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## Outline

- What is transient execution attack?


Foreshadow

- How does Meltdown work?
- We will connect the dots between a hardware optimization and a software optimization.
- How does Spectre and its variations work?
- Let's try to see through these variations and understand the fundamental problem.


## Recap: 5-stage Pipeline



## Recap: 5-stage Pipeline

- In-order execution:

- Execute instructions according to the program order
- What is the ideal instruction throughput? -- instruction per cycle (IPC)

| time | t0 | t1 | t2 | t3 | t4 | t5 | t6 | t7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| instruction1 | $\mathrm{IF}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{ID}_{1}$ | EX ${ }_{1}$ | MA ${ }_{1}$ | $\mathrm{WB}_{1}$ |  |  |  |
| instruction2 |  | $\mathrm{IF}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{ID}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{EX}_{2}$ | MA ${ }_{2}$ | $\mathrm{WB}_{2}$ |  |  |
| instruction3 |  |  | $\mathrm{IF}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{ID}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{EX}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{MA}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{WB}_{3}$ |  |
| instruction4 |  |  |  | $\mathrm{IF}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{ID}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{EX}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{MA}_{4}$ | WB |
| instruction5 |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{IF}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{ID}_{5}$ | $E X_{5}$ | MA |

## Build High-Performance Processors

Example \#1:
FMUL f1, f2, f3 ; 10 cycles Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP)
ADD r4, r4, r1 ; 1 cycle -> repeat 10

Example \#2:

LD r3, $0(r 2) \quad ; 1-100$ cycles
ADD r4, r4, r1 $; 1$ cycle -> repeat 10 times

## Technique \#1: Add More Functional Units



## Technique \#1: Add More Functional Units



```
1: FMUL f1, f2, f3
2: ADD r4, r4, r1
3: ADD r4, r4, r1
```


## Technique \#1: Add More Functional Units



## Technique \#2: Scoreboard

| Functional Unit | Busy? | Dest Reg | Src1 Reg | Src2 Reg |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Int ALU |  |  |  |  |
| Mem |  |  |  |  |
| Fadd |  |  |  |  |
| Fmul |  |  |  |  |
| Fdiv |  |  |  |  |

## Technique \#2: Scoreboard

| Functional Unit | Busy? | Dest Reg | Src1 Reg | Src2 Reg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int ALU |  |  |  |  |
| Mem |  |  |  |  |
| Fadd |  |  |  |  |
| Fmul | Y | f 1 | f 2 | f 3 |
| Fdiv |  |  |  |  |

```
1: FMUL f1, f2, f3
2: ADD r4, r4, r1
```


## Technique \#2: Scoreboard

| Functional Unit | Busy? | Dest Reg | Src1 Reg | Src2 Reg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int ALU |  |  |  |  |
| Mem |  |  |  |  |
| Fadd |  |  |  |  |
| Fmul | Y | f 1 | f 2 | f 3 |
| Fdiv |  |  |  |  |

1: FMUL f1, f2, f3
2: FDIV f5, f1, f4

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1: FMUL f1, f2, f3 ; } 10 \text { cycles } \\
& \text { 2: FADD f1, f4, f5 ; } 4 \text { cycles }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Technique \#2: Scoreboard

- Upon issue an instruction, check:

1. Whether any ongoing instructions will generate values for my source registers
2. Whether any ongoing instructions will modify my destination register

We call such a processor: in-order issue, out-of-order completion.

A problem: how to handle interrupts/exceptions?

