional and analytic queries. ObliDB improves over the performance of prior systems by supporting multiple storage methods and using a lightweight optimizer to pick between various algorithms available to satisfy a given query. Unlike previous systems, ObliDB provides two storage methods for its tables: a “linear” one, where the table is encrypted as a contiguous file and always scanned (as in Opaque and Cipherbase), and an oblivious B+ tree built over Oblivious RAM (ORAM) [51, 62] but modified to prevent leakage and performance penalties involved in a direct composition of B+ trees and ORAM. In particular, we hide the path taken in an index to retrieve records as well as the changes made to index data structures on insertions and deletions. Each table can be stored using either one or both methods, similarly to how administrators can decide to create indexes in traditional databases. For instance, if a table is stored using both methods, ObliDB can use the index for point queries and linear scans for full-table aggregation queries.

To summarize, our contributions are:

- Oblivious query processing algorithms optimized to run over both indexed and unstructured data, suitable for general purpose SQL databases.
- The design of ObliDB, the first enclave-based oblivious database engine that can efficiently run general transactional and analytics SQL workloads while hiding access patterns.
- An oblivious B+ tree that outperforms previous open-source oblivious data structures for database workloads as well as na"ıve use of ORAM.
- A lightweight optimizer to choose between operator implementations offered by ObliDB.

We evaluate ObliDB on diverse applications and find that it outperforms previous oblivious systems and achieves practical performance compared to systems with no security guarantees. For analytics, we compare ObliDB to Opaque [69] on the Big Data Benchmark [3] and find that it is competitive with Opaque on most queries, but can outperform Opaque by 19× on queries that can leverage indexes. ObliDB also comes within 2.6× of Spark SQL [7], which provides no security guarantees. For transactional workloads, we compare to recent open-source encrypted indexes and find that ObliDB outperforms the recent HIRB + vORAM of Roche et al [53] by over 7× and the Sophos encrypted search scheme [15] (which does not hide access patterns) by over 22×, and, unlike both, it also supports range search. Moreover, point insertions, deletions and selects on a 1M row dataset take 3.6–9.4ms, which is acceptable for many applications. We also compare ObliDB to a baseline where existing database algorithms are generically modified to run over ORAM, and show that ObliDB outperforms naivé use of ORAM by up to 329×. Finally, we show that the choice of physical operators in ObliDB enables meaningful query optimization, yielding speedups of up to 11×. ObliDB is open source at https://github.com/SabaEskandarian/ObliDB.

We also support padding intermediate and final results of complex queries to a fixed size, similar to Opaque’s pad mode [69], if desired.
An implementation of ObliDB using Intel SGX exploring the tradeoffs of the different algorithms and showing that ObliDB ranges from competitive to $19 \times$ faster than previous oblivious analytics systems and $7 - 22 \times$ faster than previous oblivious point query systems while supporting more general workloads.

## 2 Background

In this section we give a brief overview of hardware enclaves and ORAM, the primary tools used in ObliDB.

### 2.1 Hardware Enclaves and SGX

A **hardware enclave** provides developers with the abstraction of a secure portion of the processor that can verifiably run a trusted code base (TCB) and protect its limited memory from a malicious or compromised OS [1, 21]. The hardware handles the process of entering and exiting an enclave and hiding the activity of the enclave while non-enclave code runs. Enclave code invariably requires access to OS resources such as networking and I/O, so developers specify an interface between the enclave and the OS.

An enclave proves that it runs an untampered version of the desired code through an **attestation** mechanism. Attestation involves an enclave providing a signed hash of its initial state (including the running code), which a client compares with the expected value and rejects if there is any evidence of a corrupted program.

Finally, one of the key features of enclaves is the protection of memory. An enclave gives developers a small Enclave Page Cache (EPC), a memory region hidden from the OS and cleared when execution enters or exits an enclave. In this memory, the trusted code can keep secrets from an untrusted OS that otherwise controls the machine.

SGX provides approximately 90MB of EPC. Although the SGX API allows allocation of more memory to an enclave than can fit in the EPC, the quantity of underlying reserved memory in hardware remains fixed. To access additional memory outside the EPC, or to do I/O, enclave code has to call the OS, which creates the risk of access pattern attacks.

### 2.2 ORAM

Oblivious RAM (ORAM), a cryptographic primitive first proposed by Goldreich and Ostrovsky [31], hides access patterns to data in untrusted storage. For our purposes, an ORAM consists of a small trusted client which resides inside an enclave and performs reads/writes to untrusted memory accessible by the OS. Merely encrypting data still reveals access patterns to the data being requested or written, which can leak private information about the data [35]. ORAM shuffles the locations of blocks in memory so repeated accesses to the same block and other patterns are hidden from the adversary. Specifically, ORAM guarantees that any two access patterns of the same length are computationally indistinguishable. In Appendix A we state ORAM’s formal security definition and give an overview of the Path ORAM scheme used in our implementation [62]. We use the ORAM interface as a black box, so the details of the underlying ORAM can be omitted except to state that our choice incurs an $O(\log N)$ overhead for each access to memory.

### Implications of ORAM Security

ORAM’s security guarantee has important consequences for data structures or algorithms built on it. Specifically, **ORAM only guarantees indistinguishability for access patterns of the same length**, so algorithms using ORAM must always make the same number of memory accesses. Moreover, an algorithm using ORAM as a component must ensure that its non-ORAM operations also do not leak access patterns.

## 3 Security Goals

This section describes our threat model and desired security properties. The fundamental goal is to protect both user data and query parameters from a malicious attacker with full power to manipulate components of the system lying outside the trusted hardware enclave. This includes protection against both direct observation of sensitive data, modification of the data, and indirect observation by means of access pattern leakage.

### 3.1 Threat Model

We leverage a trusted hardware enclave to protect against an attacker with full control of the operating system (OS) running ObliDB. We assume that our attacker has the power to examine and modify untrusted memory, network communication, and communication between the processor and enclave. Moreover, it can observe access patterns to untrusted memory and maliciously interrupt the execution of an enclave. We note that an OS-level attacker can always launch an indefinite denial of service attack against an enclave, but such an attack does not compromise privacy. We also allow our attacker to use arbitrary auxiliary...
information about the nature of data stored in ObliDB. For example, if a database is storing patient data, this includes the incidence of various diseases in the general population.

We assume the security of the trusted hardware platform in that the enclave hides the contents of its protected memory pages and CPU registers from an attacker with control of the OS. Power analysis and timing side channels are out of the scope of this work. Furthermore, we also assume a secure channel exists through which a user can send messages to the enclave: for example, a client can establish such a connection to the enclave through TLS.

