

MOAT: Towards Safe BPF Kernel Extension

Hongyi Lu^{‡§}, Shuai Wang^{§*}, Yechang Wu[‡], Wanning He[‡], Fengwei Zhang^{‡*}

[‡]Southern University of Science and Technology

[§]Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

Abstract—The Linux kernel makes considerable use of Berkeley Packet Filter (BPF) to allow user-written BPF applications to execute in the kernel space. BPF employs a verifier to statically check the security of user-supplied BPF code. Recent attacks show that BPF programs can evade security checks and gain unauthorized access to kernel memory, indicating that the verification process is not flawless. In this paper, we present MOAT, a system that isolates potentially malicious BPF programs using Intel Memory Protection Keys (MPK). Enforcing BPF program isolation with MPK is not straightforward; MOAT is carefully designed to alleviate technical obstacles, such as limited hardware keys and supporting a wide variety of kernel BPF helper functions. We have implemented MOAT in a prototype kernel module, and our evaluation shows that MOAT delivers low-cost isolation of BPF programs under various real-world usage scenarios, such as the isolation of a packet-forwarding BPF program for the memcached database with an average throughput loss of 6%.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is common to extend kernel functionality by allowing user applications to download code into the kernel space. In 1993, the well-known Berkeley Packet Filter (BPF) was introduced for this purpose [3]. The classic BPF is an infrastructure that inspects network packets and decides whether or not to forward or discard them. With the introduction of its extended version (referred to as eBPF) in the Linux kernel, BPF soon became more powerful and is now utilized in numerous real-life scenarios, such as load balancing, scheduling, and auditing [17, 23, 30, 54, 65, 66].

To ensure security, BPF is equipped with a *verifier* [5]. The verifier performs a variety of static analyses to ensure the user-supplied code is secure. For instance, the verifier tracks the bounds of all pointers to prevent an out-of-bound access. Given that BPF code runs directly within the kernel, the verifier becomes crucial for the BPF security. Nevertheless, as pointed out by recent studies [26, 33, 34, 52, 62], the currently available verifier has various limitations, and is insufficient for the overall security of BPF. First, the current BPF ecosystem supports a variety of kernel functionalities with over 200 dedicated APIs [1], resulting in a complicated verification process. Even though the verifier’s correctness has been formally proved [61], the gap between abstraction and implementation may still result in vulnerabilities [37–43, 45]. Second, BPF Just-In-Time (JIT) is currently supported on multiple platforms, including x86, ARM, and RISC-V, whose differences frequently result in subtle vulnerabilities [46, 47]; note that the verifier cannot detect vulnerabilities in the JIT stage. Third, due to the rapid expansion of BPF capabilities,

the verifier has to be frequently updated. Nonetheless, it is inherently difficult to frequently update a complex static verification tool without introducing new vulnerabilities [44]. To date, the BPF subsystem has been constantly exploited. For instance, two privileged-escalation vulnerabilities have been discovered in the implementation of `bpf_ringbuf`, a rather new BPF feature introduced in 2020 [3]. Further, the verifier’s register-value tracking is quite complex and has been bypassed via corner-case operations (e.g., sign extension) [37–40].

Given the increasing security threats in BPF and the challenge of enforcing safe BPF programs with merely static verification, we seek to employ hardware extensions to sandbox untrusted BPF programs. In particular, we leverage Intel Memory Protection Keys (MPK) [8], an emerging hardware extension which partitions memory into distinct permission groups by assigning up to 16 keys to their Page Table Entries (PTEs). With the aid of MPK and the BPF verifier’s analysis results, we present MOAT, which isolates untrusted BPF programs in a low-cost and principled manner. For instance, two MPK protection keys K and E may be assigned to the kernel and a BPF program, respectively. When the kernel transfers control to the BPF program, it can set K as access-disabled to prevent the potentially malicious BPF program from tampering with kernel memory regions.

Despite its promising potential, we observe that using MPK to enforce BPF isolation is not straightforward. MOAT is deliberately designed to overcome *two major technical hurdles*. First, Intel MPK provides a maximum of 16 keys. Thus, it becomes challenging to support many BPF programs running concurrently with this limited number of hardware keys. Existing workarounds like key virtualization [53] are incompatible with the BPF scenario and challenging to be implemented in the kernel. This is because the key virtualization heavily relies on scheduling and notification facilities that are only available to userspace; directly reusing them in the kernel space may largely block kernel threads. To address this hurdle, we propose a novel dynamic/fixed key allocation scheme that can support multiple BPF programs with a small overhead.

Second, while MPK-based hardware isolation mitigates malicious BPF programs, *helper functions* provided by the BPF subsystem may be exploited by attackers. Overall, the growth of the BPF ecosystem is accompanied by the expansion of its dedicated helper functions; helper functions facilitate various tasks commonly conducted by a BPF program. On one hand, MOAT should allow benign BPF programs to freely use these helpers. On the other hand, MOAT must be cautious enough with these APIs to ensure they are not exploited by attackers. Given that there are over 200 helpers [1] provided

* Shuai Wang and Fengwei Zhang are the corresponding authors.




Fig. 1: BPF overview. We illustrate the BPF compilation procedure, and the execution context of a sample BPF program attached to the kernel scheduler. Note that BPF verification is conducted at the BPF bytecode loading time.

in the latest Linux kernel, designing individual security policy for each of them is impractical and less extensible. To this end, we analyze all existing helpers with static dependency-analysis, and propose several two defense schemes, each of which is applicable to a group of helpers. We envision that when a new helper is added, MOAT can be applied easily without introducing new schemes.

To evaluate the security impact of MOAT, we systematically examined how MOAT mitigates attack surfaces due to untrusted BPF programs. We also empirically analyze all recent CVEs within MOAT’s application scope. The result shows that MOAT successfully mitigates each CVE. Moreover, we evaluate the performance overhead of MOAT under representative and edge-case scenarios. First, we examine the performance of our dynamic/fixed key allocation policy by assessing a use case where multiple programs are executed concurrently to use all MPK keys. Then, we build a real-life port-forwarding BPF program for the `memcached` [25] database, and secure it with MOAT to measure how MOAT influences `memcached`’s throughput. Furthermore, we apply MOAT to several real-world BPF applications [54] to illustrate that MOAT can be directly applied to the current BPF ecosystem with minimal engineering effort. MOAT’s worst case performance overhead in all these experiments is less than 30%, which is acceptable given the security benefits MOAT provides. Moreover, MOAT imposes only 6% overhead on average to the `memcache`’s throughput. In sum, we make the following contributions.

- Instead of merely relying on BPF verifiers to statically validate untrusted BPF programs, this paper for the first time advocates to isolate user-supplied BPF programs with an emerging hardware extension, Intel MPK.
- Technically, MOAT is specially designed to address domain-specific challenges including limited hardware keys and protecting over 200 helper functions in the BPF ecosystem.
- We implement a prototype of MOAT as a Loadable Kernel Module (LKM) of the latest Linux (v5.19) and conduct a thorough evaluation of its security and performance. The evaluation shows that MOAT delivers a principled security guarantee with moderate performance penalty.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Berkeley Packet Filter (BPF)

BPF Overview. BPF [3] was originally introduced to facilitate flexible network package filtering. Instead of inspecting packages in the userspace, users can provide BPF instructions specifying package filter rules, which are directly executed in the kernel. This allows configurable package filtering without costly context switching and data copying. Modern Linux kernel features extended BPF (eBPF), a Linux subsystem,

which supports a wide range of use cases such as kernel profiling, load balancing, and firewalls.¹ Popular applications like Docker [36], web browsers [32, 50], and kernel debugging utilities like Kprobes [7] are built on top of BPF.

Fig. 1 depicts an overview of how BPF programs are compiled and then deployed. The eBPF subsystem offers ten general-purpose 64-bit registers, memory stack, eBPF customized data structures (often referred to as eBPF maps), and a set of eBPF helper functions. To use eBPF (e.g., for kernel profiling), users can first write their own BPF programs (in C code) to specify the functionality. The BPF programs will then be compiled into BPF bytecode and downloaded into the kernel. Given that eBPF code is written by untrusted users, the kernel employs a verifier to conduct several checks during the bytecode loading time (see below). By default, the bytecode is executed by the BPF interpreter (omitted in Fig. 1). Additionally, depending on the kernel configuration and architectural support, an optional JIT compilation may be applied to the bytecode for better performance. The BPF bytecode is then attached to certain kernel components, based on its specific end goal. For instance, as shown in Fig. 1, a BPF program attached to kernel scheduler collects relevant statistics and decides which thread should be running next to improve overall performance.




Fig. 2: BPF verification process.

BPF Verifier. BPF programs are written in C, and compiled into a RISC-like instruction set. As aforementioned, the kernel strictly verifies the BPF programs upon loading to ensure that they are safe to execute. Fig. 2 illustrates the verifying process in a holistic manner. First, a BPF program is parsed into a control flow graph (CFG) by the verifier, which first performs a CFG check phase to ensure four key properties: 1) the program size is within a limit; 2) there exists no back edges (loops) on its CFG; 3) there exists no unreachable codes; and 4) all jumps are direct jump and they refer to a valid destination. Overall, given that BPF programs must be terminated, the CFG check phase ensures that all jumps are direct jumps and there are no back edges. Given that said, loops are still feasible via unrolling at the cost of binary size.

The verifier further performs finer-grained data flow analysis. It first tracks the value flow of every register to deduce

¹There are indeed two variants of BPF: classic BPF (cBPF) and eBPF. MOAT supports both of them; see clarification later in Sec. II-A.

its value ranges conservatively. Based on these ranges, the verifier can decide if a pointer accesses safe memory regions, and if a parameter is valid. Since this analysis is performed statically prior to execution, there exists possibility that a malicious BPF program uses certain operations to bypass this analysis [37–43, 45]. Last, the verifier also performs some miscellaneous fixups, like rewriting certain instructions to simplify the follow-up JIT compilation.

BPF Maps. Out of security concern, the kernel also sets a rather strict space limit on BPF programs. Each program by default can only use up to 512 bytes stack space and 10 registers, which is far from enough for certain BPF programs. To address this problem, BPF maps can be allocated and provide additional space for BPF programs. Up to now, there are over 30 types of maps supported by kernel, such as array map and hash map [4]. Moreover, as demonstrated in Fig. 1, maps may act as a communication channel between BPF programs and user applications, since some of these maps can be accessed by both the BPF program and the user application.

