Lord of the Ring(s): Side Channel Attacks on the CPU On-Chip Ring Interconnect Are Practical

Riccardo Paccagnella, Licheng Luo, Christopher W. Fletcher

$$
\overline{\mathbf{S}_{\dot{\mathbf{a}}}^{\mathbf{\dot{\mathbf{a}}}}}
$$

{* SECURITY *}

Google emits data-leaking proofof-concept Spectre exploit for Intel **CPUs to really get everyone's** attention

I don't believe it, I had to see it, I came back, I came back haunted

Thomas Claburn in San Francisco Fri 12 Mar 2021 // 21:28 UTC **SHARE**

{* SECURITY *}

Google emits data-leaking proofof-concept Spectre exploit for Intel **CPUs to really get everyone's** attention

I don't believe it, I had to see it, I came back, I came back haunted

Thomas Claburn in San Francisco Fri 12 Mar 2021 // 21:28 UTC **SHARE**

First Fully Weaponized Spectre Exploit Discovered Online

By Catalin Cimpanu · March 1, 2021

Lord of the Ring(s): Side Channel Attacks on the CPU On-Chip Ring Interconnect Are Practical – Riccardo Paccagnella 8

What about the ring interconnect?

Lord of the Ring(s): Side Channel Attacks on the CPU On-Chip Ring Interconnect Are Practical – Riccardo Paccagnella 14

- R_c = receiver core
- R_s = receiver LLC slice

- R_c = receiver core
- R_s = receiver LLC slice

- R_c = receiver core
- R_s = receiver LLC slice
- S_c = sender core
- S_s = sender LLC slice

Slice Contention

• $S_s = R_s$: contention

Slice Contention

- $S_s = R_s$: contention
	- Slice's request queue.
	- Slice port.

Ring Stops

• $R_c = R_s$ (and $S_s \neq R_s$) : no contention

– Traffic between core *i* and slice *i* does not contend with cross-ring traffic.

Ring Stops

• $R_c = R_s$ (and $S_s \neq R_s$) : no contention

– Traffic between core *i* and slice *i* does not contend with cross-ring traffic.

Two Directions

• Loads in opposite directions = no contention.

Two Directions

- Loads in opposite directions = no contention.
	- The ring has two physical flows, one for each direction.

Two Directions

- Loads in opposite directions = no contention.
	- The ring has two physical flows, one for each direction.

Overlapping Segments

- No overlapping = no contention.
	- Traffic on the ring only travels through the shortest path.

Checkpoint

• So far: ring contention requires overlapping segments + same direction. Surprisingly, these conditions are not sufficient.

Distributed Arbitration

• Receiver envelops the sender = no contention

Distributed Arbitration

- Receiver envelops the sender = no contention
	- Traffic already on the ring has priority over new traffic.

Two Lanes

• Each ring has two "lanes", and ring stops inject traffic into different lanes depending on the cluster of its destination

• Contention? No, different lanes are used

• Contention? Yes, on the data ring!

• Contention? Yes, on the data and request rings!

• Ring contention if and only if overlapping segments + same direction + priority + same lane.

Additional observations

• Contention is larger when traffic contends on multiple rings.

Additional observations

- Contention is larger when traffic contends on multiple rings.
- LLC misses cause additional traffic flows that create different contention patterns (see paper for details).

Additional observations

- Contention is larger when traffic contends on multiple rings.
- LLC misses cause additional traffic flows that create different contention patterns (see paper for details).
- Enabling hardware prefetchers amplifies contention.

Security Implications

- Covert channel
- Side channel attack:
	- 1. Side channel attack on cryptographic code
	- 2. Keystroke timing attack

- Transmit a $"1" \rightarrow ring$ contention
- Transmit a $"0" \rightarrow$ idle

- Transmit a $"1" \rightarrow ring$ contention
- Transmit a $"0" \rightarrow$ idle

Sender sending 010101…

- Peaks are ones
- Valleys are zeros

• We tried multiple bit transmission intervals and computed the "channel capacity" metric.

- We tried multiple bit transmission intervals and computed the "channel capacity" metric.
	- On our 8-core 3 GHz CPU, max capacity = 3.35 Mbps.
	- On our 4-core 4 GHz CPU, max capacity = 4.14 Mbps.

- We tried multiple bit transmission intervals and computed the "channel capacity" metric.
	- On our 8-core 3 GHz CPU, max capacity = 3.35 Mbps.
	- On our 4-core 4 GHz CPU, max capacity = 4.14 Mbps.
- Largest to date for channels that do *not* rely on shared memory!

foreach bit b in key k do $E1()$; if $b == 1$ then $E2()$;

• If the attacker can detect E2's execution, they can leak *b*.

foreach bit b in key k do $E1()$; if $b == 1$ then $E2()$;

- If the attacker can detect F2's execution, they can leak *b*.
- First iteration (cold cache):

- If the attacker can detect F2's execution, they can leak *b*.
- First iteration (cold cache):
	- E1 loads code and data into the cache \rightarrow uses the ring interconnect

- If the attacker can detect F2's execution, they can leak *b*.
- First iteration (cold cache):
	- E1 loads code and data into the cache \rightarrow uses the ring interconnect
	- If *b=1*, E2 loads code and data into the $cache \rightarrow uses$ the ring interconnect

foreach bit b in key k do $E1()$; if $b == 1$ then $E2()$;

- If the attacker can detect F2's execution, they can leak *b*.
- First iteration (cold cache):
	- E1 loads code and data into the cache \rightarrow uses the ring interconnect
	- If *b=1*, E2 loads code and data into the $cache \rightarrow uses$ the ring interconnect
	- If *b=0*, E2 is skipped. E1 follows and hits in the cache \rightarrow does not use the ring interconnect.

foreach bit b in key k do $E1()$; if $b == 1$ then $E2()$;

- If the attacker can detect F2's execution, they can leak *b*.
- First iteration (cold cache):
	- E1 loads code and data into the cache \rightarrow uses the ring interconnect
	- If *b=1*, E2 loads code and data into the $cache \rightarrow uses$ the ring interconnect
	- If *b=0*, E2 is skipped. E1 follows and hits in the cache \rightarrow does not use the ring interconnect.

foreach bit b in key k do $E1()$; if $b == 1$ then $E2()$;

> More details in the paper

RSA square-and-multiply

• What the attacker (receiver) sees (average over 100 traces)¹:

 $^{1}R_c = 2, R_s = 1, S_c = 5$

RSA square-and-multiply

• What the attacker (receiver) sees (average over 100 traces)¹:

• We trained an SVM classifier to distinguish traces where bit=0 from traces where bit=1. Accuracy = 90% .

 $^{1}R_c = 2, R_c = 1, S_c = 5$

Keystroke timing attack

• Goal: detect *when* keystrokes occur to extract precise interkeystroke timings (which can be used to leak passwords).

Keystroke timing attack

- Goal: detect *when* keystrokes occur to extract precise interkeystroke timings (which can be used to leak passwords).
- Does processing a keystroke cause ring contention?

Keystroke Timing Attack

• What the attacker (receiver) sees:

Keystroke Timing Attack

• What the attacker (receiver) sees:

Conclusion

https://github.com/FPSG-UIUC/lotr