**Limited Oblivious Memory.** While some side-channel attacks based on abusing page faults and branching history have been demonstrated against SGX’s protected memory [38, 57], a number of standard mitigations exist to handle these attacks [52, 57–59], and other hardware enclave designs avoid the pitfalls that leave SGX vulnerable [22, 39, 42]. In particular, Sanctum [22] provides a developer abstraction similar to SGX with minimal performance overhead. As such, we assume a limited amount of oblivious memory is available to the enclave and protected from access pattern leaks (as in Opaque [69], to which we compare). That is, when the enclave makes a memory access inside this region, the operating system cannot determine which part of the oblivious memory was accessed. The quantity of oblivious memory can be set as small as a few megabytes. It primarily serves to store the root position map for our ORAM implementation, and is also used to improve performance for the aggregation, grouping, and join operators (Section 6) and hide accesses to ObliDB’s code pages. The amount of oblivious memory can be reduced at the cost of decreased performance, but we evaluate using 90MB, the size of the Enclave Page Cache in SGX. Note that many of our oblivious operators, including all SELECT algorithms and the optimizer, maintain obliviousness even with an enclave completely vulnerable to these attacks.

### 3.2 Our Guarantees

Our algorithms leak only the sizes of tables involved, the sizes of intermediate and result tables, and the physical query plan chosen. This security level is the same as Opaque’s oblivious mode [69] and Cipherbase [4]. ObliDB additionally features a padding mode where all tables are padded to some chosen size and query optimization is not applied, leaking nothing about queries but the logical plan and a public upper bound on the size of tables and results. Details regarding how we achieve these leakage properties appear in Sections 3, 6, and 7. Data at rest outside the enclave is encrypted and MACed, and leaks only its size. In both modes, we do not hide the number of tables in a database or which table(s) a query accesses.

We note that leaking a query plan does reveal information about the structure of queries, e.g. whether an INSERT or JOIN query was executed, and whether an index was used. However, ObliDB hides query parameters such as which key in an index was requested. For example, by observing the physical plans used, an attacker could learn that a query performed a point lookup on an index, but not which key was requested, or whether the same key is requested again later. Likewise, for SELECT queries, ObliDB’s optimizer chooses between different implementations of the selection operator based on the number of matching records, but the attacker does not learn which specific records were chosen (Section 7). In general, there is a fundamental tradeoff between information leakage and performance: if users want some queries to run faster than others, or to send back a smaller result set, an observer will learn that such a query was executed. However, in practice, hiding which data was accessed disables many access pattern attacks.

Beyond hiding data values and access patterns, we make the integrity guarantee that ObliDB catches and reports any tampering with data by the malicious OS. We use a series of checks to protect against arbitrary tampering within rows of a table, addition/removal of rows, shuffling of the contents of a table, or rollbacks to a previous system state. We discuss these protections in Section 5.

Appendix B presents a formalization of the security guarantees described here. We provide security arguments for the obliviousness of each storage method and operator as they appear in the text.

### 4 ObliDB Architecture Overview

Figure 1 shows an overview of the ObliDB architecture. ObliDB consists of a trusted code base inside an enclave that provides an interface for users to create, modify, and query tables using our oblivious query processing algorithms, which we describe in Section 6. ObliDB stores tables, authenticated and encrypted, in unprotected memory and obliviously accesses them as needed by the various supported operators. The encryption key for data stored
Figure 1: ObliDB runs in a hardware enclave and stores encrypted tables in an untrusted memory accessed through the OS. It can store tables using either an oblivious B+ tree index, a linear array, or both.

in unprotected memory always resides inside the enclave, encrypting/decrypting blocks of data as they are written or read from unprotected memory. It supports two storage methods for each table: Linear and Indexed. The Indexed method consists of an ORAM with a B+ tree stored inside, whereas the Linear method requires scanning the whole table on each query to ensure obliviousness.

ObliDB supports oblivious versions of the SQL operators SELECT, INSERT, UPDATE, DELETE, GROUP BY and JOIN as well as the aggregates COUNT, SUM, MIN, MAX, and AVG. Each operator is implemented for both storage methods. Finally, ObliDB includes a query optimizer that can choose between operator implementations. Specifically, for selection queries, the optimizer first determines the number of matching results and then executes the best-performing oblivious SELECT algorithm for the data to be returned, as we describe in Section 7.

4.1 Limitations

ObliDB has two limitations that we wish to point out. First, our current implementation consists only of the core database engine and lacks some components of a full-featured DBMS, e.g., transaction management and persistence to disk. In our evaluation, we compare ObliDB only to in-memory tables on other oblivious systems to avoid giving it an unfair advantage. Adding a standard write-ahead log would not create significant overhead because writing a single entry to a log file can be done quickly regardless of whether SGX is used. Appends to such a log would also not leak any additional information or affect obliviousness, as the only change would be to make a write to an encrypted log file before each insert/update/delete operation. In addition, it would be straightforward to replace ObliDB’s external memory with SSDs, as accesses to both ORAM and linear tables are already block-oriented.

Second, despite ObliDB’s security guarantees, an application interacting with it can leak additional information and must therefore be secured as well. For example, if a web application using ObliDB makes a second query to a database based on the results of a first query, observing the fact that the query occurred may leak additional information about the first query. This limitation exists in any private database system, so application developers need to consider it directly in their design process.

5 ObliDB’s Storage Methods

ObliDB can store data via two methods—Linear and Indexed—or combine both. We currently let system administrators decide which storage method(s) to use for each table based on the kinds of queries that are expected to run on it. Section 5.3 discusses the costs and benefits of choosing either or both storage methods. ObliDB creates tables with an initial maximum capacity that can be increased later by copying to a new, larger table. We divide data into blocks of a configurable size.

5.1 Linear Storage Method

The Linear storage method simply stores rows in a series of adjacent blocks with no built-in mechanism to ensure obliviousness of memory accesses, so every read or write to the table must involve accesses to every block to hide access patterns. As such, operators acting on these tables,

\[\text{Note that a naïve selection algorithm that scans a table linearly and appends selected records to another table is not oblivious: an attacker can observe which records in the input table caused the output size to grow!}\]
as will be seen in Section 5.3 involve a series of linear scans over the entire table. This performs best with small tables, tables where operations will typically require returning large swaths of the table, or analytics that involve reading most or all of the table regardless of the need for obliviousness. The challenge in designing algorithms for this storage method lies in using the limited space of the enclave effectively to reduce the number of scans and data processing operations involved in each operator.

5.2 Indexed Storage Method

Our Indexed storage method provides the functionality of a database index without violating obliviousness requirements. Standard insertion and deletion operations for B+ trees, even when combined with an ORAM, leak information about the internal structure of the tree, compromising obliviousness by splitting or merging nodes when they reach fixed threshold numbers of children. Depending on the nature of the indexed data (e.g. whether it is clustered around one point or distributed evenly), nodes could split after different numbers of operations, revealing sensitive information to an observer keeping track of how many steps each B+ tree operation takes to complete. Our oblivious B+ trees modify and optimize standard B+ tree indexes to guarantee obliviousness and optimize performance.

We ensure obliviousness by padding all insertions and deletions with additional dummy ORAM accesses until the number of accesses matches the worst-case number for the respective operation. The property of B+ trees that all data resides in the leaves of the tree means that any lookup already accesses the same number of nodes, so no modification is required for this case. Once each operation involves a fixed number of accesses to memory, we can leverage ORAM’s security to guarantee obliviousness.