BPF Helpers. Kernel also limits the kernel functions a BPF program may call. Those functions are dubbed BPF helpers, as shown in Fig. 1. To date, there are over 200 helpers scattered across subsystems of the kernel [1]. Depending on the specific task, a BPF program can usually call a group of relevant helpers. For example, a BPF program attached to the scheduler is not allowed call any helper related to kernel probing, but it can call `bpf_pid`² to get the PID of the current process and decide which process to be scheduled next.




Fig. 3: Intel MPK overview.

Classic BPF. Classic BPF (cBPF) specializes in tasks like syscall filtering (e.g., `seccomp`) and has more restrictions than its extended version, eBPF. cBPF only supports two registers and a fixed size memory. Neither helpers nor maps are supported. Thus, cBPF has a small attack surface and nearly all vulnerabilities reported in the BPF subsystem are related to eBPF. Our work mainly focuses on eBPF and directly refers eBPF as BPF for brevity in the rest of the paper. Nevertheless, MOAT can be trivially extended to shield cBPF as cBPF is internally converted to eBPF by the kernel.

Intel MPK. Intel introduces MPK [8] to provide efficient page table permissions control. By assigning a MPK protection key to each page table entry (PTE) of one process, users can enable intra-process isolation and confidential data access control [16, 29, 35, 53, 60]. As illustrated in Fig. 3, MPK uses four reserved bits [62:59] in each PTE to indicate which protection key is attached with this page. Those three PTEs in

Fig. 3 are assigned with keys `0x1`, `0xE` and `0xF`, respectively. Since there are only 4 bits involved, the maximum number of keys is 16. Then, a new 32-bit register named Protection Key Register (PKR) is introduced to specify the access permission of these protection keys. Each key occupies two bits in PKR, whose values denote either access-disabled (AD) or write-disabled (WD), respectively. By writing to certain bits in PKR, the access permission of corresponding pages can be configured accordingly. It is worth noting that one key may be assigned to arbitrary number of pages by modifying their PTEs. This facilitates changing the access permission of a large number of pages without severe performance penalty.

Clarification and Notations. As a side note, there are actually two versions of Intel MPK. One applies to the user-mode while the other applies to the supervisor-mode. For brevity, we refer these two versions in their conventional abbreviations as Protection Key Supervisor (PKS) and Protection Key User (PKU), respectively. Most existing works [16, 27, 29, 35, 53, 60] are based on PKU. In MOAT, we use PKS instead since our goal is to isolate BPF programs, which execute in the supervisor-mode. The logistics behind these two versions are mostly identical with slight variations. For instance, the permission configuration register in PKS is a Model Specific Register (MSR) named `IA32_PKRS`, which is inaccessible from userspace, whereas in PKU, this role is assigned to a dedicated register `PKRU`. In addition to PKR, there also exists a bit in the control register `CR4` that can disable/enable MPK entirely; for PKU, this bit is `CR4.PKE`; for PKS, this bit is `CR4.PKS`. To avoid potential misleading, the rest of the paper directly refers MPK leveraged by MOAT as PKS.

III. MOTIVATION AND ASSUMPTIONS

A. Typical Threats to BPF Verifier

Fast Feature Evolving. As a fast developing technology, threats may come from the inconsistency between the constantly expanding BPF capabilities and the rigorous static verification process imposed on them [41, 44]. It is a common practice to add corresponding verification procedures simultaneously when introducing new features to BPF programs. However, it is very hard to make changes correctly to the BPF verifier, a critical security kernel component, which has over 10K LoC and a variety of functionalities [5].

Challenging Pointer Tracking. Second type of threats originates from the complexity of pointer tracking mechanism. Although the correctness of the verifier is formally proved [61], there still exist gaps between the implementation and the abstraction, especially in some corner cases, such as sign extension, truncation, and bit operators [37–43, 45].

The fact that the contemporary BPF verifier only performs static analysis is a severe deficiency, as evidenced by the threats noted above. Performing sound and complete static analysis toward BPF programs to uncover potential threats is fundamentally challenging, and from the disclosed BPF vulnerabilities, we find that there frequently exists a gap between verifier’s static analysis results and BPF programs’ runtime behavior. For instance, the verifier, based on its static analysis

²Here, `bpf_pid` refers to `bpf_get_current_pid_tgid`.

results, may conclude that a program is benign because it only accesses a memory region ranging from $[0 \times 0, 0 \times 1000]$. However, by leveraging vulnerabilities like noted above, the software may behave differently during execution. Therefore, a hardware feature, Intel MPK, is utilized to enforce further isolation, such that a BPF program is constrained in its own memory regions, and any runtime accesses that violate this constraint are effectively flagged and terminated by MOAT.

B. Threat Model

Assumption. Our threat model considers a practical setting which is aligned with existing BPF vulnerabilities [37–43, 45]. In particular, we assume attackers are *non-privileged users* with BPF access, since a root user already has the control over almost the entire kernel. Attackers can download their prepared BPF code into the kernel space to launch exploitation.

Application Scope. MOAT isolates user-submitted BPF programs and prevent them from accessing privileged kernel memory regions. As will be introduced in Sec. IV, a BPF program is given only the necessary resources and privileges to complete its task. Next, we present analysis of three major components in our research context as follows.

BPF Programs. This includes the BPF bytecodes or the JIT-emitted native instructions. Our threat model takes the assumption that malicious BPF programs are able to bypass checks statically performed by the verifier; they may thus behave maliciously during runtime. Our threat model deems BPF programs as *untrusted*, and MOAT is designed to isolate them from the rest of the kernel. More specifically, every BPF program, during its runtime, is only allowed to access its own stack, allocated maps, and certain helper functions. Note that each BPF program runs in its *own* sandbox. A malicious BPF program cannot tamper with other BPF programs.

BPF Helper Functions. These helpers act as the intermediate layer between the BPF subsystem and kernel. Certain malicious BPF programs can abuse these helpers to perform attacks, and therefore, we assume they are also *untrusted*. MOAT mitigates risks raised by adversarial-manipulated helper functions with practical defenses.

Kernel. Kernel is the target to protect. We assume the kernel is functioning normally, and attackers aim to leverage malicious BPF programs to gain unauthorized access to kernel data or executing arbitrary privileged kernel code.

Out-of-Scope. The main objective of MOAT is to mitigate memory exploitation performed by BPF programs. Thus, other subtle attacks (not relevant to memory exploitations) such as speculation, race condition, and Denial of Service (DoS) occurred to exploit the BPF subsystem [48, 49] are not considered. We view them as security threats commonly faced by many other scenarios such as SGX enclaves [14, 21], and are orthogonal to our work. Moreover, as a complicated ecosystem, BPF subsystem also comes with a set of userland facilities such as `libbpf`; implementation bugs in those facilities are not considered by MOAT.

IV. DESIGN

MOAT Overview. As motivated in Sec. III, current security design against malicious BPF programs solely relies on the static analysis performed by the BPF verifier, which is seen as a weak point and exploitable by non-privileged users. MOAT instead delivers a principled isolation of BPF programs using MPK from the rest part of the kernel and prevent bypasses.




Fig. 4: MOAT overview.

Fig. 4 illustrates the lifecycle of a BPF program with the presence of MOAT. ① Given a user-submitted BPF program P , MOAT statically derives the necessary memory regions the program needs, such as stack, used maps and context by reading P 's metadata. ② These regions ("BPF Memory" in Fig. 4) are assigned to P using PKS, forming its runtime environment. ③ When the kernel invokes P , MOAT configures PKS to constrain P to its own regions and forbids its access to other memory regions. ④ On the occasions that P requires helper calls to interact with the kernel, depending on the helper types, MOAT may adjust involved kernel memory region permissions and also validate the helper parameter values to prevent helpers from being abused.

Security Guarantees. Overall, MOAT provides the following two key secure design guarantees.

- (i) Only the necessary resources and privileges are given to a BPF program, preventing any malicious behavior.
- (ii) The interactions (e.g., helper calls) between the BPF program and the kernel are audited thus not abused.

Extensibility. MOAT leverages MPK, a de facto hardware extension available on mainstream Intel architectures to isolate BPF programs. We view this design choice is consistent with recent hardware-assisted security enforcement works [16, 60]. Nevertheless, we clarify that the design of MOAT is not limited to leveraging MPK. There exist similar hardware security mechanisms on other platforms and architectures such as the Memory Domains [2] on ARM and the Domain Keys [55] on RISC-V. These mechanisms can be used to replace MPK on these platforms with a small amount of engineering effort; see Sec. VIII for our discussion on migration and extension.

A. General BPF Isolation

In accordance with the BPF program lifecycle depicted in Fig. 4, this section elaborates on the general isolation approach offered by MOAT. We further discuss two key technical challenges in Sec. IV-B.




Fig. 5: BPF memory regions.

1) *BPF Memory Regions*: Fig. 5 depicts the memory regions of BPF programs and the kernel. By default, all pages should belong to the kernel memory region, and each page is initialized with a default MPK key value 0. Then, when a BPF program P is newly loaded into the kernel, MOAT decides the memory pages it needs, and assigns these amount of pages to the memory region of P . Note that the necessary memory sections of a BPF program includes its code, stack, and the context; many non-trivial BPF programs also require BPF maps (e.g., array and hash maps) to use. After assigning these sections to the memory region of P , MOAT restricts P to its own memory regions by configuring the PKR register. Take the BPF P_1 in Fig. 5 as an example, most of its sections (including a number of BPF maps) solely belong to itself. Furthermore, P_1 and P_2 share several extra BPF maps. Thus, at its runtime, MOAT configures the PKR register of P_1 to enable its access (EN; denoted as 00 in the runtime PKR value column of Fig. 5) to its own region 0x1 and the shared region 0x3. Moreover, MOAT disables any accesses from P_1 to the kernel region 0x0 and the P_2 memory region 0x2 by setting corresponding bits in P_1 's PKR register as 01 (denoting AD).

To clarify, the code and map sections of a BPF program requires are trivially known (by reading the metadata in the BPF program) and stay fixed once it is loaded. Thus, MOAT can assign these pages to its designated region by modifying their PTEs during the program loading phase without any runtime overhead. The assignment for stack, context and some special types of maps will be discussed in the next section.

2) *BPF Runtime Environment*: Apart from the program itself and its maps, a BPF program requires additional kernel structures to function properly. These structures include descriptor tables, stacks, and the program's runtime context. Furthermore, certain maps (e.g., hash map) are not stored continuously and cannot be assigned trivially during initialization. MOAT assigns entries of these maps on the fly.

Descriptor Tables. On x86 platforms, descriptor tables such as Global Descriptor Table (GDT) and Interrupt Descriptor Table (IDT) are essential for basic operations like interrupt. These kernel data structures are assigned to a shared region that all BPF programs can access. To prevent tampering those critical structures, they are made read-only when shared.

