



# Dowsing for Overflows: A Guided Fuzzer to Find Buffer Boundary Violations

Istvan Haller and Asia Slowinska, *VU University Amsterdam*;  
Matthias Neugschwandtner, *Vienna University of Technology*;  
Herbert Bos, *VU University Amsterdam*

This paper is included in the Proceedings of the  
**22nd USENIX Security Symposium.**

August 14–16, 2013 • Washington, D.C., USA

ISBN 978-1-931971-03-4

Open access to the Proceedings of the  
**22nd USENIX Security Symposium**  
is sponsored by USENIX

# Dowsing for overflows: A guided fuzzer to find buffer boundary violations

Istvan Haller

VU University Amsterdam

Asia Slowinska

VU University Amsterdam

Matthias Neugschwandtner

Vienna University of Technology

Herbert Bos

VU University Amsterdam

## Abstract

*Dowser* is a ‘guided’ fuzzer that combines taint tracking, program analysis and symbolic execution to find buffer overflow and underflow vulnerabilities buried deep in a program’s logic. The key idea is that analysis of a program lets us pinpoint the right areas in the program code to probe and the appropriate inputs to do so.

Intuitively, for typical buffer overflows, we need consider only the code that accesses an array in a loop, rather than all possible instructions in the program. After finding all such candidate sets of instructions, we rank them according to an estimation of how likely they are to contain interesting vulnerabilities. We then subject the most promising sets to further testing. Specifically, we first use taint analysis to determine which input bytes influence the array index and then execute the program symbolically, making only this set of inputs symbolic. By constantly steering the symbolic execution along branch outcomes most likely to lead to overflows, we were able to detect deep bugs in real programs (like the `nginx` webserver, the `ircd` IRC server, and the `ffmpeg` videoplayer). Two of the bugs we found were previously undocumented buffer overflows in `ffmpeg` and the `poppler` PDF rendering library.

## 1 Introduction

We discuss *Dowser*, a ‘guided’ fuzzer that combines taint tracking, program analysis and symbolic execution, to find buffer overflow bugs buried deep in the program’s logic.

Buffer overflows are perennially in the top 3 most dangerous software errors [12] and recent studies suggest this will not change any time soon [41, 38]. There are two ways to handle them. Either we harden the software with memory protectors that terminate the program when an overflow occurs (at runtime), or we track down the vulnerabilities before releasing the software (e.g., in the testing phase).

Memory protectors include common solutions like shadow stacks and canaries [11], and more elaborate compiler extensions like WIT [3]. They are effective in preventing programs from being exploited, but they do not remove the overflow bugs themselves. Although it is better to crash than to allow exploitation, crashes are undesirable too!

Thus, vendors prefer to squash bugs beforehand and typically try to find as many as they can by means of fuzz testing. Fuzzers feed programs invalid, unexpected, or random data to see if they crash or exhibit unexpected behavior<sup>1</sup>. As an example, Microsoft made fuzzing mandatory for every untrusted interface for every product, and their fuzzing solution has been running 24/7 since 2008 for a total of over 400 machine years [18].

Unfortunately, the effectiveness of most fuzzers is poor and the results rarely extend beyond shallow bugs. Most fuzzers take a ‘blackbox’ approach that focuses on the input format and ignores the tested software target. Blackbox fuzzing is popular and fast, but misses many relevant code paths and thus many bugs. Blackbox fuzzing is a bit like shooting in the dark: you have to be lucky to hit anything interesting.

Whitebox fuzzing, as implemented in [18, 7, 10], is more principled. By means of symbolic execution, it exercises all possible execution paths through the program and thus uncovers all possible bugs – although it may take years to do. Since full symbolic execution is slow and does not scale to large programs, it is hard to use it to find complex bugs in large programs [7, 10]. In practice, the aim is therefore to first cover as much unique code as possible. As a result, bugs that require a program to execute the same code many times (like buffer overflows) are hard to trigger except in very simple cases.