Two optimizations dramatically improve the performance of our oblivious B+ trees. First, our implementation operates on a “lazy write back” principle, only writing to the ORAM when absolutely necessary and otherwise keeping nodes in the enclave until they are no longer needed. While simple, this optimization provides considerable improvement over a naïve application of ORAM. Second, we remove all parent pointers from our implementation. Normal B+ tree implementations often have pointers in each node to its parent for convenience (e.g. [9]). This optimization appears useful at first glance because we want to minimize the worst case time for each operation, and a parent pointer helps expedite the process of finding parents for the purposes of merging or splitting nodes, saving a handful of ORAM reads on every operation. However, each time a tree splits or merges a node, all the children of nodes involved need to have their parent pointers updated, a very slow process in the regime where every node requires an ORAM write to update. As such, our design avoids use of parent pointers.

Comparison with Prior Oblivious Trees. Some prominent prior works also consider applying ORAM to tree data structures. Wang et al.’s “Oblivious Data Structures” [65] introduces techniques to improve data structure performance when using recursive ORAM. The HIRB tree and vORAM of Roche et al [53] also bears a resemblance to our work but does not support range queries on indexed data. We discuss both works in Section 10 and compare performance to the HIRB tree + vORAM in Section 9.4 where we find that ObliDB outperforms HIRB by 3× on insertions/deletions and 7.6× on point queries over a table of 1,000,000 rows. We also discuss the more recent Oblix [44] in Related Work (Section 10).

5.3 Complexity

Figure 2 compares the asymptotic operations of standard read, insertion, and deletion operations as well as space overhead for each table type. The Indexed method performs best on small reads that access one or a few rows of a table, whereas queries which expect to return large segments of a table should use the Linear method, which performs faster than a linear scan over the contents of an index despite equal asymptotic runtimes. Using both storage methods, while incurring the cost of both for insertions and deletions, proves effective when queries of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Linear</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
<td>O(log² N)</td>
<td>O(log² N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Read</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Read</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>O(1)</td>
<td>O(log² N)</td>
<td>O(log² N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
<td>O(log² N)</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
<td>O(log² N)</td>
<td>O(N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Asymptotic performance of storage methods. Fast inserts on linear storage and large reads on indexed storage achieve better than expected asymptotics due to optimizations in Section 5.
diverse selectivities run on the same data. In terms of storage overhead, our oblivious indexes inherit the $4 \times$ storage overhead required by the Path ORAM [62] we use and each encrypted block is slightly larger than a plaintext block (as is always the case with authenticated encryption). All other sources of storage overhead, e.g. that required for data integrity measures, only add a few bytes to each block of data, amounting to less than 1% additional overhead.

5.4 Data Integrity

Although encryption and oblivious data structures/algorithms ensure the privacy of data in ObliDB, additional protections make certain that an attacker does not tamper with data. Such tampering could take the form of editing within rows of a table, addition/removal of rows, shuffling the contents of a table, or rollbacks to an old system state. ObliDB protects against such attacks and reports any attempt to tamper with data.

ObliDB MACs and encrypts every block of data stored outside the enclave, preventing the OS from modifying rows or adding new rows to tables. This leaves the possibility of duplicating/removing rows, shuffling rows, or rolling back the system state. Included in each block of MACed data is a record of which row(s) the block contains and a current "revision number" for that block, a copy of which ObliDB also stores inside the enclave. Each time the data inside a block is modified, we increment the block’s revision number. Any attempt to duplicate, shuffle, or remove rows within a data structure will be caught when an operator discovers that the row number of data it has requested does not exist or does not correspond to that which it has received. Spoofing a fake revision number requires either breaking the security of the MACs used or breaking the security of the enclave to modify the stored copy, neither of which lies within the power of an attacker in our model. Rollbacks of system state are caught when the revision numbers of blocks do not match the last revision numbers for those blocks recorded in the enclave. Revision numbers for each block in an ORAM can be stored with the position map entry for that block (adding 4 more Bytes to each entry), even in a recursive ORAM if applicable to reduce enclave storage needs. Rollbacks on encrypted enclave data sealed to disk can be prevented either by storing revision numbers with the client or using an enclave rollback protection system like ROTE [43]. These protections suffice to discover and block any malicious tampering with data in ObliDB.

6 Oblivious Query Processing

In this section we describe our oblivious query processing algorithms for a large subset of SQL, including insertions, updates, deletions, joins, aggregates (count, sum, max, min, average), groupings, and selection with conditions composed of arbitrary logical combinations of equality or range queries. We will begin by discussing the algorithms in the context of linear storage and then discuss the modifications needed for compatibility with indexes. Each operation will be accompanied by a security argument. Throughout this section, whenever we refer to rows of a table being read or written without explicitly stating where they are stored, it is implied that the data resides in unprotected memory, is decrypted before being read inside the enclave, and is re-encrypted before being written back outside. We evaluate the performance of our operators in Section 9.

We refer to the subject of a query as table $T$ and the returned results as table $R$. Our algorithms leak only the sizes of $T$ and $R$. In the following algorithms, the enclave learns the size of $R$ from the optimizer before executing the operator, allowing output data structures of the appropriate size to be allocated before scanning the data needed to fill them.

6.1 Operators over Linear Storage Method

6.1.1 Insert, Update, Delete

Insertions, updates, and deletions involve at most one pass over the table, during which unaffected blocks receive a dummy write (overwriting a row with the data it already held, re-encrypted and therefore re-randomized). In the case of an insertion, the first unused block encountered receives a real write. For updates or deletion, any row matching the specified criteria will be updated or marked as unused and overwritten with dummy data, respectively. All of these operations leak nothing about the parameters to the query being executed or the data being operated on except the sizes of the data structures involved because they consist of one linear scan over a table where each encrypted block is read and then written with a fresh encryption.

In tables with few deletions, a system administrator can choose to use an alternative, constant-time insertion algorithm that saves the index of the last row where an insert occurred and always inserts directly into the next
A) Small

- Complexity: $O(N \cdot K)$
- Summary: Fast when data almost fits in enclave: scan table once per enclave-full of data

B) Large

- Complexity: $O(N)$
- Summary: Fast when almost entire table selected: copy table and clear unselected rows

Cont.

- Complexity: $O(N)$
- Summary: Fast when continuous segment of table selected: write to output table for each row of input table, wrapping around at the end, making dummy writes unless row is to be selected

Hash

- Complexity: $O(N \cdot C)$
- Summary: Use if other strategies don’t apply: hash selected rows to location in output table

Naïve

- Complexity: $O(N \log N)$
- Summary: Used only in baseline: ORAM operation for each row of table being queried

Figure 3: SELECT algorithms. $N$ is table size, $K$ the number of times data fills the enclave, and $C$ the max chain length of the hash table.

block in memory, skipping the scan. This insertion leaks no additional information beyond the sizes of tables because the access pattern of the insert does not depend at all on the content of the data except on the number of insertions made, which our adversary can already learn by observing the sizes of tables over time. Note that since every entry in a table is encrypted, an adversary will not be able to tell if later operations modify or even remove the inserted data, despite knowing ahead of time where each new record will be placed.