Dedicated Stack. BPF programs require a 512-byte stack

space to store local variables and function frames. The verifier is in charge of determining if a program makes Out of Bound (OOB) accesses toward this stack. Thus, when the BPF program passes the static checks, its required stack is directly allocated from the kernel stack. However, as discussed in Sec. III, certain vulnerabilities may allow BPF programs to bypass this check at runtime. Given that this stack is utilized so frequently, we note that executing dynamic auditing on it, as MOAT does for helper calls (see Sec. IV-B2), would incur an unreasonable level of overhead. Thus, to prevent malicious BPF programs from tampering the kernel stack, one dedicated page is allocated as stack upon each execution of a BPF program, which is deallocated once it exits. A page pool is reserved for MOAT for efficient allocation/deallocation.

Runtime Context. The context refers to BPF program parameters, which vary depending on the BPF program types. For instance, if the BPF program serves as the filter attached to a particular socket, its runtime context is a pointer to the socket buffer, which stores packets for the attached socket. Since these contexts are not available until runtime, MOAT assigns these contexts to their designated PKS regions upon the entry point of each BPF program. Table I lists common BPF contexts: These contexts are rather simple and only a few of them are nested data structures (i.e., containing pointers to other structures). Thus, this assignment can be performed efficiently upon each entry point.

Incontiguous Maps. Despite the fact that there are over 30 distinct types of maps, their implementations can be roughly divided into only two types: Array maps and hash maps. The array maps are easy for MOAT to isolate since they are stored in a continuous form and of a fixed size. For these maps, MOAT determines its isolation when loading the BPF programs. The hash maps, however, are stored non-contiguously in the memory and can be dynamically expanded upon map insertion. This prevents MOAT from determining the addresses and sizes of the maps before executing the BPF programs. To overcome this issue, MOAT attaches to the `bpf_map_lookup_elem`, which is used to lookup a map entry and return its pointer. If the pointer is retrieved from a non-contiguous map, the memory to which it points is dynamically assigned to the BPF program. These entries are returned to the kernel once the program exits.

3) *Lifecycle of a BPF Program*: This section has described how MOAT uses PKS to grant a BPF program accesses to its necessary memory regions required to complete its task. This protects the kernel from being attacked by malicious BPF programs while allowing benign BPF programs to operate smoothly. We summarize all these details and depict the lifecycle of an isolated BPF program in Fig. 6.

B. Challenges for MOAT

The preceding section illustrates the overall procedure of MOAT. However, to effectively isolate a BPF program using PKS, MOAT needs to overcome the following obstacles.

C1: Limited Hardware Regions. In PKS, only 16 hardware keys are available. This means there can be no more than

TABLE I: BPF context of common program types.

Program Type	Context Type	Note
Socket Filter	<code>__sk_buff *</code>	Metadata of <code>sk_buff</code>
Socket Ops	<code>bpf_sock_ops *</code>	Socket events (timeout, retransmission, ...)
XDP	<code>xdp_md *</code>	Metadata of <code>xdp_buff</code>
Kprobe	<code>pt_regs *</code>	Register status
Tracepoints	Depending on Tracepoint Types	Relevant Tracepoint information
Perf Event	<code>bpf_perf_event_data *</code>	Perf. event (register status, sample period)
Cgroup Device	<code>bpf_cgroup_dev_ctx *</code>	Device ID, access type (read, write, ...)




Fig. 6: BPF program lifecycle under isolation of MOAT.

16 memory regions concurrently, but there may be significantly more than 16 BPF programs running in the kernel. To overcome this limitation, we propose a novel dynamical key allocation policy in Sec. IV-B1.

C2: Helpers. BPF is a complex ecosystem containing over 200 helper functions [1]. Unlike BPF programs, these helper functions must have access to certain kernel memory to function properly. Thus, MOAT must ensure that these helper functions are secure and not being abused. However, designing specific isolation policy for every one of these helpers requires massive human effort. Even worse, designing individualized isolation strategy for each helper may impede the applicability to helpers added in the future. To this end, we analyze these BPF helper functions with static analysis techniques and propose three general security isolation schemes in Sec. IV-B2.

1) *Dynamic Key Allocation:* Currently, PKS supports up to 16 memory regions, whose permissions are decided by a 32-bit PKR. Though works like `libmpk` [28, 53, 64] propose key virtualization to enable key sharing, these works typically focus on isolating userspace applications. Therefore, they rely on mechanisms that are exclusive to userspace. However, after examining their methods, we conclude that porting these userspace mechanisms to kernel is difficult, if at all possible. See further discussion on `libmpk` in Sec. VIII.

Intuitively, we may explore making key a shared resource; each BPF program will dynamically fetch and return a key upon its entry point and exit. Our tentative study shows that this approach works well with small BPF programs consuming few pages. Nevertheless, this approach may incur significant runtime overhead, as assigning these pages to a specific region upon each entry and exit can be time-consuming, particularly if the program is attached with large maps. For instance, a 512KB map consists of over 100 pages. If a BPF tracepoint program employs this map to log kernel events, there will be over 200 page assignments every time this BPF program is

invoked. These frequent assignments bring unacceptable overhead. Overall, given that frequent key retrieval and return is too expensive due to the presence of large BPF programs with many pages, we propose an adaptive dynamic key allocation scheme that shares keys across relatively small BPF programs and assigns fixed keys to large BPF programs.




Fig. 7: Adaptive key allocation.

As illustrated in Fig. 7, we divide PKS keys into two categories — dynamic keys and fixed keys. We allocate dynamic keys to small BPF programs, whose allocation procedure are specified as follows. ① Upon a BPF program P 's entry point, MOAT fetches a dynamic key and assigns this key to all pages of P . ② During the runtime, MOAT can detect if P accesses pages not assigned to it via PKS. ③ When P exits, all of its pages are returned to the kernel, and the key is deallocated. ④ If currently no key available when the kernel launches a BPF program, then this program is placed in a queue to wait. We admit that attackers may load many BPF programs and invoke their execution to cause congestion in the waiting queue, delaying certain BPF programs. However, such delaying also blocks the following up operations of that thread and results in the overall system slowdown (DoS), instead of “nullifying” the execution of certain key BPF programs (e.g., syscall filter). We presume that the kernel can rely on other mechanisms [22] to detect such DoS and alert users.

In contrast, fixed key allocation is straightforward. Once a large BPF program is loaded by the kernel, MOAT assigns a fixed key to it. In extreme cases where multiple large BPF programs are loaded into the kernel, and fixed keys are insufficient, the smallest and least frequently invoked BPF program running will be evicted to use dynamic keys.

We need to decide a threshold to determine whether a BPF program is “small” or “large.” Note that the current BPF subsystem only accepts programs that with fewer than 4,096 instructions, which occupy about eight pages. Considering that the majority of BPF programs use a small map to communicate with userspace, we select ten pages as the threshold for dynamic key allocation. That is, a BPF program using up to

ten pages is configured to use dynamic keys, whereas BPF programs with more than ten pages uses fixed keys. Our experiments in Appendix B show that dynamic key allocation imposes a moderate overhead on programs under ten pages.

Flexible Key Configuration. In MOAT, one can specify the number of dynamic and fixed keys. Note that this configuration is flexible, meaning with sufficient keys, all BPF programs can be allocated with fixed keys regardless of their sizes. MOAT begins gradually converting fixed keys into dynamic keys to meet the need of BPF programs, only when the keys are insufficient (e.g., when there are over 16 BPF programs).

2) *Helper Security Mechanism:* As interfaces between kernel and BPF programs, a set of BPF helper functions has been provided for kernel interaction. Since these helpers serve as interfaces, one may question if those helpers can access certain kernel memory to function properly. If so, these helpers may be leveraged by malicious BPF programs to launch attacks. Thus, MOAT has to prevent these helpers from being abused. However, there are over 200 helpers provided by the BPF subsystem; it is impractical to design individual protection policy for each one. To overcome this obstacle, we first manually investigate all available helper functions and characterize their memory access behaviors. Our findings, as noted below, justify the necessity of designing two general, helper-agnostic defenses.

Analyzing all helper functions requires a substantial amount of human effort. At this step, two authors spend about 80 man-hours to examine the source code of helper functions. Each author has an in-depth knowledge of BPF programs and kernel security. Moreover, we use a popular static pointer analysis framework, *SVF* [57, 58], to assist our review by providing the variable dependency information. *SVF* performs sparse value flow analysis to establish value flow and pointer analysis results. *SVF* has been widely used to analyze large-size production software [56], and we use the default flow-sensitive pointer analysis [57] provided by *SVF*. Specifically, we use it to track the value flow of the parameters of these helper functions. Two authors review the results of *SVF* and also manually review the helper source code to decide if a helper function accesses kernel memory or just operates on its own arguments. In practice, we find that *SVF* is quite accurate. Overall, with human expertise and *SVF*, we ensure the credibility of our analysis to a great extent.

Our findings, as summarized in the first two columns of Table II, show that most of the helpers perform read or even write operations toward kernel memory. In particular, based on the above analysis, we divide 260 BPF helper functions into five types. As in Table II, the first type (No Arg.) has no arguments, which does not need any extra protection. The second type (Pure Arg.) operates solely on its own arguments and does not access kernel memory, which is also safe. The third type (Read Only) accesses kernel in a read-only manner, and the forth type (Write) may use its argument to modify the kernel memory. The fifth type (Other) includes helpers that are hard to categorize. For example, `bpf_loop` is the auxiliary function that simplifies the verification process of loops. Note

that the last three types may interact with the kernel space and potentially cause unauthorized access or kernel exploitations by being abused by malicious BPF programs. That is, it is reasonable to assume that attackers may manipulate the parameters of these helpers to launch attacks. Thus, we design the following two mechanisms to ensure helper security.

TABLE II: BPF helper analysis result. CRP denotes critical region protection, and DPA denotes dynamic parameter auditing. We separate potentially vulnerable helpers (last three types) with a bold line.

Type	#	Example	Defense
No Arg.	30	<code>bpf_get_retval()</code>	No Need
Pure Arg.	16	<code>bpf_stncmp()</code>	No Need
Read Only	75	<code>bpf_get_stackid_tp()</code>	CRP/DPA
Write	129	<code>bpf_skb_set_timestamp()</code>	CRP/DPA
Other	10	<code>bpf_loop()</code>	CRP/DPA




Fig. 8: Critical region protection (CRP).

