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## A Artifact Appendix

## A. 1 Abstract

This artifact is an implementation of multi-bank hammering in our paper. It is based on the TRRespass repository and designed to test bitflips on Intel systems with DDR4 memory. The code is expected to show a near-linear increase in the number of total bitflips with the increase of hammered banks and a jump in the effectiveness of the hammering pattern when the number of hammered banks is increased from one to two.

## A. 2 Description \& Requirements

## A.2.1 Security, privacy, and ethical concerns

Running this program should not pose any security, privacy, or ethical concerns that we know of. By design, bitflips found by the code are contained in address spaces within the program. However, it may be possible that the program may flip a random bit in the system and make the system to be unstable.

## A.2.2 How to access

The code is avaliable at: Github Page Link

## A.2.3 Hardware dependencies

Running this program requires a 6th to 10th-generation Intel processor with a DDR4 compatible mainboard. The installed DDR4 memory must be susceptible to TRRespass.

## A.2.4 Software dependencies

The code requires gcc and Make to compile. DRAM addressing function in src/main.c must be configured according
to the DRAM configuration. We include the addressing function for 8GB x8 single DIMM, single channel and 16GB x 8 two DIMMs, dual channel configuration for 6th to 10thgeneration Intel processors. The addressing function can be configured through src/main.c. Additional addressing functions for different configurations can be discovered using DRAMA,

The OS should be linux-based and the code requires 1 GB hugepage to be available or transparent hugepages be set to madvise or always in the OS.

## A.2.5 Benchmarks

None.

## A. 3 Set-up

The machine running the program should satisfy all hardware and software dependencies from the previous section. While running the program, it is advised that no other program is running alongside it, as it may interfere with the hammering process.

## A.3.1 Installation

With the test machine setup, $c d$ into multibank_hammer and run make. Then, run sudo ./hugepage.sh to mount the 1 GB huge page.

## A.3.2 Basic Test

After compiling the code, run sudo ./obj/tester $-v$. In our configuration, we were able to see a bitflip within the first minute. If a bitflip is found, there will be a command line output notifying the user of the flip direction and the row, bank, and column of the flipped bit. The program will terminate after 1000 different hammering iterations.


Figure 1: Example of output.


Figure 2: Example of the parser output.

## A. 4 Evaluation workflow

## A.4.1 Major Claims

(C1): The provided multi-bank hammering pattern exhibits a jump in the number of bitflips per bank per hammering attempt when increasing the number of hammered banks from one to two.
(C2): The total number of bitflips per hammering attempt will increase almost linearly with the increase in the number of hammered banks when increasing from two. The optimal number of banks would differ per configured system. In our case, the number of bitflips peaked at 4 banks.

## A.4.2 Experiments

By default, the code is configured to hammer 10 aggressors per bank and increase the number of hammered banks from 1 to 6 , hammering 1000 iterations per bank configuration. On our machine, this took around 2 hours to run.

Preparation: Set the DRAM addressing function in src/main.c according to the system configuration and num_aggs in hammer-suite.c to the optimal number of aggressors of the installed DDR4 DIMM and run make.

Execution: run sudo ./obj/tester -v. Parse the result by running python3 ./parse_result.py data/test.csv $-v$.

Results: Figure 1 is the an example of the program output. Line 1 shows the aggressor rows in the order that they are hammered. line 2 and 4 is the hammering pattern (thp), the 0 and 1 after the pattern indicate whether we're looking for 0 to 1 flips or 1 to 0 flips, respectively. The number after the colon is the total time it took for the hammering pattern ( ms ) and the time between two ACTs to rows across banks (ns). Note that because this is across banks, the time between ACTs would be smaller as ACTs are parallelized. Finally, line 3 is the output when a bitflip is found. It indicates the flip direction and the location of the flipped bit. This information, aggressor rows,
timing information, and the bitflips, are also saved as a file in data/test.csv by default.
Figure 2 is an exemplary output of the parser. thp 0 are the results for 0 to 1 flips and thp 1 are the results for 1 to 0 flips. numattks is the total number of different hammering attempts, patterns is the number of patterns that was able to flip bits, tot. $a v g$ is the average time in ms to run the hammering pattern, $a 2 a$ is the average time between activates (across banks), $x b k$ is the average time between activates within a bank. flips is the total number of flips across all iterations, and flips/attk is the total number of flips divided by the number of iterations.


Figure 3: Total number of flips plot.
If you plot the total number of flips, it should look like Figure 3, where the number of flips increases with the number of banks. In Figure 3, the peak was with 4 banks, a 2.85 x increase in total number of bitflips compared to 1 bank. The peak number of banks and the total number of bitflips may differ per configuration.
Figure 4 is the total number of flips divided by the hammering iterations divided by hammered banks. This is to measure how effective the hammering pattern is at flipping bits. The plot should show a jump when increasing the number of banks from one to two and steadily decline afterwards. In Figure 4


Figure 4: Total number of flips / (number of iterations * number of banks).
the effectiveness jumped by 1.2 x compared to a single bank. The increase in effectiveness may differ per configuration.

## A. 5 Notes on Reusability

While multi-bank hammering was only tested with n-sided hammering, the same principles that increased the number of flips should apply to other hammering patterns, such as Blacksmith. This would allow the user to create more powerful hammering patterns.

## A. 6 Version

Based on the LaTeX template for Artifact Evaluation V20231005. Submission, reviewing and badging methodology followed for the evaluation of this artifact can be found at https://secartifacts.github.io/usenixsec2024/.