**Select.** One natural way to implement a SELECT operator would be to sequentially read each record in the targeted table and write out the row if it should be selected. Despite touching each row in the table once, this implementation does not provide obliviousness. An adversary observing the pattern of accesses to the input and output tables would know whether a row is written to the output after each read: both tables are accessed each time a row is selected, but only the input table is accessed when the a row is not selected. This allows the attacker to infer exactly which rows have been included in the final response.

To defend against this and other subtle attacks, including those based on prior partial knowledge of the protected data (e.g. distribution of data), ObliDB provides the following oblivious SELECT algorithms (summarized in Figures 3 and 4):

**Naïve:** included only as a baseline for comparison, the naïve oblivious algorithm mirrors a straightforward translation of a non-oblivious SELECT to an oblivious one via an ORAM. After examining each row, it executes an ORAM operation. If the examined row is to be included in the output, it makes a write. If not, it makes a dummy read (reading an arbitrary block). There must be an ORAM operation after reading each row or else an adversary would know that any row which did not coincide with an ORAM operation was not included in the output. After completing the scan of the input table, it copies the contents of the ORAM to a linear storage format and returns it.

Our techniques to improve upon this baseline consist of finding the right balance between using data structures inside the enclave to remove the need for an ORAM and making multiple fast passes over data—passes that remain oblivious because nothing about the data in the table can...
be leaked if every row is read every time. These ideas constitute the guiding principle in designing our remaining SELECT algorithms and choosing between them.

**Small**: In the case where all the rows of table $R$ only require a few times the space available in the enclave, a selection strategy that makes multiple fast passes over the data proves effective. We take multiple passes over table $T$, each time storing any selected rows into a buffer in the enclave and keeping track of the index of the last checked row. Each time the buffer fills, its contents are written to $R$ after that pass over $T$. Although this strategy could result in a number of passes linear in the size of $R$, it proves effective for small tables.

This algorithm leaks only the sizes of tables $T$ and $R$ because every pass over the data consists only of reads to each row of the table and the number of passes reveals only how many times the output set will fill the enclave, a number that can be calculated from the size of $R$.

**Large**: If table $R$ contains almost every row of table $T$, we create $R$ as a copy of $T$ and then make one pass over $R$ where each unselected row is marked unused and each selected row receives a dummy write. Obliviousness holds because the copy operation does not depend on the data copied and the process of clearing unselected rows involves a read followed by a write to each block of the table, revealing only the size of $T$.

**Continuous**: Should the rows selected form one continuous section of the data stored in the table, a common special case, ObliDB employs a strategy that requires only one pass over the table. First, it creates table $R$. Then, for the $i$th row in table $T$, if that row should be in the output, it writes the row to position $i \mod |R|$ of $R$. If not, it makes a dummy write. Since the rows that need to be included in $R$ make up one continuous segment of $T$, this procedure results in exactly the selected rows appearing in $R$.

In addition to the sizes of tables $T$ and $R$, the fact that ObliDB chooses this algorithm over one of the other options leaks the fact that the result set is drawn from a continuous set of rows in the table. Users concerned about this additional leakage could disable this option and use one of the other options with no reduction in supported functionality. The execution of the algorithm itself is oblivious, however, because the memory access pattern is fixed: at each step, the algorithm reads the next row of $T$ and then writes to the next row of $R$.

**Hash**: If none of the preceding special-case algorithms apply, ObliDB uses a hashing solution. For the $i$th row in $T$, if the row is to be included in the output, we write the content of the row to the $h(i)$th position in $R$, for some hash function $h$. Otherwise make a dummy write to the $h(i)$th position in $R$. Since the hash is taken over the index of the row in the data structure and not over the actual contents of a row, information about the data cannot be leaked by access patterns when rows are written to $R$.

The algorithm above needs a couple changes to ensure that we properly handle collisions while maintaining obliviousness. We can use standard techniques to resolve collisions, but in order to maintain obliviousness, every row of $T$ must make the same accesses to memory regardless of whether it is included in $R$. We handle this by having every write make as many memory accesses as in the case of the worst expected chain of collisions, regardless of whether the row under consideration in $T$ actually appears in $R$. Following the guidance of Azar et al [10] to get small probability of failure, we use double hashing and have a fixed-depth list of 5 slots for each position in $R$. This means that for each block in $T$, there will be 10 accesses to $R$, 5 for each of the two hash functions.

The modifications above ensure that data access patterns are fixed regardless of the data in the table and which rows the query selects. As mentioned above, since we hash the index of the row in the data structure and not the actual contents of a row, information about the data itself cannot be leaked by access patterns when rows are written to $R$. As such, we leak only the sizes of $T$ and $R$.

### 6.1.2 Aggregates & Group By

An aggregate over a whole table or some selected subset of a table requires only one pass over the whole table where we calculate the aggregate cumulatively based on the data in each row. A naïve approach uses an ORAM to keep track of the aggregate and needs to access it once for every row to update, causing an unnecessary slowdown. We achieve better performance by keeping the aggregate statistic inside the enclave in oblivious memory and avoiding the ORAM overhead. Since the memory access pattern of this operation always involves sequential reads of each block in the data structure, nothing leaks from this operation beyond the size of table $T$.

We handle groupings similarly to aggregates without groupings, except we keep an array inside the enclave that keeps track of the aggregate for each group where a naïve
We implement joins for the Linear storage method as a variant of the standard hash join algorithm [25]. We refer to the two tables being joined as $T_1$ and $T_2$. We make a hash table out of as many rows of $T_1$ as will fit in the enclave and then hash the variable to be joined from each row of $T_2$ to check for matches. This process repeats until reaching the end of $T_1$. After each check, a row is written to the next block of an output table. If there is a match, the joined row is written. If not, a dummy row is written to the table at that position. Since each comparison between the tables always results in one write to the next block of the output structure, the memory access pattern of this algorithm is oblivious.

For joins where we assume each record from the first table matches at most one row from the second table (all our benchmarks take this form), the size of the output table can be set to the larger of $|T_1|$ or $|T_2|$, revealing the sizes of $T_1$ or $T_2$ but not of the output table. In the general case, however, this algorithm could result in a table of size $|T_1| + |T_2|$. In cases where this size is too large and would result in an output table filled primarily with dummy blocks, an ORAM of the expected output size can replace the output table, removing the requirement that each dummy write go to a different block of memory. Since ORAM hides the actual block being accessed, making all dummy writes to the same block is indistinguishable from writing a different block each time.

### 6.2 Operators over Indexed Storage Method

Just as in the case of operators over linear tables, naïve implementations of query processing over indexed tables are not oblivious. Oblivious operations for the Indexed storage method behave similarly to the Linear method, but all operations take place over the oblivious B+ tree index described in Section 5. This, however, comes with some security ramifications. If the rows returned by a query are not continuous, the leakage also includes the size of the segment of the database scanned in the index. For example, supposing that there is one student named Fred in a table of students indexed by student IDs, the query

```plaintext
SELECT * FROM students WHERE NAME = "Fred" AND ID > 50 and ID < 60
```

leaks that 9 rows were scanned in the execution of the query. We consider this leakage to be included in the sizes of intermediate tables, as this query is equivalent to a query plan which selects a continuous segment from an index and then selects a noncontinuous segment from the returned table. Padding can hide this leakage.