Critical Region Protection (CRP) in Kernel. Though many helpers only access kernel in a read-only manner, they may still be abused to probe sensitive data of the kernel, such as `task_struct`. Moreover, a considerable number of helpers, as illustrated in Table II, may modify kernel memory. To prevent such abuse, we protect these critical kernel regions with PKS. As shown in Fig. 8, instead of treating the entire kernel memory as a whole, we divide it into normal regions and critical regions. Permissions of these critical regions are managed via an additional key. When entering helper functions, instead of setting the entire kernel space as access-enabled (EN), those critical memory regions remain access-disabled (AD), preventing any access to these regions. Once the helper finishes, these normal regions will be set back to access-disabled (AD) to avoid potential security risk. It is worth noting these critical memory regions do *not* vary with helpers. That is, only helpers manipulated by attackers (e.g., via deliberately crafted helper parameters) may attempt to access these critical regions. These critical regions can be specified in the configurations of MOAT.

BPF Instructions	Static Register Value Inferred by Verifier	Runtime Register Values for Each Instruction	
		r0	r1
<code>r0 = 0x10</code>	r0 = 0x10	0x10	0xbe ...
<code>r1 = r0 + 0x1</code>	r0 = 0x10 r1 = 0x11	0x10	0x11 ...
<code>call BPF_HELPER</code>	r0 = 0x10 r1 = 0x11	0x10	0x11 ...

Fig. 9: Register value tracking of the verifier. While the verifier can indeed deduce a possible value *range* of each register, for simplicity, we use a value *point* (e.g., `r1 = 0x11`) here.

Dynamic Parameter Auditing (DPA). To further regulate helpers, we propose dynamic parameters auditing (DPA),

which leverages the information obtained from the BPF verifier to dynamically check if the parameters are within their legitimate ranges. As illustrated in Fig. 9, the verifier can deduce the value range of each register via static analysis (as a practical assumption, we allow the statically deduced value ranges to be *invalid*; see below for clarification). MOAT logs such value range information, and during runtime, MOAT serves as a “gateway” when the BPF program enters a helper function to check if the provided parameters are within the verifier-deduced value ranges. In our example, we can check if `r0==0x10; r1==0x11` when `BPF_HELPER` is called. If the parameter runtime values do not match with the static analysis results, the BPF program is terminated immediately.

Clarification. In the aforementioned DPA strategy, one may question if the expected “legitimate value ranges” inferred by the verifier are correct. To clarify this issue, we list all possible cases of a BPF variable v ’s value ranges and system states in Table III; our discussions are as follows.

TABLE III: Four cases of a BPF variable v ’s value ranges. R denotes the runtime value of v , D denotes the verifier’s deduced value of v , E denotes verifier’s *expected* legitimate value range of v , while T denotes the *ground truth* legitimate value range of v .

	R	D	E	T	State
1	0x10	0x10	[0, 0x20]	[0, 0x20]	✓
2	0xba	0xba	[0, 0x20]	[0, 0x20]	✓
3	0xba	0x10	[0, 0x20]	[0, 0x20]	✓
4	0xba	0xba	[0, 0xba]	[0, 0x20]	✗

Case 1 illustrates the value range of a variable v in a benign BPF program. The runtime value aligns with verifier’s deduction which further falls within the *expected* and *true* legitimate value ranges simultaneously ($R = D \in E = T$, see the caption of Table III). Case 2 demonstrates the value range of a variable v in a malformed BPF program. The runtime value 0xba is out of bound and this invalid value is detected by the verifier through static analysis. Therefore, this program is rejected by the verifier and the system remains safe ($R = D \notin E = T$). Case 3 shows the value range of v in a malicious BPF program. The runtime value 0xba is out of bound. However, this malicious value is hidden from the verifier through corner-case operations (e.g., sign extension, truncation). Due to incomplete analysis, the verifier deduces that v ’s value is 0x10, which is within the verifier’s expectation. Since DPA operates in the runtime and checks whether the runtime value actually matches the verifier’s deduction, this mismatch is then detected by DPA and this malicious BPF program is terminated ($R \neq D \in E = T$).

While the above three cases cannot be exploited, Case 4 implies a scenario where DPA fails and the helper is abused. The verifier’s *expected* value range differs from the *ground truth*, legitimate value range. This discrepancy allows an out of bound value 0xba to be passed as an argument to a helper for exploitation. For this to occur, the following conditions shall be satisfied simultaneously: ① The verifier makes *incorrect* expectation (i.e., $E \neq T$). ② The incorrect expectation E is *unsafe* (i.e., $T - E$ overlaps exploitable structure). ③ The BPF program is carefully tweaked to be aligned with D and evade DPA (i.e., $R = D$). For BPF programs, E is usually

straightforward to obtain by the verifier statically (e.g., E encodes the array size). It is thus hard to satisfy ① and ② simultaneously. For today’s known BPF exploitations (all of which fall into Case 3), the verifier makes correct expectation $E = T$ but incomplete deduction $R \neq D$; therefore, the discrepancy $E \neq T$ is never encountered in practice.

Also, though it may be technically feasible to perform dynamic auditing to validate the data facts after executing every BPF instruction, it is apparently too costly. MOAT thus leverages PKS to deliver a low-cost and principled isolation.

Hybrid Usage. We summarize the applicability of these three defense mechanisms in Table II. On the one hand, DPA protects helpers from being abused by ensuring the validity of their parameters. On the other hand, even if the helpers are already compromised, CRP can still protect the kernel from these compromised helpers. Thus, combining these mechanisms together improves the overall security for both BPF helpers and the kernel. Moreover, we want to emphasize that these defenses are not dependent on a specific helper. Instead, they are applicable to helper groups, as listed in Table II. Though it can be argued both defenses may be evaded in extreme circumstances, we believe the attack feasibility is very low (if it exists at all), given that the BPF program itself has been isolated by MOAT and these helpers constitute a relatively minor attack surface. Our investigation on existing vulnerabilities supports this assumption.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

MOAT is written in 2,075 lines of C code, as a loadable kernel module for portability.³ We explain key points below.

Portable Implementation. The major components of MOAT are implemented as hooks to replace their corresponding kernel functions. This is accomplished using an existing kernel hook utility named `ftrace` [6]. This introduces a small amount of overhead, but it allows these major components to be kernel-agnostic and can be easily ported across different kernel versions. Though the overhead of the current MOAT prototype is reasonable (see details in Sec. VI-B), we anticipate to further reduce the performance overhead of MOAT, if it is implemented via directly modifying kernel.

Kernel Interrupt Handling. Though the major components of MOAT are implemented as loadable modules, certain low-level codes still require direct kernel modification. For instance, during the execution of BPF programs, an interrupt may occur and take over the control flow to its handler. Note that most interrupt handlers require access to kernel memory and as a result, the PKS would presumably raise spurious alerts. Thus, we need to temporarily disable PKS inside these handlers and re-enable it once the handlers are finished. The modified code is shown in Fig. 10. Additionally, the exception handler of the kernel is also modified to support terminating and detaching malicious BPF programs upon violation.

Granularity of PKS. Since protection keys are associated with memory pages, MOAT can only protect memory in the

³We will release the codebase of MOAT once this paper is published. We will maintain MOAT to benefit the community and follow-up research.


```

1  mov  %cr4,%rbx
2  push %rbx                ; save CR4
3  and  $0xfffffffffffffff, %rbx ; clear CR4.PKS
4  mov  %rbx,%cr4
5  call \cfunc              ; invoke handler
6  pop  %rbx
7  mov  %rbx,%cr4          ; restore CR4

```

Fig. 10: The modified kernel interrupt handler in `entry_64.S`.

granularity of a page, which is generally 4KB. However, the objects used by BPF programs are not necessarily aligned to 4KB, which may interleave with critical kernel structures. Therefore, granting BPF programs access to these objects may also enable access to such critical structures and lead to exploitation. To prevent this, we have modified BPF-related objects (e.g., maps) so that they are page-aligned and do not interleave with other kernel structures.

VI. EVALUATION

To evaluate MOAT, we first analyze how MOAT mitigates various attack interfaces, and then benchmark its CVEs detectability in Sec. VI-A. We then assess the performance of MOAT under different BPF program setups in Sec. VI-B. Lastly, the functionality of MOAT is tested using various types of BPF programs and under different scenarios in Sec. VI-C2.

A. Security Evaluation

1) *Analysis of Attack Surface Mitigation:* We first systematically analyze how MOAT mitigates five representative attack interfaces presented in the BPF ecosystem. These potential attack interfaces are illustrated in Fig. 11.




Fig. 11: Analysis of mitigating potential attack surfaces.

① **Arbitrary Kernel Accesses.** Currently, the most prevalent threat to the BPF ecosystem is the ability of malicious BPF programs to arbitrarily modify kernel memory. In order to accomplish this, these BPF programs typically employ corner-case operations to deceive the verifier during the loading phase and to behave maliciously during runtime. This type of attack is effectively mitigated due to the fact that MOAT derives the necessary memory regions of each BPF program and uses PKS to prevent any runtime access beyond this region (Sec. IV-A), mitigating such illegal accesses.

② **Helper Function Abuse.** Apart from launching attack directly from BPF programs, a malicious BPF program may carefully prepare parameter values by exploiting similar corner-cases operations in ① and pass them to abuse certain helpers. To prevent such abuse, MOAT features three security enforcement schemes (Sec. IV-B2) to dynamically audit helper parameters and also protect critical kernel memory regions

during the execution of these helpers. Thus, the attacker can no longer take advantage of these helpers.

③ **PTE Corruption.** A page’s PKS region is configured via its PTE. Consequently, a malicious BPF program may attempt to tamper these PTEs to disable MOAT. However, this is impossible since MOAT sets these PTEs as access-disabled; they are thus protected by PKS like other kernel resources.

④ **Descriptor Table Tampering.** Descriptor tables like GDT and IDT are essential for segmentation and interrupt handling. Since they are needed for these critical functions, blindly setting them as access-disabled would cause system crashes. However, since these descriptor tables are only accessed in a read-only manner, MOAT sets them as write-disabled to thwart any tampering made by malicious BPF programs. This effectively prevents malicious BPF programs from compromising the kernel using these tables.

⑤ **Hardware Configuration Tampering.** Besides memory-based attacks discussed above, attackers may also directly disable PKS through hardware configurations. As described in Sec. II, `CR4.PKS` and `IA32_PKRS` are two critical registers for configuring PKS. One may disable PKS via modifying these two registers. However, both registers can only be modified via special instructions, and BPF instruction sets do not include any of these. Therefore, BPF bytecodes containing these instructions are rejected immediately. Since the BPF programs are set to $W \oplus X$ (meaning write and executable permissions cannot be simultaneously enabled), adding these instructions via self-modification is also impossible.

