#### **SPOILER:** Speculative Load Hazards Boost Rowhammer and Cache Attacks

Saad Islam, **Daniel Moghimi (@danielmgmi)**, Ida Bruhns, Moritz Krebbel, Berk Gulmezoglu, Thomas Eisenbarth, Berk Sunar

Worcester Polytechnic Institute & University of Lübeck



# **CPU Optimization?**

- Branch Prediction
- Cache and internal buffers
- Speculate the Speculations??!
  - "speculative prefetching"
  - "speculatively scheduled operation"
  - "speculative execution event counter"
  - "speculative memory accesses"
  - "speculative load instruction"





store  $a \rightarrow X$ 

- store  $b \rightarrow Y$
- store  $c \rightarrow Z$
- $\textit{load} \quad d \gets W$

inc d

| r Dec |      | Execute |    |    |    |    |      |
|-------|------|---------|----|----|----|----|------|
|       | Se 5 | X1      | X2 | X3 | X4 | X5 | nnit |
|       |      |         |    |    |    |    |      |
|       |      |         |    |    |    |    |      |
|       |      |         |    |    |    |    |      |
|       |      |         |    |    |    |    |      |
|       |      |         |    |    |    |    |      |

store  $a \rightarrow X$ 

- store  $b \rightarrow Y$
- store  $c \rightarrow Z$
- $\textit{load} \quad d \leftarrow W$

inc d





is Busy

 $\overline{\bigcirc}$ 

Whatever, Let's Load and Compute!!!



store  $a \rightarrow X$ 

- store  $b \rightarrow Y$
- store  $c \rightarrow Z$
- $load \quad d \leftarrow W$

inc d

 $\begin{array}{lll} \text{store} & a \to X \\ \text{store} & b \to Y \end{array}$ 

- store  $c \rightarrow Z$
- $\textit{load} \quad d \gets W$

inc d

Huum! Was

it dependent.

on Stores?

store  $a \rightarrow X$ 

store  $b \rightarrow Y$ 

store  $c \rightarrow Z$ 

load  $d \leftarrow W$ 

d

inc



8

No Clue!

Check store

**ADDRESSES:** 

X, Y, Z?



- store  $a \rightarrow X$
- store  $b \rightarrow Y$
- store  $c \rightarrow Z$
- $\textit{load} \quad d \gets W$

inc d

How about

this one? Is W

dependent on

**Y**?







- store  $a \rightarrow X$
- store  $b \rightarrow Y$
- store  $c \rightarrow Z$
- $\textit{load} \quad d \leftarrow W$

inc d













# Design Challenges?

- Loads are executed out-of-order and speculatively to avoid performance loss.
- Load may be dependent on preceding stores (dependency).
- Dependency check is difficult:
  - Virtual addresses may be aliased.
  - Physical addresses are not available immediately.
  - Stores may stay in-flight for a while.
    - We can't wait for them to succeed.
    - Can we forward the data from the store to the load?





# **SPOILER**

#### **US 7,603,527 B2** RESOLVING FALSE DEPENDENCIES OF SPECULATIVE LOAD INSTRUCTIONS

"an operation X may determine whether the lower portion of the virtual address of a speculative load instruction matches the lower portion of virtual addresses of older store operations" LoosnetCheck

*"an operation Y may determine whether the upper portion of the virtual address of the speculative load matches the upper portion of virtual addresses of older store" "If there is a hit at operation Y then the load may be blocked"* 

*"in an embodiment, the load instruction may have its input data forwarded from the store operation from which the load instruction depends at operation"* **Store Forwarding** 

"If there is a hit at operation X and a miss at operation Y, ... the physical addresses of the load and the store may be compared at an operation Z" "In one embodiment, if there is a hit at operation X and the physical address of the load or the store operations is not valid, the physical address check at operation Z may be considered as a hit" "In some embodiments, the physical address check at operation Z may use a partial physical address, e.g., base on data stored in the SAB. This makes the checking at operation Z conservative. Accordingly, in some embodiments, a matchmay occur on a partial address and block..." Finenet Check



#### **SPOILER Attack**

**Dependency Resolution** 











0 x 4 F 1 2 3 4

0 C 0

Load





















| Set 1 Set 2 | • • • | Set n |
|-------------|-------|-------|
|-------------|-------|-------|