**Multi-Use of Index Structure.** If the cost of maintaining both Indexed and Linear representations of data is prohibitively expensive, e.g. storage is limited or tables are very frequently updated, the Indexed storage data structure can also be scanned linearly as a table using the Linear method would be, ignoring the index structure. Our algorithms can treat both internal tree nodes and extra ORAM blocks as dummy blocks with no security consequences. This scan has additional overhead over directly using the Linear storage method because of the extra space required by ORAM and the index structure, but in practice this overhead is less than $2\times$.

**Sort-Merge Join.** In addition to the joins discussed above, we can obliviously sort-merge join tables already ordered by the same index [25]. For tables $T_1$ and $T_2$ where each record in $T_1$ matches at most one record in $T_2$, the tables are scanned at the same time, and matching rows are placed in an output ORAM. Specifically, at each step, the next row of each of $T_1$ and $T_2$ is read. If the rows match, the pointer on the table $T_2$ advances and there is a write to the ORAM, and if they do not match, a dummy write takes place and the pointer on the table with the lesser value advances. This process proceeds until pointers reach the end of both tables. Obliviousness holds because each step of the algorithm consists of one read to the ORAMs for each of $T_1$ and $T_2$ and one write to an ORAM, and the total number of steps is only a function of the table sizes.

### 6.3 Complexity

Prior systems that implement oblivious operators include Opaque [69], Cipherbase [4], and the Oblivious Query Processing algorithms of Arasu and Kaushik [5]. All three works focus on oblivious algorithms for analytic queries and only propose algorithms that involve scans over entire tables. The approach to this kind of operator typically involves a combination of oblivious sorts and filters. In contrast, our work uses new ideas to achieve similar functionalities for both storage methods, providing support for...
a broader set of general database use cases. In comparison to the $O(N \log N)$ complexity of an oblivious sort or filter, two of ObliDB’s solutions for selection (large and continuous algorithms) run in $O(N)$ time, and a third (hash algorithm) runs in $O(N \cdot C)$ time, where $C$ is the max chain length of the hash table, a small constant. The “small” algorithm has asymptotically worse $O(N \cdot K)$ complexity, where $K$ is the number of times the selected data fills the enclave, but it runs fastest in practice for queries with small output sizes. Our aggregation and grouping algorithms also run in $O(N)$ time, and join algorithms have the same asymptotics as the standard, non-enclave, algorithms on which they are based.

7 Optimizer

For SELECT queries, our optimizer picks which select algorithm to use based on statistical information on the data to be returned. Our main insight is that we can use the information already leaked by the data structures and output sizes in ObliDB to minimize additional leakage from the optimizer. In Section 9.4, we find that the optimizer can improve query performance by 4.6-11×. The optimizer is not used in pad mode, where we hide output sizes.

ObliDB runs the optimizer at runtime whenever it encounters a selection operator. For each selection, the optimizer begins with a fast linear scan over the data, during which it keeps track of (1) the number of rows passing the condition and (2) whether those rows are adjacent in the input table. The enclave also saves the computed output size to pass into selection operators that need to pre-allocate output storage. Based on the ratio of number of output rows to available enclave space, the optimizer decides which variant of the selection operator from Section 6 to use. We use a precomputed set of thresholds to decide when to run each operator. For maximum flexibility, users can also manually choose to force a particular physical operator.

Note that we cannot simply return the query result in the first scan over the data, as a naïve one-pass algorithm would violate obliviousness. Instead, we must run one of the oblivious operators from Section 6. Because many of these operators need to know the size of the output table up-front (to allocate an ORAM or memory inside the enclave for the results), the optimizer’s first scan to compute statistics is often “for free.” Performance improvements due to query planning intrinsically require leakage because the benefits of planning arise from the fact that different algorithms perform better for different data and queries. Our choice of physical operator reveals two pieces of information. The first is the number of matching rows. Since the non-padded execution mode already reveals the output size of the result, this adds nothing to the overall leakage of the system. The second is whether or not the rows returned by a query form a continuous segment of the table queried. This is revealed by the choice of the Continuous algorithm from Section 6 which occurs if the rows to be returned are continuous. The Continuous algorithm can optionally be disabled, causing optimization to leak no additional information beyond what is already revealed through output sizes.

Our optimizer has the same memory access pattern regardless of data queried: read each row, update statistics, and perform a table lookup to select an algorithm at the end. As such, the only leakage introduced by the optimizer comes from its final choice of which physical operator to run, not the optimization algorithm itself.

8 Implementation

Our implementation includes the storage methods from Section 5 as well as the oblivious operator algorithms and optimizer of Sections 6 and 7. It consists of over 14,000 lines of code of which approximately 10,000 are new and builds upon the Remote Attestation sample code provided with the SGX SDK [1] and the B+ tree implementation of [9], the latter of which was heavily edited in order to support our ORAM memory allocator. We used SGX SDK libraries for encryption, MACs, and hashing.

We tuned ObliDB’s parameters for the protected memory space provided by SGX. We chose a nonrecursive Path ORAM [62] (see Appendix A) for our ORAM scheme. Our ORAM implementation can fit up to about 10 million blocks in a 90MB SGX enclave, so ObliDB can handle data sets of about 40GB without recursive ORAM, assuming 4KB blocks. Our implementation allows easy swapping of ORAM schemes through a common interface, so ObliDB can be modified to use recursive ORAM with 2× performance overhead to support 40.9 billion blocks, or 163.6TB of data. Analytic queries (over either storage method) will have no overhead because they ignore the recursive ORAM and only scan the main data structure.
Table Name | Rows | Notes
--- | --- | ---
CFPB | 107,000 | Customer complaints to the US Consumer Financial Protection Bureau [26].
USERVISITS | 350,000 | Server logs for many sites. Part of the Big Data Benchmark data set [3].
RANKINGS | 360,000 | URLs, PageRanks, and average visit durations for many sites. Part of the Big Data Benchmark data set [3].

Figure 5: Data sets for our evaluation and comparisons against prior database systems. Larger synthetic data sets are used for comparison to prior oblivious data structures that provide limited functionalities.

9 Evaluation

We evaluate ObliDB on several datasets, comparing to prior private database systems, widely used non-private systems, and a baseline implementation that naively modifies database algorithms to use ORAM. We use three real-world datasets, shown in Figure 5, as well as larger synthetic data. In addition, we measure the overhead of ObliDB’s padding mode and demonstrate the effectiveness of ObliDB’s query optimizer through a microbenchmarks. We evaluated ObliDB on an Intel Core i7-6700 CPU @3.4GHz with 8GB of RAM running Ubuntu 16.04.2 and the SGX SDK version 1.9.

