Solo5: A sandboxed, re-targetable execution environment for unikernels

Dan Williams (IBM Research), djwillia@us.ibm.com Martin Lucina (robur.io / CCT), martin@lucina.net Ricardo Koller (IBM Research), kollerr@us.ibm.com

FOSDEM 2019, Microkernel and Component-based OS devroom

Background: LibOS and unikernels

Library operating systems

- A collection of **libraries** providing traditional OS functionality.
- No concept of process isolation.
- Generally use co-operative scheduling.

... these are combined at compile time with **application code** into a *unikernel*.

Unikernels

- Minimal code size, minimal attack surface.
- Single-purpose, single-application operating system.
- Perceived as something that must run in kernel space.

What is Solo5? (I)



What is Solo5? (II)

- 1. A minimalist, legacy-free *interface*.
- 2. *Bindings* to this *interface* for:
 - microkernels (Genode), separation kernels (Muen)
 - virtio-based hypervisors
 - monolithic kernels (Linux, FreeBSD, OpenBSD)
- 3. On monolithic kernels a *tender* is used to strongly sandbox the unikernel:
 - hvt: hardware virtualized *tender*
 - $\circ~$ spt: sandboxed process tender



What is Solo5? (III)

From the libOS point of view:

- "Middleware".
- Integrated into the libOS build system.
- The developer does not interact with Solo5 directly.

Example, for MirageOS:

mirage configure -t {hvt | spt | muen | genode | ...}
make depend && make

Builds a *unikernel* for your target of choice.

Solo5 compared

Solo5 compared to common isolation *interfaces* and units of execution:



(From left to right: Solo5, traditional VMs, Linux containers)

Philosophy of Solo5 (I)

The *interface* must be:

- 1. Minimal.
- 2. Stateless.
- 3. Portable.

The *implementation* must:

- Do one thing and do it well:
 - Be an **engine** for running unikernels.
- Orchestration, configuration management, monitoring, etc. are done elsewhere.

Philosophy of Solo5 (II)

Minimal

- Simplest useful abstraction.
 - Not Linux!
- No "device discovery" at run time.

Leads to:

- Small implementation size:
 - Typical configuration: ~3 kLOC.
 - 12 kLOC in total (all combinations!).
- Clarity of implementation.
- Fast startup time:
 - \circ Solo5 hvt/spt: < 50 ms
 - $\circ~$ gemu Linux VM: ~ 1000 ms
 - Cloud-managed VMs: Seconds.

Philosophy of Solo5 (III)

Stateless

Very little state in the *interface* itself:

- Guest cannot change host state:
 - No dynamic resource allocation.
- Host cannot change guest state:
 - No interrupts.

Results in a system that:

- Is **deterministic** and easy to reason about.
- Is static.
- Enables **strong isolation**:
 - On monolithic *and* component-based / high assurance systems.

Philosophy of Solo5 (IV)

Portable

Easy to port libOS to Solo5:

• MirageOS (Ocaml-based), IncludeOS (C++), Rumprun (NetBSD).

Easy to port Solo5 to new targets:

- OpenBSD vmm, Muen Separation Kernel, Genode OS framework.
- Contributed by folks who are not Solo5 "experts".

Solo5: Limitations

Minimal

- Does not run Linux applications.
- But, there are POSIX-ish libOSes (Rumprun, LKL) that do.

Stateless

- "No interrupts" implies single core.
- Not intended for interfacing to hardware.
- Drivers are "some other component's" problem.

Portable

- Performance (copying semantics, number of "calls per IOP").
 - Not intended for HPC or millions of PPS.

The Solo5 *interface* (I)

```
struct solo5_start_info {
    const char *cmdline;
    uintptr_t heap_start;
    size_t heap_size;
}
int solo5_app_main(const struct solo5_start_info *info) /* entry point */
void solo5_exit(int status)
void solo5_abort(void)
void solo5_console_write(const char *buf, size_t size)
solo5_time_t solo5_clock_monotonic()
solo5_time_t solo5_clock_wall()
bool solo5_yield(solo5_time_t deadline)
```

The Solo5 *interface* (II)

```
bool solo5_yield(solo5_time_t deadline)
```

```
typedef enum {
    SOLO5_R_OK, SOLO5_R_AGAIN, SOLO5_R_EINVAL, SOLO5_R_EUNSPEC
} solo5_result_t
```

```
solo5_result_t solo5_block_read(solo5_off_t offset, uint8_t *buf, size_t size)
solo5_result_t solo5_block_write(solo5_off_t offset, const uint8_t *buf, size_t size)
void solo5_block_info(struct solo5_block_info *info)
```

```
solo5_result_t solo5_net_read(uint8_t *buf, size_t size, size_t *read_size)
solo5_result_t solo5_net_write(const uint8_t *buf, size_t size)
void solo5_net_info(struct solo5_net_info *info)
```

(Demo: Solo5 in action)

hvt: "Hardware virtualized tender" (I)

- Uses hardware virtualization as an isolation layer.
 - KVM, FreeBSD (Bhyve), OpenBSD (vmm).
- Not a traditional VMM:
 - 10 hypercalls.
 - Modular, typical configuration ~1.5 kLOC.
 - Compare QEMU: ~1000 kLOC, crosvm: ~100 kLOC.
- Supports x86_64 and arm64 architectures.
- Mature implementation, around since 2015.
 - Formerly known as ukvm.



hvt: "Hardware virtualized tender" (II)

- Loads the unikernel.
- Sets up host resources.
- Sets up VCPU, page tables.
- Handles guest hypercalls (VMEXITs).



hvt: Hypercalls

- Hybrid PIO/MMIO-like approach.
- Transfer a 32-bit pointer to a struct.