⑥ **Return-Oriented Programming.** Two properties of BPF ISA prevent potential control-flow hijacking attacks like return-oriented programming (ROP). First, BPF only supports jump instructions with *constant and instruction-level* offsets. This means the destinations of jumps are trivially known during the compile time and there are no *unintended ROP gadgets* (jump between instructions) like x86 [12]. Secondly, as a specialized ISA, BPF does not include any instructions that may modify hardware configurations such as `XRSTOR` and `WRMSR`. These two properties allow MOAT to perform reliable detection of invalid instructions and prevent BPF programs from tampering hardware settings.

⑦ **Attacks in PKU Pitfalls [18].** We carefully examined attacks mentioned in PKU Pitfalls [18], which focuses on breaking PKU, the user variant of MPK. Their noted attacks can be roughly categorized into three types. The first type manipulates memory mappings to subvert PKU, such as modifying userland PTEs and mutable backup. These attacks are feasible in userland since user applications can leverage certain syscalls (e.g., `mremap`) to change their own mapping and then compromise PKU. However, none of those syscalls is available to BPF programs and there is no helper that can manipulate kernel memory mappings. The second type involves tampering the saved state of `PKRU` and disabling PKU entirely upon restoration. Unlike PKU, MOAT exclusively manages the saved state of `IA32_PKRS`, which is further protected via CRP, making these attacks infeasible. The third type relies on mechanisms that are exclusive to the userland (e.g., using

seccomp to intercept syscalls) and is not applicable to MOAT.

2) *Real-world CVE Evaluation*: We analyzed all nine BPF CVEs rooted from runtime memory exploitation; these CVEs fall within the application scope of MOAT. Since these exploitations typically lead to arbitrary kernel accesses, they all result in privilege escalation and impose a severe security threat to the kernel. As listed in Table IV, five of these vulnerabilities have PoC exploits available to the public and are evaluated at this step.

We report that MOAT can successfully mitigate all of them. We clarify that these five are *not* cherry-picked; the untested four only have high-level text descriptions without further details or any PoC, making it extremely hard for us to build a workable exploit based on these descriptions alone. Instead, we thoroughly analyze these four vulnerabilities. Due to their conceptual similarity to the other five tested cases, it should be accurate to conclude that these four can also be mitigated by MOAT. For instance, though there is no exploit for CVE-2021-3444, it shares the same logistics with CVE-2021-31440, albeit with different BPF instructions. Note that both originate from incorrect truncation. Since CVE-2021-31440 is mitigated by MOAT, we would believe the same for CVE-2021-3444.

To clarify, there are also other BPF CVEs caused by issues such as race condition, speculation, or miscellaneous implementation bugs. These vulnerabilities typically cause information leakage or DoS, whereas all memory exploitations lead to privilege escalation. As stated in our threat model, defending these attacks is orthogonal to our work. See Appendix A for a complete list of these CVEs and our discussion.

TABLE IV: BPF CVE detectability evaluation. ● denotes experimented and mitigated by MOAT. ○ denotes the CVEs share conceptually identical patterns, though they lack available PoC exploit.

CVE ID	Description	Status
2022-2785 [45]	Incorrect Instruction Rewrite	○
2022-23222 [44]	Mischeck <code>*_OR_NULL</code> Pointer	●
2021-45402 [43]	Incorrect <code>MOV32</code> Bound	○
2021-3490 [42]	Incorrect <code>ALU32</code> Bound	●
2021-31440 [39]	Incorrect 32-bit Truncation	●
2021-3444 [41]	Incorrect <code>MOD32</code> Truncation	○
2021-33200 [40]	Incorrect Pointer Arithmetic	○
2020-8835 [38]	Incorrect 32-bit Bound	●
2020-27194 [37]	Incorrect <code>OR32</code> Bound	●

CVE Case Study. To better explain how MOAT mitigates these CVEs, we elaborate on the exploit paths for two of them, CVE-2022-23222 and CVE-2020-27194.

CVE-2022-23222 is a pointer mischeck vulnerability introduced via a rather new feature of BPF named `bpf_ringbuf`. This new feature was brought to BPF in 2020 along with a new pointer type named `PTR_TO_MEM_OR_NULL`. However, the verifier had not been updated to track the bounds of this new type, resulting in this vulnerability. As illustrated in Fig. 12, the malicious payload first retrieves a `nullptr` via `bpf_ringbuf_reserve` (line 1), which returns this newly-added pointer type named `PTR_TO_MEM_OR_NULL`. Since this new type is not tracked by the verifier, the payload can bypass pointer checks by convincing the verifier that `r1` is `0x0` when it is actually `0x1` (line 3). This pointer can

then be multiplied with any offset to perform arbitrary kernel accesses (line 9). However, such arbitrary access violates PKS immediately and is terminated by MOAT (line 10).

```

1  r0 = bpf_ringbuf_reserve(fd, INT_MAX, 0)
2  r1 = r0 // R:r0=0;r1=0 V:r0=r1=?
3  r1 = r0 + 1 // R:r0=0;r1=1 V:r0=r1=?
4  if (r0 != nullptr) { // R:r0=0;r1=1 V:r0=r1=?
5      ringbuf_discard(r0, 1)
6      exit(2)
7  }
8  off = <OOB addr> // R:r0=0;r1=1 V:r0=r1=0
9  off = off * r1 // R:off=<OOB addr> V:off=0
10 * (ptr+off) = 0xbad // PKS violation!

```

Fig. 12: Code snippet of CVE-2022-23222. R denotes variable runtime statuses. V denotes verifier-deduced values of variables.

CVE-2020-27194 is a vulnerability due to incorrect truncation. As in Fig. 13, the user first inputs an arbitrary value in the range of `[0, 0x600000001]` (line 1). Then, two conditional clauses help the verifier to determine its value range (line 3 and line 5). However, when tracking the `BPF_OR` operator (line 7), the verifier performs a wrong truncation on its upper bound. After the truncation, the user-controlled `r5` is viewed by the verifier as a legitimate constant scalar `0x1` (line 7), which can later be used as the offset to perform arbitrary accesses to the kernel (line 8). Similarly, such accesses can be detected by MOAT and terminated instantly.

```

1  r5 = <OOB addr>
2  r6 = 0x600000002
3  if (r5 >= r6) // R&V:r5<=0x600000001
4      exit(2)
5  if (r5 <= 0) // R&V:0x1<=r5<=0x600000001
6      exit(2)
7  r5 = r5 | 0 // R:r5=<OOB addr> V: r5=0x1
8  * (ptr+r5)=0xbad // PKS violation!

```

Fig. 13: Code snippet of CVE-2020-27194. R denotes variable runtime statuses. V denotes verifier-deduced values of variables.

B. Performance Evaluation

We assess MOAT performance overhead on Linux v5.19 and a 14-core Intel 12700H. As a common setup, the cycle and time statistics are measured via the `rdtscp` instruction and the kernel utility `get_ktime_raw`, respectively.

1) *Micro Benchmark*: For micro benchmark, we measure the CPU cycles of four key operations in MOAT. We list the the four operations in Table V. `switch_pks` enables/disables PKS by setting/clearing the corresponding control bit in CR4. `set_pkr` changes region permissions by changing `IA32_PKR` via `WRMSR`. `get_pkr` returns current permission configuration by reading `IA32_PKR` via `RDMRS`. `assign_page` changes the permission region of one page by modifying its PTE. Each operation is measured by averaging ten runs of one million invocations to eliminate randomness.

As Table V shows, the most expensive operation is `assign_page()` which modifies the region one page belongs to, including locating its PTE and changing specific bits within. Notably, setting and getting the region permissions (`set_pkr/get_pkr`) in PKS is much more expensive than its userspace variant in `libmpk` [53] (see

TABLE V: Micro benchmark results. As a reference [53], userspace RDPKRU, WRPKRU, and pkey_assign take 0.5, 23.3, and 1104.9 cycles, respectively.

Operation	# Cycle	Note
switch_pks	4.2	Set/Clear CR4.PKS
set_pkr/WRMSR	71.7	Set region permissions
get_pkr/RDMSR	25.8	Get region permissions
assign_page	99.4	Assign a page to region

the caption of Table V). We presume that this is because in PKU, the region permission is controlled via a dedicated register named PKRU with two special instructions RDPKRU/WRPKRU, whereas in PKS employed by MOAT, its region permission is stored in an MSR named IA32_PKRS without any special instruction. To configure the permission in IA32_PKRS, one has to use the expensive RDMSR/WRMSR instructions with the MSR ID 0x6E1. Similarly, directly enabling/disabling PKS via switch_pks also takes fewer cycle than set_pkr. As for the performance difference between pkey_assign in libmpk and MOAT’s assign_page, we presume that this is because pkey_assign serves as a syscall for userspace, which involves costly context switch, whereas MOAT operates in the kernel without these overheads.

Since configuring permission via set_pkr is more expensive than switch_pks, on situations where MOAT needs to temporarily switch back to kernel regions (e.g., interrupt handling), it uses switch_pks to disable PKS instead of using set_pkr. Then, before returning to BPF programs, we reactivate PKS to maintain isolation.

2) *Macro Benchmark:* To prepare the macro benchmark suite, we consider the following properties.

- (a) To test the performance of fixed and dynamic key allocation, BPF programs of varying sizes should be included.
- (b) The number of BPF programs should exceed the number of available keys to test MOAT in situations where hardware keys are insufficient.
- (c) The BPF programs should be highly parallel to evaluate the waiting time when dynamic keys are insufficient.
- (d) The execution order should reflect actual system behavior with high enough frequency to stress MOAT.

To simultaneously fulfill these requirements, we prepare macro benchmark as follows. We choose seven different events frequently triggered in the kernel, which are sys_open, sys_close, sys_read, sys_write, sched_switch, page_fault_user, and page_fault_kernel. These events are of high frequency (e.g., sched_switch occurs on every context switch) and can reflect actual BPF running behavior. For each of these events, we attach three BPF tracepoints of varying sizes to log this event. This ensures that these BPF programs are highly parallel.

MOAT Configuration. In both regular and extreme cases (see below), we choose the configuration as follows: the threshold for dynamic key allocation is ten pages. The number of fixed keys is nine, while the number of dynamic keys is four. Three keys are reserved for the kernel memory region, the shared region (i.e., IDT, GDT), helper protection (i.e., CRP), respectively. During these experiments, both helper

protections (CRP/DPA) are enabled whenever applicable. CRP is configured for MOAT’s own memory regions (e.g., saved state of PKS), which can be extended to other critical regions (e.g., PTEs) if needed. All evaluation are based on the BPF interpreter. See Sec. VIII for details about BPF JIT.