Eventual completeness, as provided by symbolic execution, is both a strength and a weakness, and in this paper, we evaluate the exact opposite strategy. Rather

<sup>1</sup>See <http://www.fuzzing.org/> for a collection of available fuzzers

than testing all possible execution paths, we perform *spot checks* on a small number of code areas that look likely candidates for buffer overflow bugs and test each in turn.

The drawback of our approach is that we execute a symbolic run for each candidate code area—in an iterative fashion. Moreover, we can discover buffer overflows only in the loops that we can exercise. On the other hand, by homing in on promising code areas directly, we speed up the search considerably, and manage to find complicated bugs in real programs that would be hard to find with most existing fuzzers.

**Contributions** The goal we set ourselves was to develop an efficient fuzzer that actively *searches* for buffer overflows *directly*. The key insight is that careful analysis of a program lets us pinpoint the right places to probe and the appropriate inputs to do so. The main contribution is that our fuzzer directly zooms in on these buffer overflow candidates and explores a novel ‘spot-check’ approach in symbolic execution.

To make the approach work, we need to address two main challenges. The first challenge is *where* to steer the execution of a program to increase the chances of finding a vulnerability. Whitebox fuzzers ‘blindly’ try to execute as much of the program as possible, in the hope of hitting a bug eventually. Instead, *Dowser* uses information about the target program to identify code that is most likely to be vulnerable to a buffer overflow.

For instance, buffer overflows occur (mostly) in code that accesses an array in a loop. Thus, we look for such code and ignore most of the remaining instructions in the program. Furthermore, *Dowser* performs static analysis of the program to *rank* such accesses. We will evaluate different ranking functions, but the best one so far ranks the array accesses according to complexity. The intuition is that code with convoluted pointer arithmetic and/or complex control flow is more prone to memory errors than straightforward array accesses. Moreover, by focusing on such code, *Dowser* prioritizes bugs that are complicated—typically, the kind of vulnerabilities that static analysis or random fuzzing cannot find. The aim is to reduce the time wasted on shallow bugs that could also have been found using existing methods. Still, other rankings are possible also, and *Dowser* is entirely agnostic to the ranking function used.

The second challenge we address is *how* to steer the execution of a program to these “interesting” code areas. As a baseline, we use *concolic* execution [43]: a combination of concrete and symbolic execution, where the concrete (fixed) input starts off the symbolic execution. In *Dowser*, we enhance concolic execution with two optimizations.

First, we propose a new path selection algorithm. As we saw earlier, traditional symbolic execution aims

at code coverage—maximizing the fraction of individual branches executed [7, 18]. In contrast, we aim for *pointer value* coverage of *selected* code fragments. When *Dowser* examines an interesting pointer dereference, it steers the symbolic execution along branches that are likely to alter the value of the pointer.

Second, we reduce the amount of symbolic input as much as we can. Specifically, *Dowser* uses dynamic taint analysis to determine which input bytes influence the pointers used for array accesses. Later, it treats only these inputs as symbolic. While taint analysis itself is not new, we introduce novel optimizations to arrive at a set of symbolic inputs that is as *accurate* as possible (with neither too few, nor too many symbolic bytes).

In summary, *Dowser* is a new fuzzer targeted at vendors who want to test their code for buffer overflows and underflows. We implemented the analyses of *Dowser* as LLVM [23] passes, while the symbolic execution step employs S2E [10]. Finally, *Dowser* is a *practical* solution. Rather than aiming for all possible security bugs, it specifically targets the class of buffer overflows (one of the most, if not the most, important class of attack vectors for code injection). So far, *Dowser* found several real bugs in complex programs like `nginx`, `ffmpeg`, and `inspircd`. Most of them are extremely difficult to find with existing symbolic execution tools.