We find that ObliDB significantly outperforms a baseline implementation using ORAM and can leverage its indexes to achieve order of magnitude performance improvements over previous private database systems. In particular, ObliDB matches Opaque [69] for scan-based queries but can outperform it by 19× when it uses an index. ObliDB also performs 22.6-24.6× faster than Sophos [15], a recent searchable encryption scheme, and comes within a small factor of non-private systems Spark SQL and MySQL.

9.1 Comparison to Naïve ORAM Baseline

To evaluate the impact of ObliDB’s storage methods and operators, we implemented a baseline that genrically modifies existing database algorithms to run over ORAM. Since a direct translation of the memory accesses of a non-oblivious data structure to ORAM does not guarantee obliviousness (e.g., if different operations make different amounts of ORAM accesses), we modified several standard database data structures and algorithms as little as possible to achieve obliviousness, always erring on the side of stronger performance, the goal being to simulate the behavior of a generic conversion system that would render legacy code oblivious. Our baseline uses the same data structure as ObliDB for Linear storage but uses a naïve B+ tree that does not use any of the optimizations discussed in Section 5. That is, it writes back to the ORAM every time part of the tree changes instead of waiting as long as possible to remove redundant writes and does not optimize parameters for ORAM. Moreover, it keeps parent pointers, a shortcut that usually helps, but, as discussed in Section 5, damages oblivious performance. The baseline also uses the naïve operators described in Section 6.

Figure 6 compares ObliDB to our naïve ORAM baseline. ObliDB achieves up to 29× speedup for SELECT queries and over 328× speedup for aggregates. SELECT queries on linear tables enjoy much larger speedup over the baseline than index queries because an oblivious B+ tree lookup dominates the cost of indexed SELECT queries. Since a naïve application of ORAM to a B+ tree does not yield an oblivious B+ tree (see Section 5), we used the same algorithm for this lookup in both the baseline and the actual system.

The largest speedups, two orders of magnitude, appear in aggregation queries. This arises from the need to hide data structures that keep statistics for each group without revealing when a row does not match with any known groups and needs to begin a new group. The possibility of this occurrence forces, in the naïve algorithm, an access to each group’s data for each row. With a high system-wide maximum number of groups, such a query cannot complete within a reasonable time frame and takes well over the 1,000 seconds where we cut off experiments. The aggregation query over the CFPB table completes in a shorter period of time because we used our prior knowledge of the number of banks to set the maximum number of groups to a lower threshold (200 in this case).

9.2 Comparison to Opaque

Figure 7 compares ObliDB with Opaque’s oblivious mode [69] and Spark SQL [7], which provides no security guarantees, on queries 1-3 of the Big Data Benchmark [3] (same queries used by Opaque) on tables of 360,000 and 350,000 rows. Opaque also uses an SGX enclave and can be configured in either “encryption” mode or “obliv-
Figure 6: Comparison of ObliDB and baseline where a naive oblivious database implementation directly ports non-oblivious algorithms to their oblivious counterparts via ORAM. ObliDB outperforms the baseline on all queries. Aggregate and join queries were run on the Linear storage method since they read most or all rows of their tables.

Table 2: Query results for linear and index selections. ObliDB outperforms baseline on all queries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Query</th>
<th>ObliDB</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Speedup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFPB</td>
<td>SELECT * FROM CFPB WHERE Date_Received = 2013-05-14</td>
<td>1.192s</td>
<td>34.79s</td>
<td>29.2x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANKINGS</td>
<td>SELECT pageURL, pageRank FROM RANKINGS WHERE pageRank &gt; 1000</td>
<td>2.434s</td>
<td>46.33s</td>
<td>19.0x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFPB</td>
<td>SELECT * FROM CFPB WHERE Date_Received = 2013-05-14 (point query)</td>
<td>0.472s</td>
<td>0.678s</td>
<td>1.4x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANKINGS</td>
<td>SELECT pageURL, pageRank FROM RANKINGS WHERE pageRank &gt; 1000</td>
<td>0.082s</td>
<td>0.107s</td>
<td>1.3x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We began by configuring ObliDB to use only the Linear storage method, as Opaque does, and found that ObliDB performs comparably to Opaque, slightly worse on query 1 and slightly better on queries 2 and 3. Next, we used the combined storage method. An oblivious index allows ObliDB to outperform Opaque by 19x on query 1 since this query scans a small part of a table whereas Opaque and spark SQL, which primarily handle analytic workloads, scan the entire table. Indexes do not provide a speedup on queries 2 and 3 because those queries scan most of the input tables. ObliDB is only 2.4x and 2.6x slower than Spark SQL on queries 2 and 3.

We also tested scan-based queries against the Indexed storage method to see how ObliDB performs on frequently-updated data too expensive to maintain in linear storage. These queries performed about 2x slower than on linear tables. Thus, unlike prior, linear-only systems, ObliDB performs analytics relatively quickly on “live” tables frequently updated with point insertions and deletions.

9.3 Comparison to Secure Index Structures

In this section we compare ObliDB’s performance to two prior secure index structures: The HIRB Tree + vORAM [53] and Sophos [15]. Unlike ObliDB, neither sys-
ObliDB outperforms Opaque Oblivious \cite{69} by 1.1-19× and never runs more than 2.6× slower than Spark SQL \cite{7} on Queries Q1-Q3 of the Big Data Benchmark \cite{3}. Even without use of an index, ObliDB performs comparably to Opaque Oblivious. ObliDB always outperforms Sophos by at least 22.6×. Unlike ObliDB, Sophos leaks access patterns to data.

ObliDB’s oblivious indexes outperform the HIRB tree + vORAM oblivious map construction. HIRB Tree + vORAM. Figure 9 compares the point query performance of ObliDB’s oblivious indexes with a HIRB tree + vORAM oblivious map \cite{53} and MySQL. We instantiated both the table in ObliDB and the HIRB tree with 64-Byte data entries and allocated the underlying vORAM with bucket size 4096, a somewhat larger size than our own ORAM’s buckets (HIRB performed worse on smaller bucket sizes). On tables of 1,000,000 rows, ObliDB outperforms HIRB by 7.6× in point selection and by 3× on insertions and deletions. While still an order of magnitude slower than MySQL for larger tables, network latency from user to cloud can be tens of milliseconds, rendering the difference insignificant. We compare the design and features of ObliDB and HIRB in Section 10.

Sophos. We compare ObliDB’s oblivious index to the searchable symmetric encryption (SSE) scheme Sophos \cite{15} in Figure 8. Sophos does not provide obliviousness guarantees, meaning it leaks access patterns. It does provide a good point of comparison for the performance of our SGX-based oblivious indexes with a non-
SGX based, non-oblivious index that still provides some privacy. We compare against numbers reported in the Sophos paper for a 1.4 million row table using a more powerful machine than ours: an Intel Core i7 4790K 4.00GHz CPU with 8 logical cores and 16GB of RAM running on OS X.10 Despite the difference in hardware and the fact the Sophos is multithreaded, ObliDB outperforms Sophos by 22.6-24.6×. We observe that the performance tipping point between Indexed and Linear storage methods in this experiment arrives between $10^4$ and $10^5$ rows, and ObliDB’s performance on larger queries beyond that point would remain constant. ObliDB performs better than Sophos because the tens of AES invocations needed for ORAM accesses are much cheaper than Sophos’s public-key cryptography.

