

Flow Analysis:
Scaling it up
to a complete
language and
problem set



Pointers

→ α char *a = "hi";
(β char *)*p = &a;
(γ char *)*q = p;
 ω char *b = fgets(...);
*q = b;
printf(*p);

Solution exists:

$\alpha = \beta = \text{untainted}$

$\omega = \gamma = \text{tainted}$

$\text{untainted} \leq \alpha$

$\alpha \leq \beta$

$\beta \leq \gamma$

$\text{tainted} \leq \omega$

$\omega \leq \gamma$

$\beta \leq \text{untainted}$

Misses illegal flow!

- p and q are aliases
 - so writing **tainted** data to q
 - makes p's contents **tainted**

Pointers

```
 $\alpha$  char *a = "hi";  
( $\beta$  char *)*p = &a;  
( $\gamma$  char *)*q = p;  
 $\omega$  char *b = fgets(...);  
*q = b;  
printf(*p);
```

~~Solution exists:~~

$\alpha = \beta = \text{untainted}$

$\omega = \gamma = \text{tainted}$

$\text{untainted} \leq \alpha$

$\alpha \leq \beta$

$\beta \leq \gamma$

$\gamma \leq \beta$

$\text{tainted} \leq \omega$

$\omega \leq \gamma$

$\beta \leq \text{untainted}$

Flow and pointers

- An assignment via a pointer “flows both ways”
 - Ensures that **aliasing constraints are sound**
 - But can lead to **false alarms**
- Reducing alarms
 - If pointers are never assigned to (`const`) then backward flow is not needed (sound)
 - Drop backward flow edge anyway
 - Trades false alarms for missed errors (unsoundness)

Implicit flows

```
void copy(tainted char *src,  
         untainted char *dst,  
         int len) {  
    untainted int i;  
    for (i = 0; i < len; i++) {  
        dst[i] = src[i]: //illegal  
        untainted char    tainted char  
    }  
}
```

Illegal flow :
tainted $\not\equiv$ **untainted**

Implicit flows

```
void copy(tainted char *src,  
         untainted char *dst,  
         int len) {  
    untainted int i, j;  
    for (i = 0; i<len; i++) {  
        for (j = 0; j<sizeof(char)*256; j++) {  
            if (src[i] == (char)j)  
                dst[i] = (char)j; //legal?  
        }  
        untainted char  
    }  
}
```

Missed flow

Information flow analysis

- The prior flow is an **implicit flow**, since information in one value *implicitly* influences another
- One way to discover these is to maintain a scoped **program counter (*pc*) label**
 - Represents the maximum taint affecting the current *pc*
- Assignments generate constraints involving the *pc*
 - $x = y$ produces two constraints:
 $label(y) \leq label(x)$ (as usual)
 $pc \leq label(x)$
- **Generalized analysis** tracks **information flow**

Info flow example

$pc_1 =$ untainted	<code>tainted int src;</code>	
$pc_2 =$ tainted	<code>α int dst;</code>	
$pc_3 =$ tainted	<code>if (src == 0)</code>	untainted $\leq \alpha$
	<code>dst = 0;</code>	$\alpha \leq pc_2$
	<code>else</code>	untainted $\leq \alpha$
	<code>dst = 1;</code>	$\alpha \leq pc_3$
$pc_4 =$ untainted	<code>dst += 0;</code>	untainted $\leq \alpha$
		$\alpha \leq pc_4$

Solution requires $\alpha =$ **tainted**
Discovers implicit flow

Why not information flow?

- Tracking implicit flows with a *pc* label can lead to **false alarms**

- E.g., ignores values

```
tainted int src;  
α int dst;  
if (src > 0) dst = 0;  
else       dst = 0;
```

- Extra constraints also **hurt performance**
- Our copying example is *pathological*
 - We typically don't write programs like this
 - Implicit flows will have little overall influence
- So: **tainting analyses tend to ignore implicit flows**