**Assumptions and outline** Throughout this paper, we assume that we have a test suite that allows us to reach the array accesses. Instructions that we cannot reach, we cannot test. In the remainder, we start with a big picture and the running example (Section 2). Then, we discuss the three main components of *Dowser* in turn: the selection of interesting code fragments (Section 3), the use of dynamic taint analysis to determine which inputs influence the candidate instructions (Section 4), and our approach to nudge the program to trigger a bug during symbolic execution (Section 5). We evaluate the system in Section 6, discuss the related projects in Section 7. We conclude in Section 8.

## 2 Big picture

The main goal of *Dowser* is to manipulate the pointers that instructions use to access an array in a loop, in the hope of forcing a buffer overrun or underrun.

### 2.1 Running example

Throughout the paper, we will use the function in Figure 1 to illustrate how *Dowser* works. The example is a simplified version of a buffer underrun vulnerability in the `nginx-0.6.32` web server [1]. A specially crafted

## A buffer underrun vulnerability in nginx

```

[1] int ngx_http_parse_complex_uri(ngx_http_request_t *r)
[2] {
[3]     state = sw_usual;
[4]     u_char* p = r->uri_start; // user input
[5]     u_char* u = r->uri.data; // store normalized uri here
[6]     u_char ch = *p++;
[7] 
[8]     while (p <= r->uri_end) {
[9]         switch (state) {
[10]             case sw_usual:
[11]                 if (ch == '/') {
[12]                     state = sw_slash; *u++ = ch;
[13]                     else /* many more options here */
[14]                         ch = *p++; break;
[15] 
[16]             case sw_slash:
[17]                 if (ch == '/') {
[18]                     *u++ = ch;
[19]                     else if (ch == '=') {
[20]                         state = sw_dot; *u++ = ch;
[21]                         else /* many more options here */
[22]                             ch = *p++; break;
[23] 
[24]             case sw_dot:
[25]                 if (ch == '=') {
[26]                     state = sw_dot_dot; *u++ = ch;
[27]                     else /* many more options here */
[28]                         ch = *p++; break;
[29] 
[30]             case sw_dot_dot:
[31]                 if (ch == '=') {
[32]                     state = sw_slash; u -= 4;
[33]                     while (*u-1 != '/') u--;
[34]                     else /* many more options here */
[35]                         ch = *p++; break;
[36] 
[37]         }
[38]     }
}

```

Fig. 1: A simplified version of a buffer underrun vulnerability in nginx.

input tricks the program into setting the `u` pointer to a location outside its buffer boundaries. When this pointer is later used to access memory, it allows attackers to overwrite a function pointer, and execute arbitrary programs on the system.

Figure 1 presents only an excerpt from the original function, which in reality spans approximately 400 lines of C code. It contains a number of additional options in the `switch` statement, and a few nested conditional `if` statements. This complexity severely impedes detecting the bug by both static analysis tools and symbolic execution engines. For instance, when we steered S2E [10] all the way down to the vulnerable function, and made solely the seven byte long uri path of the HTTP message symbolic, it took over 60 minutes to track down the problematic scenario. A more scalable solution is necessary in practice. Without these hints, S2E did not find the bug at all during an eight hour long execution.<sup>2</sup> In contrast, *Dowser* finds it in less than 5 minutes.

The primary reason for the high cost of the analysis in S2E is the large number of conditional branches which depend on (symbolic) input. For each of the branches, symbolic execution first checks whether either the condition or its negation is satisfiable. When both branches are feasible, the default behavior is to examine both. This

Nginx is a web server—in terms of market share across the million busiest sites, it ranks third in the world. At the time of writing, it hosts about 22 million domains worldwide. Versions prior to 0.6.38 had a particularly nasty vulnerability [1].

When nginx receives an HTTP request, the parsing function `nginx_http_parse_complex_uri`, first normalizes a uri path in `p=r->uri_start` (line 4), storing the result in a heap buffer pointed to by `u=r->uri.data` (line 5). The `while-switch` implements a state machine that consumes the input one character at a time, and transform it into a canonical form in `u`.