### 9.4 Impact of Storage Method and Optimizer

ObliDB’s two storage methods enable meaningful performance gains for diverse queries. Figure 10 compares our storage methods on SELECT (hash algorithm), GROUP BY (low-cardinality), INSERT, DELETE, and UPDATE queries. Linear scans perform better when more rows are returned, but smaller queries perform significantly better on an index. Indexed DELETE and UPDATE queries outperform their linear ones, but the fast Linear INSERT query outperforms the Indexed INSERT. The Linear storage method’s performance (outside of constant-time fast insertions) degrades linearly in table size, but point operations on indexes take polylogarithmic time. Figure 11 shows the scaling of various operations.

Often a combined table representation that maintains both storage methods for the same data proves effective. Although ObliDB pays insertion and deletion costs for both methods, it can use the better representation for each query, an important benefit because many real-world workloads rely heavily on different kinds of reads. Figure 12 shows ObliDB running various workloads with Linear,
Figure 13: Our optimizer picks the best algorithm for handling SELECT queries based on a preliminary scan that determines whether the data to be returned is small, large, or consists of a continuous set of rows in the table. Bars omitted when an algorithm is not applicable.

9.5 Impact of Padding Mode

Padding mode additionally hides the sizes of tables, intermediate results, and final outputs—comparable to the padding mode described but not evaluated by Opaque [69]. We evaluated this mode by running queries on the CFPB table of 107,000 rows padded to 200,000 rows. Our aggregate query with the Linear storage method had a 4.4× slowdown and a select had a 2.4× slowdown. The larger slowdown for aggregates results from the padding algorithm padding to the maximum supported number of groups for aggregates—in this case, 350,000. We did not evaluate padding mode for indexes as the benefit of the Indexed storage method results from knowledge of the selectivity of a query, the exact information padding hides.

To our knowledge, no other comparable system implements a padding mode, so we cannot compare to prior work. The results do, however, represent reasonable slowdowns for inflating a table’s size by approximately 2× with padding.

10 Related Work

**Encrypted Databases.** Fuller et al [29] summarize prior work on cryptographically protected databases. The well-known CryptDB [49] enables a tradeoff between security and performance, encrypting fields differently according to security needs. More recently, Arx [48] uses only strong encryption but leverages special data structures to allow search. Other solutions, including Demertzis et al, Sophos, and Diana [15, 16, 23], use searchable encryption. Although all of these systems encrypt data, they can leak access patterns. Several access pattern attacks [19, 36, 45, 68] have been shown to affect these schemes outside their original security models.

**SGX Databases.** EnclaveDB [51] is an SGX-based DBMS that does not hide access patterns. A concurrent work, StealthDB [32] builds a mostly-oblivious database compatible with existing systems but does not provide integrity or hide access patterns to indexed data. VeritasDB [61] provides integrity but not privacy to a key-value store. POSUP [34] uses ORAM and SGX for search and update on encrypted data, but supports a more limited range of functionalities than ObliDB. Finally, Oblix [44] builds an oblivious search index that requires no obliviousness assumptions inside the enclave and provides significant speedup over prior work in that security model.

**Trusted Hardware.** Some generic tools provide legacy applications the heightened security available from SGX and other trusted hardware [8, 12, 35, 60]. Many works also implement variations of other analytics systems on SGX [14, 27, 28, 46]. M2R [24] and VC3 [56] provide MapReduce and cloud data analytics functionalities, and HardIDX and LPAD [28, 63] build key-value stores that are not oblivious. TrustedDB [11] uses older trusted hardware designs to build a protected database, but does not protect access patterns.

Of the systems using trusted hardware, Opaque [69] and Cipherbase [4] are the closest to ObliDB because they support oblivious execution. However, both Opaque and Cipherbase provide oblivious operators only for analytics queries that scan all the data, because they rely on oblivious sorts of an entire input table to implement their operators. To our knowledge, ObliDB is the first oblivious database engine to efficiently support both transactional
and analytics workloads. In particular, our variants of selection, aggregation and join operators not based on sorting (Section 6) are novel over these prior oblivious systems, as is our use of oblivious B+ trees in addition to linear storage.

Several side-channel attacks affect SGX [17,38,66,67], but other work generically closes side channels [52-57,59]. Outside SGX, some other hardware solutions render programs’ accesses to protected memory oblivious as well [22,39,42].

General-Purpose Oblivious Computing. Zero-Trace [55] provides oblivious memory primitives based on ORAM over SGX. Pyramid ORAM [20] builds a more efficient ORAM for use inside of enclaves, and ObliVM [40] automatically compiles programs to oblivious representations. By specializing its data structures and operators to run over ORAM, however, ObliDB greatly outperforms a naïve translation of database algorithms to ORAM.

Data Structures over ORAM. Wang et al. [65] optimize several high-level data structures on top of ORAM, focusing on the case of recursive ORAM. The optimization most relevant to our work is their pointer-based technique, which applies to any data structure whose access pattern takes the form of walking a tree. This optimization changes the design of the ORAM itself to improve performance: in this approach, each node contains the position map information for its children, reducing the total access cost by a logarithmic factor when using recursive ORAM (where normally the position map would itself be in an ORAM). This technique could complement our oblivious B+ tree when the enclave’s oblivious memory is small enough that a recursive ORAM becomes necessary to fit the ORAM position map, but it does not directly address our problem, which is adapting a B+tree to run efficiently on ORAM.

Roche et al. [53] build a history-independent “HIRB tree” over vORAM, an ORAM with variable-sized blocks, but do not support range queries. They consider a “catastrophic attack” which compromises the system holding the ORAM client, and they design the HIRB tree to provide history independence and secure deletion even under such an attack. Since our work relies on the security of the hardware enclave and keeps the ORAM client inside the enclave, the additional security properties desired by HIRB come for free in our setting. Both our work and the HIRB tree make use of padding for obliviousness, but each uses different optimizations to minimize padding. As shown in Section 9.3 our oblivious B+ tree is up to 7× more efficient than HIRB when running in SGX.

11 Conclusion

ObliDB fills the gap between previous enclave-based query processing engines and oblivious indexes by combining new oblivious query processing algorithms with accompanying data structures and an optimizer to support both transactional and analytic workloads. While obliviousness has a cost, ObliDB approaches practical performance: it is competitive to 19× faster than Opaque [69] and comes within 2.6× of Spark SQL. It also outperforms previous systems with support for transactional queries by 7-22×, completing point queries on a 1 million row table with 3–9ms latency. Our open source implementation of ObliDB is available at https://github.com/SabaEskandarian/ObliDB.
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In this appendix, we formally state the security guarantee provided by ORAM and give an overview of the Path ORAM scheme used in our implementation [62].

