Low-level software vulnerability protection mechanisms
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wabrandsm (2551008) writes with this excerpt from The Verge:

Last night, researchers at Malwarebytes noticed strange behavior on sites like Last.fm, The Times of Israel and The Jerusalem Post. Ads on the sites were being unusually aggressive, setting off anti-virus warnings and raising flags in a number of Malwarebytes systems. After some digging, researcher Jerome Segura realized the problem was coming from Google's DoubleClick ad servers and the popular Zedo ad agency. Together, they were serving up malicious ads designed to spread the recently identified Zemot malware. A Google representative has confirmed the breach, saying "our team is aware of this and has taken steps to shut this down."
How can we help prevent exploitation of buffer overflows and other control flow hijacking?

- Non-executable memory pages
- Return-into-libc exploits, Return-oriented programming
- Address space layout randomization
- StackGuard, StackShield
- Software fault isolation
Process memory layout

 unused space

Low memory addresses

High memory addresses

.text: machine code of executable
.data: global initialized variables
.bss: “below stack section”
global uninitialized variables

heap: dynamic variables
stack: local variables, track func calls
Env: environment variables, arguments to program

Low memory addresses

High memory addresses
Typical return ptr overwrite exploit
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Countermeasures?

- Stack canaries
- Address space layout randomization
- $W^X$
- Confinement
Protecting the stack

Can we protect the return address from being overwritten?

Two approaches:
• Detect manipulation (and then fail safe)
• Prevent it completely
Detection: stack canaries

Canary value can be:
- Random value (choose once for whole process)
- NULL bytes / EOF / etc. (string functions won’t copy past canary)

On end of function, check that canary is correct, if not fail safe
Detection: stack canaries

StackGuard:
- GCC extension that adds runtime canary checking
- 8% overhead on Apache

ProPolice:
- Modifies how canaries inserted
- Adds protection for registers
- Sorts variables so arrays are highest in stack
Detection: stack canaries

Discussion: How would you get around it?

Reading the stack, remotely

Request (can trigger buffer overflow in stack)

Apache forks off child process to handle request

Response (unless process crashes)

Apache web server

For each value x, send request and see if responded to properly

Expected $2^7 + 2^7 + 2^7 + 2^7 = 512$ requests

Repeat for subsequent bytes of canary
Detection: copying values to safe location

StackShield:
- Function call: copy return address to safer location (beginning of .data)
- Check if stack value is different on function exit

Discussion: How would you get around this?
Prevention

StackGhost:
- Encrypting the return address
  - XOR with random value on function entrance
  - XOR with same value on function exit
- Per-kernel XOR vs. Per-process XOR
- Return address stack
Countermeasures?

- Stack canaries
- Address space layout randomization
- W^X
- Confinement
Address space layout randomization (ASLR)

dynamically linked libraries (libc) go in here

Low memory addresses

High memory addresses
Address space layout randomization (ASLR)

- dynamically linked libraries (libc) go in here

PaX implementation for example:
- Randomize offsets of three areas
- 16 bits, 16 bits, 24 bits of randomness
- Adds unpredictability... but how much?
Defeating ASLR

- Large nop sled with classic buffer overflow (W^X prevents this)
- Use a vulnerability that can be used to leak address information (e.g., printf arbitrary read)
- Brute force the address
Defeating ASLR

Brute-forcing example from reading “On the effectiveness of Address Space Layout Randomization” by Shacham et al.

Apache web server with Oracle 9 PL/SQL module

request

Apache forks off child process to handle request

response

There is a buffer overflow in module that helps process request
Defeating ASLR

Brute-forcing example from reading “On the effectiveness of Address Space Layout Randomization” by Shacham et al.