## Exception in OoO Processors: Example \#1

| 1: LD $\mathrm{r} 3,0(\mathrm{r} 2)$; Exception in 3 cycles <br> 2: ADD r4, r4, r1 ; 1 cycle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 8 |
| 1: LD | IF | ID | Issue | ALU | Mem | Mem. | Mem | Exception |
| 2: ADD |  | IF | ID | Issue | ALU | WB |  |  |

## Exception in OoO Processors: Example \#2

| 1: FMUL f1, f2, f3 ; 10 cycles <br> 2: LD $\mathrm{r} 3, \theta(\mathrm{r} 2)$; Exception in 1 cycl |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 <br> FMUL | 8 |
| 1: FMUL | IF | ID | Issue | FMUL | FMUL | FMUL |  | ... |
| 2: LD |  | IF | ID | Issue | ALU | Mem | Exception |  |

## Technique \#3: In-order Commit



## Another Way to Draw It



To know more advanced out-of-order (OoO) features, take 6.5900 [6.823]

## Re-examine Examples With In-order Commit

```
1: LD r3, 0(r2) ; Exception in 3 cycles
2: ADD r4, r4, r1 ; 1 cycle
```

```
1: FMUL f1, f2, f3 ; 10 cycles
2: LD r3, 0(r2) ; Exception in 1 cycle
```


## Recap: Page Mapping



## Mapping Kernel Pages



## Jumping Between User and Kernel Space

- Key challenge: need to make sure we use the correct page table
- CR3 (in x86) or satp (in RISCV) stores the page table physical address



## A Performance Optimization

- Context switch overhead:
- Page table changes, so in many processors, we need to flush TLB
- But sometimes, we only go to kernel to do some simple things
- E.g., getpid()
- The optimization: map kernel address into user space in a secure way


## Map Kernel Pages Into User Space



Page Table


A Page Table Entry


Kernel?
$R / W / X$ ?

- What will happen if accessing kernel addresses in user mode?
- Protection fault


## Meltdown

- Put two optimizations together, we have Meltdown
- Hardware optimization: out-of-order execution
- Software optimization: mapping kernel addresses into user space
- Attack outcome: user space applications can read arbitrary kernel data

```
.....
Ld1: uint8_t secret = *kernel_address;
Ld2: unit8_t dummy = probe_array[secret*64];
```



## Meltdown w/ Flush+Reload

1. Setup: Attacker allocates probe_array, with 256 cache lines. Flushes all its cache lines
2. Transmit: Attacker executes
```
Ld1: uint8_t secret = *kernel_address;
Ld2: unit8_t dummy = probe_array[secret*64];
```

3. Receive: After handling protection fault, attacker performs cache side channel attack to figure out which line of probe_array is accessed $\rightarrow$ recovers byte

## Meltdown Mitigations

- Stop one of the optimizations should be sufficient
- SW: Do not let user and kernel share address space (KPTI) -> broken by several groups (e.g., EntryBleed)
- HW: Stall speculation; Register poisoning

```
Ld1: uint8_t secret = *kernel_address;
Ld2: unit8_t dummy = probe_array[secret*64];
```

- We generally consider Meltdown as a design bug


## Spectre Variant 1 - Exploit Branch Condition

- Consider the following kernel code, e.g., in a syste

Always malicious?
No. It may be a benign misprediction. We do not consider Spectre as a bug.


Attacker to read arbitrary memory:

1. Setup: Train branch predictor
2. Transmit: Trigger branch misprediction; \&array1 [x] maps to some desired kernel address
3. Receive: Attacker probes cache to infer which line of array2 was fetched

## Spectre Variant 2 - Exploit Branch Target

- Most BTBs store partial tags and targets...
- <last n bits of current PC, target PC>


Train BTB properly $\rightarrow$ Execute arbitrary gadgets speculatively

## General Attack Schema



## Apply the General Attack Scheme

The RSA Square-and-Multiply Exponentiation example.
Attackers aim to leak e


## Apply the General Attack Scheme



## General Attack Schema



- Traditional (non-transient) attacks

Hard to fix

- Data in-use
- Transient attacks: can leak data-at-rest
- Meltdown = transient execution + deferred exception handling
"Easy" to fix
- Spectre $=$ transient execution on wrong paths

Hard to fix

# Next: Software-Hardware Contract 
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