Recall that ORAM guarantees that any two access patterns of the same length are computationally indistinguishable. Formally, ORAM’s security is defined as follows:

A ORAM Formal Definition and Path ORAM overview

In this appendix, we formally state the security guarantee provided by ORAM and give an overview of the Path ORAM scheme used in our implementation [62].

Recall that ORAM guarantees that any two access patterns of the same length are computationally indistinguishable. Formally, ORAM’s security is defined as follows:
Definition 1 (ORAM Security [62]) Let \( \vec{y} := ((\text{op}_1, a_1, \text{data}_1), \ldots, (\text{op}_M, a_M, \text{data}_M)) \) denote a data request sequence of length \( M \), where each \( \text{op}_i \) denotes a \text{read}(a_i) or a \text{write}(a_i, \text{data}) \) operation. Specifically, \( a_i \) denotes the address of the block being read or written, and \( \text{data}_i \) denotes the data being written.

Let \( A(\vec{y}) \) denote the (possibly randomized) sequence of accesses to the untrusted storage given the sequence of data requests \( \vec{y} \). An ORAM construction is said to be secure if:

1. For any two data request sequences \( \vec{y} \) and \( \vec{z} \) of the same length, their access patterns \( A(\vec{y}) \) and \( A(\vec{z}) \) are computationally indistinguishable by anyone but the client ORAM controller.
2. The ORAM construction is correct, in the sense that it returns, on input \( \vec{y} \), output data that is consistent with \( \vec{y} \) with probability \( 1 - \text{negl}(|\vec{y}|) \). That is, the ORAM may fail only with a negligible probability \( \text{negl}(|\vec{y}|) \).

Implementing ORAM  The ORAM scheme we use in ObliDB is Path ORAM [62]. Path ORAM belongs to a family of schemes known as tree-based ORAMs, which operate by storing encrypted blocks of the oblivious memory in a tree structure. Every read or write to a block of memory (reads and writes are indistinguishable) reads a path from the root to a leaf, and then writes the same path again, regardless of where in the path the desired block sits. The contents of each node in the path are decrypted, read, and re-encrypted to hide which node held the desired information. To prevent leaking statistical information about repeated accesses to the same address, a block is randomly reassigned to a new part of the tree after each access. This causes reads and writes to the ORAM to incur an \( O(\log N) \) overhead, where \( N \) is the ORAM’s size in blocks. If the tree lacks space to store some node in its designated place, the node is kept in an off-tree stash until it can find space in the future. Path ORAM guarantees that the stash stays quite small with overwhelming probability.

One feature of Path ORAM requires further discussion. In order to know which path down the tree to read to find a given block, the ORAM client keeps a position map that maps each block of memory to a leaf in the tree that identifies the path where it can be found. Since the size of the position map is a fixed fraction of the size of the raw data, Path ORAM recursively stores the position map in a second ORAM and repeats until the client storage requirement becomes sufficiently small. In practice, because the size of an entry in a position map is many times smaller than a block of data, at most one layer of recursion suffices to store large quantities of data. For example, a 10MB position map can support 10GB of data. Adding a second layer of recursion (where the 10GB data actually holds a position map for a larger ORAM) supports 10TB of data. We call an ORAM with no recursion a nonrecursive ORAM and an ORAM that recursively uses a second ORAM a recursive ORAM.

B Security Theorem

We can formally model our privacy guarantees by showing there exists a simulator such that for all efficient adversaries \( \mathcal{A} \), \( \mathcal{A} \) cannot distinguish between a real memory trace from ObliDB and a memory trace from the simulator that is given access to query plans and table sizes. The idea is that since the simulator only sees what we intend to leak, the adversary cannot have learned any additional information from its interaction with our system. In this model, an (informal) theorem statement similar to that of Opaque [69] also applies to ObliDB. Let \( \mathcal{D} \) be a dataset, \( \mathcal{S} \) be its schema, and \( \mathcal{Q} \) be a query. Moreover, let \( \text{OPT}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Q}) \) be the choice of algorithms made by ObliDB’s optimizer for query \( \mathcal{Q} \) on data \( \mathcal{D} \) and \( \text{TRACE}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Q}) \) be the distribution of complete transcripts of memory accesses outside of oblivious memory made by ObliDB while running query \( \mathcal{Q} \) on \( \mathcal{D} \). Finally, \( |\mathcal{D}| \) denotes the size of \( \mathcal{D} \) and \( |\text{TRACE}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Q})| \) denotes the sizes of the memory traces of running each operator in \( \mathcal{Q} \) on \( \mathcal{D} \). Since ObliDB stores intermediate tables encrypted outside of the enclave, this includes intermediate table sizes.

Theorem 2  For all \( \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \) and a security parameter \( \lambda \) there exists a polynomial-time simulator \( \text{SIM} \) such that for all efficient adversaries \( \mathcal{A} \),

\[
|\text{Pr}[\mathcal{A}(\text{SIM}(|\mathcal{D}|, \mathcal{S}, \text{OPT}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Q}), |\text{TRACE}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Q})|)) = 1]
- \text{Pr}[\mathcal{A}(\text{TRACE}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Q})) = 1]| \leq \text{negl}(\lambda).
\]

The fact that such a \( \text{SIM} \) exists means that anything that can be learned by looking at the transcript of ObliDB running on actual data and queries can also be learned by looking only at the sizes of the data/queries as well as
the table schemas and the physical operator chosen by the optimizer.

The security theorem for padding mode replaces the data and trace size with a public parameter $M$ indicating the maximum size to which all tables, query results, and intermediate tables are padded.

**Theorem 3** For all $D, S, Q$, there exists a polynomial-time simulator $SIM'$ whose outputs are distributed such that

$$SIM'(M, S, OPT(D, Q)) \approx TRACE(D, Q).$$

In order to argue that $SIM$ exists, we first argue that each operator output by $OPT$ is composed of algorithms that satisfy our obliviousness property. We provide these arguments in Section 6 with the description of each operator. Next, we show in Section 7 that the optimizer’s operations are data-oblivious and that its only leakage is inherent in the final choice of which physical operator to run, information which our adversary can see. With this, we have all the pieces required to explicitly describe $SIM$ that prints an access pattern transcript distributed indistinguishably from $TRACE(D, Q)$ because the trace of query $Q$ on dataset $D$ consists exactly of the accesses made by running the planner and then the chosen operator(s).

$SIM$ begins by reading $S$ and $|TRACE(D, Q)|$. It uses this information to simulate the access pattern of one linear scan over $D$. This is identical to the access pattern of the optimizer. Now $SIM$ reads $OPT(D, Q)$ to determine which operator to simulate. Using the provided choice of operator, the schema $S$, and its knowledge of input and output table sizes gleaned from $|TRACE(D, Q)|$, it simulates the access pattern described in the body of the paper for the selected operator on $D$ (i.e. some number of linear scans or ORAM operations). This completes the simulated output which is distributed indistinguishably from that of $TRACE(D, Q)$. We omit a discussion of the simulator $SIM'$ for padding mode because it behaves analogously to $SIM$. 