Attacker makes a guess of where `usleep()` is located in memory

Failure will crash the child process immediately and therefore kill connection

Success will crash the child process after sleeping for 0x01010101 microseconds and kill connection

If on 64-bit architecture, such brute-force attack unlikely to work
Reading the stack, remotely

Request (can trigger buffer overflow in stack)

Apache forks off child process to handle request

Response (unless process crashes)

Apache web server

Reading stack for EBP/EIP can give approximate address offset
Can also randomize more stuff:
• Instruction set randomization
• per-memory-allocation randomization
• etc.
Countermeasures?

• Stack canaries
• Address space layout randomization
• W^X
• Confinement
W^X (W xor X)

• The idea: mark memory page as either
  – Writable or Executable (not both)
• Specifically: make heap and stack non-executable
$W^X$ (W xor X)

- AMD64: NX bit (Non-Executable)
- IA-64: XD bit (eXecute Disabled)
- ARMv6: XN bit (eXecute Never)
  - Extra bit in each page table entry
  - Processor refuses to execute code if bit = 1
  - Mark heap and stack segments as such

Low memory addresses

High memory addresses
$W^{\land}X$ (W xor X)

Software emulation of NX bits

- ExecShield (RedHat Linux)
- PaX (Page-eXec) (uses NX bit if available)

mprotect()

- Process can set permissions on memory pages
Will W^X stop:

AlephOne’s stack overflow exploit? (Yes)

Stack smash that overwrites pointer to point at shell code in Heap or Env variable? (Yes)

Heap overflow with same shell location? (Yes)

Double free with same shell location? (Yes)
Limitations of W^X

Software emulation ...
• May not be perfect and is slow
• E.g., double-free or format-string vulnerability may allow turning off protections

Breaking compatibility
• GCC stack trampolines (calling conventions, nested functions)
• Just-in-time (JIT) compilation using heap

Exploits designed to only run existing code
Remote Exploit Vulnerability Found In Bash

Soulskill posted 2 hours ago | from the don't-bash-bash dept.

kdryer39 sends this news from CSO:

A remotely exploitable vulnerability has been discovered by Stephane Chazelas in bash on Linux, and it is unpleasant. The vulnerability has the CVE identifier CVE-2014-6271. This affects Debian as well as other Linux distributions. The major attack vectors that have been identified in this case are HTTP requests and CGI scripts. Another attack surface is OpenSSH through the use of AcceptEnv variables. Also through TERM and SSH_ORIGINAL_COMMAND. An environmental variable with an arbitrary name can carry a nefarious function which can enable network exploitation.

Popular Wi-Fi Thermostat Full of Security Holes
Return-into-libc exploits

- libc is standard C library, included in all processes
- system() --- execute commands on system
Return-into-libc exploits

Overwrite EIP with address of system() function
junk2 just some filler: returned to after system call
first argument to system() is ptr to “/bin/sh”

Low memory addresses

High memory addresses
Return-into-libc exploits

This simple exploit has a few deficiencies (for attacker):
- Crashes after exiting called /bin/sh ( easy to fix with exit() )
- system() drops privileges by default

wrap.c :
main() {
  setuid(0);
  setgid(0);
  system("bin/sh");
}

printf( "%3$n", ... )
%3n means “write number of bytes in format string up to the format token into third parameter”
execl( "./wrap", "./wrap", 0 )
Writes 0 here
Return-into-libc exploits

These exploits only execute instructions marked executable

W^X cannot stop such an attack

```
wrap.c:
main()
{
    setuid(0);
    setgid(0);
    system("bin/sh");
}
```

```
printf("%3$n", ... )
%3n means “write number of bytes in format string up to the format token into third parameter”
```

```
execl("./wrap", "./wrap", 0 )
```

```
junk addr of printf addr of execl addr of "%3$n" addr of "/wrap" addr of "/wrap" addr of HERE
```

```
Writes 0 here
```

%3n means “write number of bytes in format string up to the format token into third parameter”
Return-into-libc exploits

Return-into-libc may seem limited:
- Only useful for calling libc functions
- Okay in last example, but not always sufficient
- Before W^X, exploit could run arbitrary code

Can we not inject any malicious code and yet have an exploit that runs arbitrary code?
Return-oriented programming (ROP)

Second return-into-libc exploit:
  self-modifying exploit buffer to call a sequence of libc calls

Logical extreme:
  chain together a long sequence of calls to code

But we want arbitrary code, not sequence of libc calls:
  chain together a long sequence of calls to code snippets
Return-oriented programming (ROP)

Figure 3: Load a word in memory into %eax.

