

Re: Scheduler fixes for hyperthreading

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/arch/2005-05/0064.html>

From: Sam Lawrance (boris_at_brooknet.com.au)

Date: 05/22/05

To: Colin Percival <cperciva@freebsd.org>

Date: Sun, 22 May 2005 15:02:50 +1000

On Sat, 2005-05-21 at 21:35 -0700, Colin Percival wrote:

> *Marcel Moolenaar wrote:*

> > *There are a lot of variables that need to be taken into account and*

> > *those variables do not necessarily map perfectly from a P4 to an I2.*

> > *Sharing of the L1 cache is not a sufficient condition to create a*

> > *side-channel for timing attacks. A reliable time source with enough*

> > *precision is also necessary (as you and Stephan have pointed out).*

> > *The precision of the time source depends on latencies of the various*

> > *cache levels and the micro-architectural behavior of the processor.*

>

> *Point taken. I maintain, however, that it is much better to make*

> *"information can leak between these processors" a machine-independent*

> *concept which is handled appropriately by the scheduler (with the*

> *necessary machine-dependent code to specify *which* sets of processors,*

> *if any, have such leakage).*

I'm just curious here... would the mac_seeotheruids policy help in obscuring the value of any information collected by a spy process?

freebsd-arch@freebsd.org mailing list

<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-arch>

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-arch-unsubscribe@freebsd.org"