DRAM



| \$ \$ \$ \$<br>\$ \$ \$ \$ | Set 2 | • • • | Set n |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
|                            |       |       |       |

DRAM







Skylake Client L1: 64 Sets, 6 bit Index L2: 1024 Sets, 10 bit Index LLC: 2048 Sets, 11 bit Index, 1-2 bit slices



#### **SPOILER – Javascript Eviction Sets**

• 1 MB Aliasing Leakage



• Eviction Set Finding Comparison

| Algorithm     | R  | t <sub>total</sub> | t <sub>AAS</sub> | $t_{ESS}$ | Success |
|---------------|----|--------------------|------------------|-----------|---------|
| Classic [42]  | 3  | 46s                | -                | 100%      | 80%     |
| Improved [14] | 3  | 35s                | -                | 100%      | 80%     |
| AA (ours)     | 10 | 10s                | 54%              | 46%       | 67%     |
| AA (ours)     | 20 | 12s                | 75%              | 25%       | 100%    |



- Physical addresses are used for mapping DRAM banks
  - More Banks, More Physical Address Bits

- Single-Sided Rowhammer:
  - Requirement: Bank Co-location
- Double-Sided Rowhammer:
  - Contiguous Memory Pages



- Reverse Engineering DRAM Banks using DRAMA Tool
- Rowbuffer Conflict



| System Model       | DRAM Configuration | # of Bits |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| Dell XPS-L702x     | 1 x (4GB 2Rx8)     | 21        |
| (Sandy Bridge)     | 2 x (4GB 2Rx8)     | 22        |
| Dell Inspiron-580  | 1 x (2GB 2Rx8) (b) | 21        |
| (Nehalem)          | 2 x (2GB 2Rx8) (c) | 22        |
|                    | 4 x (2GB 2Rx8) (d) | 23        |
| Dell Optiplex-7010 | 1 x (2GB 1Rx8) (a) | 19        |
| (Ivy Bridge)       | 2 x (2GB 1Rx8)     | 20        |
|                    | 1 x (4GB 2Rx8) (e) | 21        |
|                    | 2 x (4GB 2Rx8)     | 22        |

• Detecting Contiguous Memory

• Rowhammer Bitflips



# CVE-2019-0162

- 12/01/2018: We informed our findings to iPSIRT.
- 12/03/2018: iPSIRT acknowledged the receipt.
- 03/01/2018: We published the paper.
- 04/09/2019: iPSIRT released public advisory (INTELSA-00238) (CVE-2019-0162).
- And we got some free logos, *Thanks to Media* !!!

















#### **SPOILER Attack – HPC Analysis**



# SPOILER: 1 MB Aliasing

- Significant delay on Load when it matches with 20 bits of a store address (1 MB aliasing)
- The delay is highest when the store appears later in the store buffer.
- The number of steps has a correlation with the store buffer size.
- HPC Analysis:
  - STALLS\_LDM\_PENDING: Direct correlation, confirms that the delay is due to the Load
  - Ld\_Blocks\_Partial:Address\_Alias: Negative Correlation, confirms that the delay is not due to *Loosenet* check

#### **SPOILER Attack – Affected Machines**

| CPU Model            | Architecture  | Steps | SB Size |
|----------------------|---------------|-------|---------|
| Intel Core i7-8650U  | Kaby Lake R   | 22    | 56      |
| Intel Core i7-7700   | Kaby Lake     | 22    | 56      |
| Intel Core i5-6440HQ | Skylake       | 22    | 56      |
| Intel Xeon E5-2640v3 | Haswell       | 17    | 42      |
| Intel Xeon E5-2670v2 | Ivy Bridge EP | 14    | 36      |
| Intel Core i7-3770   | Ivy Bridge    | 12    | 36      |
| Intel Core i7-2670QM | Sandy Bridge  | 12    | 36      |
| Intel Core i5-2400   | Sandy Bridge  | 12    | 36      |
| Intel Core i5 650    | Nehalem       | 11    | 32      |
| Intel Core2Duo T9400 | Core          | N/A   | 20      |
| Qualcomm Kryo 280    | ARMv8-A       | N/A   | *       |
| AMD A6-4455M         | Bulldozer     | N/A   | *       |









## Remarks