Regular Case. In the regular case, we attach each one of these events with three types of BPF tracepoints, i.e., small (1 page), medium (10 pages) and large (200 pages). We run each setup ten times, and each run consists of 1,000 invocations of each tracepoint. The average results are reported in Fig. 14. We find that even in the worst case, MOAT imposes a moderate overhead of less than 30%. This overhead occurs when launching the medium-size BPF program attached to the event page_fault_kernel. Since its size (10 pages) does not exceed the threshold of dynamic key allocation, it has to repetitively assign and return the dynamic key to its pages upon every entry point and exit. Moreover, though MOAT’s *relative* slowdown on page_fault_kernel is near 30%, the *absolute* overhead is still quite low (about 200 ns). Overall, we interpret the performance penalty is aligned with our expectation, and the overall overhead is reasonable.

All large-size BPF programs exceed the size threshold of dynamic key allocation. Therefore, MOAT assigns fixed keys to them during their loading phase without runtime overhead. The incurred overheads are generally moderate: for all cases, the overheads are under 10%. Moreover, the overheads for those small-size BPF programs are all under 16%, which lie between the large-size and the medium-size ones.

Apart from the total overhead reported above, we also investigate the *waiting* overhead, which is the amount of time a BPF program must wait if there is no dynamic key available. Note that in the regular cases above, 14 programs are smaller than the page number threshold; they are configured to use the dynamic key allocation scheme, though there are only four dynamic keys available. Their waiting statistics are shown in Table VI. It is seen that though the average waiting time is near 1 μ s, less than 1% BPF executions really experience this delay. Considering there are 14 running processes and only four dynamic keys available, we can conclude that the dynamic key allocation policy handles parallelism reasonably well. Moreover, this also shows that four dynamic keys are sufficient for most scenarios; adding more dynamic keys brings marginal benefit.

TABLE VI: Waiting time statistics.

Avg. (ns)	Waited Avg. (ns)	Waited Max. (ns)	# Waited
7.1	915.2	2559	0.8%

Extreme Cases. The above regular cases only evaluate MOAT under situations where dynamic keys are limited but fixed keys are sufficient. Here, we further explore MOAT’s overhead via extreme cases. Instead of attaching three BPF programs of varying sizes, as we did in the regular cases above, in the extreme case evaluation we attach three large (200 pages) BPF programs to each tracepoint. Under this setting, there are only ten fixed keys available, though there are 21 large-size BPF programs, requiring dynamic key allocation for over half of these programs. Since each of these programs contains




Fig. 14: Regular macro benchmark. The upper legends (e.g., 1.09) denote the relative slowdown, and the lower ones (e.g., 1750) denote the absolute execution time in nanosecond.

over 200 pages, there are a large number of page assignments occurring upon their program entry points and exits.

TABLE VII: Extreme overhead.

Static Keys (ns)		Dynamic Keys (ns)		Waited	# Waited
Avg.	Max.	Avg.	Max.		
140.7	202.8	3630	4401	1968.1	4%

We report the evaluation results of extreme cases in Table VII. We find that MOAT imposes a negligible overhead to BPF programs that use fixed keys even under such extreme cases. And for those large BPF programs that use dynamic keys, the average overhead is still reasonably low (around $3.6\mu s$). Overall, we point out that real-life scenarios seldomly require this many BPF programs with large maps running concurrently. Moreover, the currently observed overhead can be further reduced by sharing these large maps between BPF programs, thereby reducing the need for fixed keys. We also report that the waiting time due to the shortage of dynamic keys shows a similar pattern to the regular cases. Though the average waiting time is near $2\mu s$, less than 5% of the executions would experience this delay.

Evaluations on Helper Protections. We measure the cost of two helper protections (CRP/DPA) individually and report their overheads in Table VIII. Our preliminary analysis shows that CRP does not introduce additional cost; only a different `IA32_PKRS` value is used to restrict helpers' access to kernel memory regions. DPA checks helper arguments against the verifier's results, whose cost correlates with the number of involved arguments. We clarify that a BPF helper can have at most five arguments.

TABLE VIII: Helpers protection overhead.

DPA ~ #Arg 1 - 5 (ns)					CRP (ns)
11.3	22.4	33.6	44.6	58.3	47.8

We interpret that the experiment results are aligned with our expectation. All three mechanisms only impose a generally low overhead, and the overhead of DPA correlates with the number of helper arguments.

C. Real-world Applications

1) *memcache Port Forwarding.* To evaluate the performance of MOAT under real-world scenarios, we setup a BPF port forwarding program which redirects incoming requests to the `memcached` [25] memory database. To prepare the benchmark, we choose YCSB [19] to generate six distinct workloads and test the overall throughput of the `memcached` service. The results are shown in Fig. 15. From the figure, we can see that MOAT imposes on average 6% (up to 14%) slowdown to the overall performance of the BPF-based port forwarding, which is acceptable considering the security

benefits MOAT provides. Note that this overhead is far less than the worst overhead we observed from the regular/extreme cases above, which further justifies our assumption that BPF programs are invoked less frequently in real-world applications than in extreme cases.




Fig. 15: Overall throughput of the `memcached` case study.

2) *bcc Toolbox.* To show that MOAT is able to support various BPF features, we select seven BPF applications with varying functionalities from the famous `bcc` toolbox [54]. Among them, `execsnoop` and `opensnoop` are used for kernel profiling, recording different system events; `tcptrace` and `net_monitor` are used for network monitoring, collecting packet statistics; `xdp_drop`, `xdp_cpu` and `xdp_interface` can be used for packet filtering scenarios such as firewalls and load balancing, redirecting or dropping packages. These applications cover the majority of contemporary BPF ecosystem usage scenarios. After securing these applications with MOAT, we examine the runtime status of these applications and confirm that they are operating correctly and are not affected by MOAT. Furthermore, Fig. 16 reports the performance evaluation results of these applications with MOAT enabled. The extra overhead incurred by MOAT under different scenarios is reasonably low. Overall, the evaluation shows that MOAT can be smoothly applied to secure de facto BPF applications under various scenarios with minimal engineering effort and moderate cost.




Fig. 16: Application benchmark. The upper legends (e.g., 1.06) denote the relative slowdown, and the lower ones (e.g., 8153) denote the absolute execution time in nanosecond.

VII. RELATED WORK

In-Kernel Isolation. Most existing works [9–11, 13, 15, 24, 27, 31, 51, 63, 67] on kernel isolation focuses kernel components like device drivers and file systems, which are distinct from BPF programs and hence cannot be reused directly in our scenario. Existing works can be roughly divided into three categories: virtualization, Software Fault Isolation (SFI), and formal methods. Narayanan et al. [51] propose LVD, which

isolates kernel components in a virtualized environment. Based on LVD, Huang et al. [31] split kernel modules into individual components for finer-grained isolation. SFI is employed to instrument programs at the source or binary level [11, 13, 24]. These works ensure kernel security by inserting pointer checks prior to memory accesses. Furthermore, formal methods enable principled isolation of kernel components, e.g., separating kernel code from untrusted drivers [63], or verifying file system correctness [9, 15].

We believe none of these methods are readily re-usable in our BPF scenario. Virtualization methods [10, 31, 51, 67] require placing the program in a separated address space, making it hard for BPF programs to interact (via helpers) with the kernel; see our discussion on kernel space virtualization in Sec. VIII. SFI [11, 13, 24] is based on program (compile-time) instrumentation. Holistically speaking, similar concepts have already been adopted by the BPF verifier which forbids developers to dereference a pointer without checking its bound explicitly. However, the verifier still suffers from vulnerabilities mentioned in Sec. III. Lastly, the BPF verifier itself performs formal verification, which shares conceptually similar advantage and drawbacks with existing formal method-based kernel isolation methods [9, 15, 63]; MOAT employs hardware extensions to offer more principled BPF isolation.

MPK-Based Isolation. Prior to PKS, Intel first announced its userspace variant PKU. Consequently, most existing works [29, 53, 60] using MPK focus on userspace isolation. To better utilize PKU as an isolation primitive, Park et al. [53] proposed `libmpk` that resolves the semantic discrepancies between PKU and conventional `mprotect`. There are also works [29, 60] that leverage PKU to protect confidential data. Apart of using PKU to isolate normal user applications, efforts are made to isolate trusted applications in SGX via PKU [16, 35]. SGXLock [16] establishes mutual distrust between kernel and the trusted SGX applications, while `EnclaveDom` [35] enables intra-isolation within one enclave. PKU has been used for kernel security [27, 59] as well. `IskiOS` [27] applies PKU to kernel pages by marking them as user-owned, while Sung et al. [59] employ PKU to protect userspace unikernels.

BPF Security. There are contemporary works [26, 33, 34, 52, 62] on securing the BPF ecosystem. However, most of them use formal methods to enhance the following BPF components: the verifier, the JIT compiler, and the BPF program itself. To enhance the BPF verifier, Gershuni et al. [26] propose `PREVAIL` based on abstract interpretation [20], which supports more program structures (e.g., loops) and is more efficient than the standard verifier. `PRSafe` [34], on the other hand, designs a new domain-specific language, whose ultimate goal is to build a mathematically verifiable compiler for BPF programs. As for the BPF JIT compiler, Jitk [62] denotes a JIT compiler whose correctness is proven manually. Further, Nelson et al. [52] propose `Jitterbug` to generate automated proof for real-world BPF JIT compilers. Lastly, Luke Nelson [33] build proof-carrying BPF programs, requiring developers to provide a correctness proof alongside with the program before loading it into the kernel.

VIII. DISCUSSION

Kernel Space Key Virtualization. There exist several works [28, 53, 64] on virtualizing MPK. However, all of them focus on the virtualization of userspace MPK, and thus rely on mechanisms that are exclusive to the userspace.

In `libmpk` [53], when there is no available hardware key, `libmpk` just invokes `mprotect` to change the page permission. This is efficient when protecting a single confidential memory region in the userspace. However, MOAT aims to protect the kernel space from malicious BPF programs and setting the entire kernel space as inaccessible via page permission is too costly and practically hard, if at all possible.

Both EPK [28] and VDom [64] adopt the idea of virtualizing keys via separated user address spaces. However, to implement this in the kernel, these individual address spaces have to be compatible to various low-level kernel routines (e.g., interrupt handling, memory management). As Linux is a monolith kernel with a huge codebase, we tend to believe that splitting it into multiple address spaces without impeding its functionality is extremely hard, if at all possible.