From Shacham “The Geometry of Innocent Flesh on the Bone...” 2007
Return-oriented programming

Vulnerable function

ROP gadget 1 (elsewhere in memory)

ROP gadget 2 (elsewhere in memory)

1) Loads value Const into register %eax
2) Loads *(Const+64) into register %eax
Return-oriented programming (ROP)

From Shacham “The Geometry of Innocent Flesh on the Bone…” 2007

If this is on stack and (*) is return pointer after buffer overflow, then the result will be loading 0xdeadbeef into edx register
From Shacham “The Geometry of Innocent Flesh on the Bone…” 2007
ROP where do we get code snippets?

Unintended instructions —

```assembly
movl $0x00000001, -44(%ebp)
```

```assembly
test $0x00000007, %edi
```

```assembly
setnzb -61(%ebp)
```

Buchanan et al., Blackhat 2008
W^X wrapup

W^X does not prevent arbitrary code execution, but does make it harder!

What else can we do?
Countermeasures?

• Stack canaries
• Address space layout randomization
• W^X
• Confinement
Confinement (sand boxing)

• All the mechanisms thus far are circumventable, though exploits become harder

• **Confinement goal:** Can we at least confine code that is potentially vulnerable so it doesn’t cause harm?
Simple example is chroot

chroot /tmp/guest
su guest

Now all file access are prepended with /tmp/guest

open("/etc/passwd", "r")
Attempts to open /tmp/guest/etc/passwd

Limitation is that all needed files must be inside chroot jail
jailkit

Limitation: network access not inhibited
Escaping jails

open( "../../etc/passwd", "r" )
Attempts to open
/tmp/guest/..../etc/passwd

chroot should only be executable by root

create /aaa/etc/passwd
chroot /aaa
su root
System call interposition

• Malicious code must make system calls in order to do bad things
• So monitor system calls!

![Diagram showing system call interposition between user land, kernel, process, and monitor with 'Ok / not ok' decision.]
Figure 1. System Call Interposition in Janus
Software-fault isolation example: Google Native Client

Goal: run native code from a web browser safely

Examples are Quake and XiaoS ported over

From Yee et al. 2009
Software-fault isolation example: Google Native Client

Inner sandbox

- static analysis to detect flaws
- require code to abide by alignment and structure rules, allowing disassembly.
- Find any disallowed machine instructions
- x86 segmented memory to confine data and instruction references

Validator quickly checks that a binary abides by these rules
Software-fault isolation example: Google Native Client

Outer sandbox

- system call interposition to monitor
- similar to Janus / ptrace
Native client spec perf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>static</th>
<th>aligned</th>
<th>NaCl</th>
<th>increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ammp</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bzip2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crafty</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eon</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equake</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gap</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gcc</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gzip</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mcf</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mesa</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parser</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perlbmk</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twolf</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vortex</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| vpr  | 90.7   | 88.4    | 89.6 | -1.2%    

Table 4: SPEC2000 performance. Execution time is in seconds. All binaries are statically linked.
Native client Quake perf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run #</th>
<th>Native Client</th>
<th>Linux Executable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>142.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>144.2</td>
<td>143.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>143.7</td>
<td>143.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Quake performance comparison. Numbers are in frames per second.
More sandboxing: virtualization

- Modern virtual machines (VMs) often used for sandboxing

- NSA NetTop
More sandboxing: virtualization

• Malicious use of virtualization: blue pill virus
Countermeasures?

• Stack canaries
• Address space layout randomization
• W^X
• Confinement
Discussion:
state of low level software security

• Do you think Native Client is fool proof?
• What about VM-based sandboxing?