On x86_64:

On arm64:

```
static inline void hvt_do_hypercall(int n, volatile void *arg)
{
    __asm____volatile__("str %w0, [%1]"
    :
        "rZ" ((uint32_t)((uint64_t)arg)),
        "r" ((uint64_t)HVT_HYPERCALL_ADDRESS(n))
        : "memory");
}
```



hvt: Bindings

Implement the Solo5 interface:

- Using **hypercalls** to *tender*.
- Handle VCPU trap vectors.
 - Which just "report and abort".
- Provide monotonic time.
 - Via RDTSC or equivalent.

```
unikernel
Linux/KVM
FreeBSD vmm
OpenBSD vmm
```

```
solo5_result_t solo5_net_write(const uint8_t *buf, size_t size)
{
    volatile struct hvt_netwrite wr;
    wr.data = buf;
    wr.len = size;
    wr.ret = 0;
    hvt_do_hypercall(HVT_HYPERCALL_NETWRITE, &wr);
    return (wr.ret == 0 && wr.len == size) ? SOLO5_R_OK : SOLO5_R_EUNSPEC;
}
```

spt: "Sandboxed process tender" (I)

- Uses **process isolation** with **seccomp-BPF** as an **isolation layer**.
 - The system call filter is a **strict whitelist**.
 - ~7 system calls needed for the **entire** Solo5 *interface*.
- Should be possible to port to other kernels.
 - FreeBSD: Capsicum.
 - OpenBSD: pledge(2).
- See our ACM SoCC 2018 paper:
 - <u>https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3267845</u>



spt: "Sandboxed process tender" (II)

- Loads the unikernel.
- Sets up host resources.
- Applies the seccomp-BPF sandbox.
- Effectively ceases to exist!
- Treats the monolithic kernel as a **hypervisor**!



spt: Bindings

Implement the Solo5 *interface*:

- By directly invoking system calls.
- No libc involved.

```
solo5_result_t solo5_net_write(const uint8_t *buf, size_t size)
{
    assert(netfd >= 0);
    long nbytes = sys_write(netfd, (const char *)buf, size);
    return (nbytes == (int)size) ? SOLO5_R_OK : SOLO5_R_EUNSPEC;
}
```

- Supports x86_64 and arm64.
- Trivial to add more architectures.



muen: Native component

Muen: An x86_64 **Separation Kernel** for High Assurance.

- Guarantees that components communicate **exclusively** according to given security policy.
- Isolation using **hardware virtualization**.
- Implemented in ADA/SPARK.
- Formally proven to contain no runtime errors at the source code level.
- Open Source, <u>https://muen.sk/</u>.

Solo5 *bindings* shared with hvt:

- No hypercalls.
- Communication via shared memory rings.



virtio: Cloud hypervisors

- The first Solo5 implementation.
- No longer consistent with our philosophy:
 - Still too much legacy in interface.
 - **2.5 kLOC**, and still not complete.
 - Anyone for SCSI?
- But, runs on **existing** cloud hypervisors:
 - e.g. Google Compute Engine.



Debugging

Just use gdb!

- (1) \$ solo5-hvt --gdb test_hello.hvt
- (2) \$ gdb --ex="target remote localhost:1234" test_hello.hvt

Lessons learned (I)

Usable modularity

- Wanted a *tender* that is **specialized** to the *unikernel*.
- Original hvt approach:
 - Specialize at **unikernel compile time**.
 - This is **not practical**:
 - Supply chain is wrong.
- Removed for spt.

Lessons learned (II)

Usable modularity

- We still want to **enforce a contract** (*tender/unikernel*).
 - *unikernel* wants *A*, *B*, *C*.
 - *tender* must match or refuse to run.
 - *tender* **must not** accidentally provide *D*.
- Embed a "manifest" into the *unikernel*:
 - Enforce at run time.
 - Can we still **specialize** the *tender*?

Future: Plans and challenges (I)

Security

Implement more best practices:

- ASLR (static PIE), SSP, W^X.
 - Undocumented ABIs.
 - $\circ~$ hvt: Hypervisor support lacking.
 - EPT mprotect

Defense in depth:

- Further de-privilege *tenders*.
- Initial setup stage runs with full privileges.

Future: Plans and challenges (II)

Portability

- Can we do dynamic linking *safely*?
- Leads to a *tender*-independent unikernel binary.

Performance

• Can we define an *interface* that allows **asynchronicity**, yet is consistent with our philosophy? (**Minimal**, **Stateless**, **Portable**).

Future: Ideas

More languages and libOS

- Go, Rust, ...
 - Further validation of the Solo5 interface.

More targets

- Mac OS Hypervisor.framework.
- Secure enclaves (e.g. SGX).

Architecture independence

- Webassembly as a target.
 - Build once, run on any CPU architecture.

Related work

Library operating systems

- MSR Drawbridge
- Graphene

Lightweight VMs

- kvmtool, qemu-lite
- novm
- crosvm
- Firecracker

Securing the Linux interface

• gVisor

Conclusion

Minimalism!

- Tiny API (13 functions), legacy-free. ISC licensed.
- Low resource usage. Run 1500 VMs on your 3 year old laptop.

Apply unikernels everywhere!

• Linux, FreeBSD, OpenBSD, Muen, Genode, Cloud, ...

No compromises!

• **Strong isolation** on all targets.

https://github.com/Solo5/solo5