Scalability via Clustering. Though our dynamic key allocation scheme has shown reasonably good performance in Sec. VI, there remain cases where over 100 distinct BPF programs are needed (e.g., containers, cloud servers). In these cases, MOAT can be extended to cluster BPF programs (e.g., within the same container) together, depending on the exact setup. For example, the admin may configure MOAT to allocate a same key to all BPF programs from the same user, which shall effectively reduce the demand for keys in these cases.

Platform Migration. The current prototype implementation of MOAT is based on MPK, a hardware extension available on Intel platforms. Below, we discuss migrating MOAT to other platforms with similar hardware extensions.

ARM Memory Domains. “Domain” is a MPK-like feature supported since ARMv7 [2]. It employs 4-bit domain keys in PTEs and a Domain Access Control Register (DACR) in supervisor mode. Following a similar rationale to MPK, DACR allows accesses to be configured as denied, fully-allowed, or the same as PTEs. Since this feature is only supported on first-level and section-level PTEs, the domain boundaries must be aligned to 1 megabyte. Due to the similarity between this feature and MPK, we expect MOAT to be implemented on ARM with a moderate effort using this feature.

RISC-V Domain Keys. As an open-source architecture, there exists a hardware extension on the RISC-V platform that supports similar features as MPK named `Donky` [55]. `Donky` leverages ten unused bits in the PTEs as a protection key, hence supporting 1,024 permission regions. `Donky` also introduces a 64-bit `DKRU` register with four key slots. Each slot can be loaded with a 10-bit protection key. Only when a key is loaded in `DKRU` can its associated region be accessed. From the description above, we interpret that `Donky` is quite flexible, and therefore, MOAT may be smoothly implemented on RISC-V using `Donky`.

BPF JIT Support. As described in Sec. II, there are two ways of executing a BPF program: directly interpreting the BPF

bytecode, or using a JIT compiler for improved performance. Our prototype implementation of MOAT is based on the BPF interpreter. However, we note that the design of MOAT is compatible with the JIT compiler. First, the PKS is configured at the entry and exit points of running a BPF program, which is independent of the BPF program execution method. Second, the operations that MOAT performs during the BPF execution, such as helper auditing, are implemented as part of BPF helpers and also decoupled from how BPF programs are executed. Therefore, MOAT is essentially agnostic about the BPF program execution method, and it is adaptive to the native code produced by the BPF JIT compiler. Moreover, unlike the JIT compiler in Java virtual machine (JVM), which compiles only hotspot code chunks of Java bytecode each time, the BPF JIT compiler compiles the entire BPF program bytecode into native code at once. This further reduces the effort of adapting MOAT to BPF programs compiled by JIT.

JIT is designed to improve the performance of BPF programs. Therefore, we envision that JIT can further increase the overall efficiency of MOAT-enhanced BPF programs. To clarify, the interpreter indeed has its own overhead comparing to JITed BPF programs and may “hide” the *relative* performance penalty brought by MOAT. However, we report that from our evaluation, the *absolute* overhead brought by MOAT is very limited (typically less than 1,000 ns) and correlates to the number of pages assigned upon the entry and exit of a program. We further investigate this correlation in Appendix B

IX. CONCLUSION

Despite the increasing popularity of using BPF to extend kernel functionality, the security of BPF programs is still a concern. Recent attacks reveal that BPF applications can bypass static security checks and conduct unauthorized kernel memory accesses. This paper has presented MOAT, which isolates potentially malicious BPF applications from the kernel using Intel MPK. MOAT addresses technical challenges and delivers a practical and extensible protection mechanism, in compensation to the contemporary BPF verifiers. Our evaluation reveals that MOAT can isolate (malicious) BPF programs in various real-world circumstances at a low cost.

REFERENCES

- [1] *BPF-Helpers(7) - Linux Manual Page*, 2021.
- [2] *ARM Architecture Reference Manual*, 2022.
- [3] *BPF Documentation — The Linux Kernel Documentation*, 2022.
- [4] *eBPF Maps — The Linux Kernel Documentation*, 2022.
- [5] *eBPF Verifier — The Linux Kernel Documentation*, 2022.
- [6] *ftrace - Function Tracer — The Linux Kernel Documentation*, 2022.
- [7] *Kprobes Documentation — The Linux Kernel Documentation*, 2022.
- [8] *Intel 64 and IA-32 Architectures Software Developer Manuals*, 2022.
- [9] Sidney Amani, Alex Hixon, Zilin Chen, Christine Rizkallah, Peter Chubb, Liam O’Connor, Joel Beeren, Yutaka Nagashima, Japheth Lim, Thomas Sewell, Joseph Tuong, Gabriele Keller, Toby Murray, Gerwin Klein, and Gernot Heiser. Cogent: Verifying high-assurance file system implementations. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, ASPLOS ’16*, page 175–188, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450340915. doi: 10.1145/2872362.2872404.
- [10] Silas Boyd-Wickizer and Nickolai Zeldovich. Tolerating malicious device drivers in linux. In *Proceedings of the 2010 USENIX Conference on USENIX Annual Technical Conference, USENIXATC’10*, page 9, USA, 2010. USENIX Association.
- [11] David Brumley and Dawn Song. Privtrans: Automatically partitioning programs for privilege separation. In *13th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 04)*, San Diego, CA, August 2004. USENIX Association.
- [12] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Rop is still dangerous: Breaking modern defenses. In *Proceedings of the 23rd USENIX Conference on Security Symposium, SEC’14*, page 385–399, USA, 2014. USENIX Association. ISBN 9781931971157.
- [13] Miguel Castro, Manuel Costa, Jean-Philippe Martin, Marcus Peinado, Periklis Akritidis, Austin Donnelly, Paul Barham, and Richard Black. Fast byte-granularity software fault isolation. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 22nd Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP ’09*, page 45–58, New York, NY, USA, 2009. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781605587523. doi: 10.1145/1629575.1629581.
- [14] Guoxing Chen, Sanchuan Chen, Yuan Xiao, Yinqian Zhang, Zhiqiang Lin, and Ten-Hwang Lai. Sgxpectre attacks: Leaking enclave secrets via speculative execution. *CoRR*, abs/1802.09085, 2018.
- [15] Haogang Chen, Daniel Ziegler, Tej Chajed, Adam Chlipala, M. Frans Kaashoek, and Nickolai Zeldovich. Using crash hoare logic for certifying the FSCQ file system. In *2016 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 16)*, Denver, CO, June 2016. USENIX Association.
- [16] Yuan Chen, Jiaqi Li, Guorui Xu, Yajin Zhou, Zhi Wang, Cong Wang, and Kui Ren. SGXLock: Towards efficiently establishing mutual distrust between host application and enclave for SGX. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 4129–4146, Boston, MA, August 2022. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-31-1.
- [17] Cilium. Cilium. <https://github.com/cilium/cilium>, 2022.
- [18] R. Joseph Connor, Tyler McDaniel, Jared M. Smith, and Max Schuchard. PKU pitfalls: Attacks on pku-based memory isolation systems. In Srdjan Capkun and Franziska Roesner, editors, *29th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2020, August 12-14, 2020*, pages 1409–1426. USENIX Association, 2020. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity20/presentation/connor>.

- [19] Brian F. Cooper, Adam Silberstein, Erwin Tam, Raghu Ramakrishnan, and Russell Sears. Benchmarking cloud serving systems with ycsb. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing, SoCC '10*, page 143–154, New York, NY, USA, 2010. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450300360. doi: 10.1145/1807128.1807152.
- [20] Patrick Cousot and Radhia Cousot. Abstract interpretation: a unified lattice model for static analysis of programs by construction or approximation of fixpoints. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM SIGACT-SIGPLAN symposium on Principles of programming languages*, pages 238–252, 1977.
- [21] Jinhua Cui, Jason Zhijiang Yu, Shweta Shinde, Prateek Saxena, and Zhiping Cai. Smashex: Smashing SGX enclaves using exceptions. In Yongdae Kim, Jong Kim, Giovanni Vigna, and Elaine Shi, editors, *CCS '21: 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Virtual Event, Republic of Korea, November 15 - 19, 2021*, pages 779–793. ACM, 2021. doi: 10.1145/3460120.3484821.
- [22] Henri Maxime Demoulin, Isaac Pedisich, Nikos Vasilakis, Vincent Liu, Boon Thau Loo, and Linh Thi Xuan Phan. Detecting asymmetric application-layer Denial-of-Service attacks In-Flight with FineLame. In *2019 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 19)*, pages 693–708, Renton, WA, July 2019. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-03-8. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc19/presentation/demoulin>.
- [23] Pekka Enberg, Ashwin Rao, and Sasu Tarkoma. Partition-aware packet steering using xdp and ebp for improving application-level parallelism. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM CoNEXT Workshop on Emerging In-Network Computing Paradigms, ENCP '19*, page 27–33, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450370004. doi: 10.1145/3359993.3366766.
- [24] Úlfar Erlingsson, Martín Abadi, Michael Vrabie, Mihai Budiu, and George C. Necula. XFI: Software guards for system address spaces. In *7th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 06)*, Seattle, WA, November 2006. USENIX Association.
- [25] Brad Fitzpatrick. Distributed caching with memcached. *Linux J.*, 2004(124):5, aug 2004. ISSN 1075-3583.
- [26] Elazar Gershuni, Nadav Amit, Arie Gurfinkel, Nina Narodytska, Jorge A. Navas, Noam Rinetzy, Leonid Ryzhyk, and Mooly Sagiv. Simple and precise static analysis of untrusted linux kernel extensions. In *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2019*, page 1069–1084, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450367127. doi: 10.1145/3314221.3314590.
- [27] Spyridoula Gravani, Mohammad Hedayati, John Criswell, and Michael L. Scott. Fast intra-kernel isolation and security with iskios. In *24th International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses, RAID '21*, page 119–134, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450390583. doi: 10.1145/3471621.3471849.
- [28] Jinyu Gu, Hao Li, Wentai Li, Yubin Xia, and Haibo Chen. EPK: Scalable and efficient memory protection keys. In *2022 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 22)*, pages 609–624, Carlsbad, CA, July 2022. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-29-36. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc22/presentation/gu-jinyu>.
- [29] Mohammad Hedayati, Spyridoula Gravani, Ethan Johnson, John Criswell, Michael L. Scott, Kai Shen, and Mike Marty. Hodor: Intra-Process isolation for High-Throughput data plane libraries. In *2019 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 19)*, pages 489–504, Renton, WA, July 2019. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-03-8.
- [30] Toke Høiland-Jørgensen, Jesper Dangaard Brouer, Daniel Borkmann, John Fastabend, Tom Herbert, David Ahern, and David Miller. The express data path: Fast programmable packet processing in the operating system kernel. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Emerging Networking EXperiments and Technologies, CoNEXT '18*, page 54–66, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450360807. doi: 10.1145/3281411.3281443.
- [31] Yongzhe Huang, Vikram Narayanan, David Detweiler, Kaiming Huang, Gang Tan, Trent Jaeger, and Anton Burtsev. KSplit: Automating device driver isolation. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)*, pages 613–631, Carlsbad, CA, July 2022. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-28-1.
- [32] Google Inc. The Chromium Projects. <https://www.chromium.org/chromium-projects/>, 2022.
- [33] Emina Torlak Luke Nelson, Xi Wang. A proof-carrying approach to building correct and flexible in-kernel verifiers. <https://homes.cs.washington.edu/~lukenels/slides/2021-09-23-lpc21.pdf>, 2021.
- [34] Sai Veerya Mahadevan, Yuuki Takano, and Atsuko Miyaji. Prsafe: Primitive recursive function based domain specific language using llvm. In *2021 International Conference on Electronics, Information, and Communication (ICEIC)*, pages 1–4, 2021. doi: 10.1109/ICEIC51217.2021.9369763.
- [35] Marcela S. Melara, Michael J. Freedman, and Mic Bowman. Enclavedom: Privilege separation for large-tcb applications in trusted execution environments, 2019.
- [36] Dirk Merkel. Docker: lightweight linux containers for consistent development and deployment. *Linux journal*, 2014(239):2, 2014.
- [37] MITRE. CVE-2020-27194. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2020-27194>, .
- [38] MITRE. CVE-2020-8835. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/>

- cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2020-8835, .
- [39] MITRE. CVE-2021-31440. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2021-31440>, .
 - [40] MITRE. CVE-2021-33200. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2021-33200>, .
 - [41] MITRE. CVE-2021-3444. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2021-3444>, .
 - [42] MITRE. CVE-2021-3490. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2021-3490>, .
 - [43] MITRE. CVE-2021-45402. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2021-45402>, .
 - [44] MITRE. CVE-2022-23222. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2022-23222>, .
 - [45] MITRE. CVE-2022-2785. <https://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-CVE-2022-2785>, .
 - [46] MITRE. CVE-2021-38300. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2021-38300>, .
 - [47] MITRE. CVE-2021-29154. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2021-29154>, .
 - [48] MITRE. CVE-2021-4001. <https://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2021-4001>, .
 - [49] MITRE. CVE-2021-29155. <https://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2021-29155>, .
 - [50] Mozilla. The Firefox Projects. <https://www.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/browsers/>, 2022.
 - [51] Vikram Narayanan, Yongzhe Huang, Gang Tan, Trent Jaeger, and Anton Burtsev. Lightweight kernel isolation with virtualization and vm functions. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS International Conference on Virtual Execution Environments, VEE '20*, page 157–171, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450375542. doi: 10.1145/3381052.3381328.
 - [52] Luke Nelson, Jacob Van Geffen, Emina Torlak, and Xi Wang. Specification and verification in the field: Applying formal methods to BPF just-in-time compilers in the linux kernel. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 20)*, pages 41–61. USENIX Association, November 2020. ISBN 978-1-939133-19-9.
 - [53] Soyeon Park, Sangho Lee, Wen Xu, HyunGon Moon, and Taesoo Kim. libmpk: Software abstraction for intel memory protection keys (Intel MPK). In *2019 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 19)*, pages 241–254, Renton, WA, July 2019. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-03-8.
 - [54] IO Visor Project. BPF Compiler Collection. <https://github.com/iovisor/bcc>, 2022.
 - [55] David Schrammel, Samuel Weiser, Stefan Steinegger, Martin Schwarzl, Michael Schwarz, Stefan Mangard, and Daniel Gruss. Donky: Domain keys – efficient In-Process isolation for RISC-V and x86. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 1677–1694. USENIX Association, August 2020. ISBN 978-1-939133-17-5.
 - [56] Yulei Sui. SVF References. <http://svf-tools.github.io/SVF/>.
 - [57] Yulei Sui and Jingling Xue. Svf: interprocedural static value-flow analysis in llvm. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on compiler construction*, pages 265–266. ACM, 2016.
 - [58] Yulei Sui, Ding Ye, and Jingling Xue. Detecting memory leaks statically with full-sparse value-flow analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 40(2):107–122, 2014.
 - [59] Mincheol Sung, Pierre Olivier, Stefan Lankes, and Binoy Ravindran. Intra-unikernel isolation with intel memory protection keys. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS International Conference on Virtual Execution Environments, VEE '20*, page 143–156, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450375542. doi: 10.1145/3381052.3381326.
 - [60] Anjo Vahldiek-Oberwagner, Eslam Elnikety, Nuno O. Duarte, Michael Sammler, Peter Druschel, and Deepak Garg. ERIM: Secure, efficient in-process isolation with protection keys MPK. In *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*, pages 1221–1238, Santa Clara, CA, August 2019. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-06-9.
 - [61] Harishankar Vishwanathan, Matan Shachnai, Srinivas Narayana, and Santosh Nagarakatte. Sound, precise, and fast abstract interpretation with tristate numbers. In *Proceedings of the 20th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization, CGO '22*, page 254–265. IEEE Press, 2022. ISBN 9781665405843. doi: 10.1109/CGO53902.2022.9741267.
 - [62] Xi Wang, David Lazar, Nickolai Zeldovich, Adam Chlipala, and Zachary Tatlock. Jitk: A trustworthy In-Kernel interpreter infrastructure. In *11th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 14)*, pages 33–47, Broomfield, CO, October 2014. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-931971-16-4.
 - [63] Miao Yu, Virgil Gligor, and Limin Jia. An i/o separation model for formal verification of kernel implementations. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 572–589, 2021. doi: 10.1109/SP40001.2021.00101.
 - [64] Ziqi Yuan, Siyu Hong, Rui Chang, Yajin Zhou, Wenbo Shen, and Kui Ren. Vdom: Fast and unlimited virtual domains on multiple architectures. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 2, ASPLOS 2023*, page 905–919, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450399166. doi: 10.1145/3575693.3575735. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3575693.3575735>.
 - [65] Yuhong Zhong, Haoyu Li, Yu Jian Wu, Ioannis Zarkadas, Jeffrey Tao, Evan Mesterhazy, Michael Makris, Junfeng Yang, Amy Tai, Ryan Stutsman, and Asaf Cidon. XRP: In-Kernel storage functions with eBPF. In *16th USENIX*

Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22), pages 375–393, Carlsbad, CA, July 2022. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-28-1.

- [66] Hao Zhou, Shuohan Wu, Xiapu Luo, Ting Wang, Yajin Zhou, Chao Zhang, and Haipeng Cai. Nscope: Hardware-assisted analyzer for native code in android apps. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, ISSTA 2022, page 629–641, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450393799. doi: 10.1145/3533767.3534410.
- [67] Zongwei Zhou, Miao Yu, and Virgil D. Gligor. Dancing with giants: Wimpy kernels for on-demand isolated i/o. In *2014 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 308–323, 2014. doi: 10.1109/SP.2014.27.

APPENDIX

A. BPF CVE List

TABLE IX: BPF CVE list. We bold the CVEs (e.g., **2022-2785**) that can lead to privilege escalation.

Type	CVE ID
Runtime Memory Exploit	2022-2785 , 2022-23222 , 2021-3490
	2021-3489 , 2021-3444 , 2021-33200
	2020-8835 , 2020-27194 , 2021-45402
	2021-20268
Misc Implementation Bugs (e.g., bugs in libbpf)	2022-3533, 2022-2905, 2022-0500
	2022-0433, 2022-45941, 2022-45902
	2021-41864, 2021-4135, 2021-39711
	2021-38166, 2021-29649, 2021-29648
Speculation	2021-20268
	2021-35477, 2021-34556, 2021-33624
	2021-31829, 2021-29155, 2020-27171,
	2020-27170
Race Condition	2021-4001, 2021-23133
JIT	2021-38300 , 2021-29154 , 2021-20320

We list the types of all reported BPF vulnerabilities in Table IX. Runtime memory exploitations are among the most critical security issues, as all of them result in privilege escalation (see the caption of Table IX). Other vulnerabilities in the BPF subsystem typically cause information leaks/DoS. The two privilege escalation vulnerabilities in JIT are restricted to specific platforms (e.g., MIPS). MOAT can prevent all of the runtime memory exploits.

B. Page Assignment Overhead

From the statistics collected in Table V of Sec. VI-B1, we can see that the most time-consuming operation in MOAT is to assign a memory page to a designated PKS region. Similar results are also observed in the macro benchmark launched in Sec. VI-B2, where the overhead brought by MOAT correlates to the number of pages assigned upon the entry and exit of a BPF program. We clarify that, in most cases, these pages are trivially known once the program is loaded and can be assigned before the execution without any runtime overhead. Nevertheless, there are cases (e.g., dynamic key allocation) that require such assignments upon every execution. Therefore, to further study the overhead brought by MOAT, we conduct the following experiment.

TABLE X: Absolute overhead statistics

Avg. per Page (ns)	10 Pages (ns)	100 Pages (ns)	200 Pages (ns)
13.8	165.2	1557.6	2791.4




Fig. 17: MOAT's absolute overhead with different number of pages.

In our experiment, we measure the absolute overhead of MOAT under different page assignment settings. We choose BPF programs that request 10 to 1,000 pages and execute them under dynamic and fixed key allocation, respectively. We run this setup ten times, and each run consists of 1,000 invocations. Our findings are reported in Fig. 17 and Table X. The absolute overhead of MOAT is very limited (under 500 ns) for BPF programs that use a fixed key or under our threshold (i.e., ten pages; see Sec. IV-B1). As for the BPF programs that request a large amount of memory, their overheads strongly correlate to the number of requested pages. However, as BPF programs typically serve as kernel extensions, they usually do not request this massive amount of memory and only equip a small map to communicate with the user space. Moreover, since the maps used by a BPF program are trivially known once the program is loaded, MOAT can be configured to reject BPF programs that equip with huge maps (e.g., over 1,000 pages) when the fixed keys are insufficient. Even if a BPF program indeed requests this many pages, one may extend MOAT to use features like huge pages of 2MB to reduce the number of requested pages. Therefore, we expect the absolute overhead of MOAT to be reasonably low and controllable across different normal and edge cases.