The source of the vulnerability is in the `sw_dot_dot` state. When provided with a carefully crafted path, nginx wrongly sets the beginning of `u` to a location somewhere below `r->uri.data`. Suppose the uri is "`//.../foo`". When `p` reaches "`/foo`", `u` points to `(r->uri.data+4)`, and `state` is `sw_dot_dot` (line 30). The routine now decreases `u` by 4 (line 32), so that it points to `r->uri.data`. As long as the memory below `r->uri.data` does not contain the character `/`, `u` is further decreased (line 33), even though it crosses buffer boundaries. Finally, the user provided input ("`foo`") is copied to the location pointed to by `u`.

In this case, the overwritten buffer contains a pointer to a function, which will be eventually called by nginx. Thus the vulnerability allows attackers to modify a function pointer, and execute an arbitrary program on the system.

It is a complex bug that is hard to find with existing solutions. The many conditional statements that depend on symbolic input are problematic for symbolic execution, while input-dependent indirect jumps are also a bad match for static analysis.

procedure results in an exponentially growing number of paths.

This real world example shows the need for (1) focusing the powerful yet expensive symbolic execution on the most interesting cases, (2) making informed branch choices, and (3) minimizing the amount of symbolic data.

## 2.2 High-level overview

Figure 2 illustrates the overall *Dowser* architecture.

First, it performs a data flow analysis of the target program, and ranks all instructions that access buffers in loops ①. While we can rank them in different ways and *Dowser* is agnostic as to the ranking function we use, our experience so far is that an estimation of complexity works best. Specifically, we rank calculations and conditions that are more complex higher than simple ones. In Figure 1, `u` is involved in three different operations, i.e., `u++`, `u--`, and `u-=4`, in multiple instructions inside a loop. As we shall see, these intricate computations place the dereferences of `u` in the top 3% of the most complex pointer accesses across nginx.

In the second step ②, *Dowser* repeatedly picks high-ranking accesses, and selects test inputs which exercise them. Then, it uses dynamic taint analysis to determine which input bytes influence pointers dereferenced in the candidate instructions. The idea is that, given the for-

<sup>2</sup>All measurements in the paper use the same environment as in Section 6.




Fig. 2: *Dowser*—high-level overview.

mat of the input, *Dowser* fuzzes (i.e., treats as symbolic), only those fields that affect the potentially vulnerable memory accesses, and keeps the remaining ones unchanged. In Figure 1, we learn that it is sufficient to treat the uri path in the HTTP request as symbolic. Indeed, the computations inside the vulnerable function are independent of the remaining part of the input message.

Next ③, for each candidate instruction and the input bytes involved in calculating the array pointer, *Dowser* uses symbolic execution to try to nudge the program toward overflowing the buffer. Specifically, we execute symbolically the loop that contains the candidate instructions (and thus should be tested for buffer overflows)—treating only the relevant bytes as symbolic. As we shall see, a new path selection algorithm helps to guide execution to a possible overflow quickly.

Finally, we detect any overflow that may occur. Just like in whitebox fuzzers, we can use any technique to do so (e.g., Purify, Valgrind [30], or BinArmor [37]). In our work, we use Google’s AddressSanitizer [34] ④. It instruments the protected program to ensure that memory access instructions never read or write so called, “poisoned” red zones. Red zones are small regions of memory inserted inbetween any two stack, heap or global objects. Since they should never be addressed by the program, an access to them indicates an illegal behavior. This policy detects sequential buffer over- and underflows, and some of the more sophisticated pointer corruption bugs. This technique is beneficial when searching for new bugs since it will also trigger on silent failures, not just application crashes. In the case of nginx, AddressSanitizer detects the underflow when the `u` pointer reads memory outside its buffer boundaries (line 33).

We explain step ① (static analysis) in Section 3, step ② (taint analysis) in Section 4, and step ③ (guided execution) in Section 5.

### 3 Dowsing for candidate instructions

Previous research has shown that software complexity metrics collected from software artifacts are helpful in finding vulnerable code components [16, 44, 35, 32]. However, even though complexity metrics serve as useful indicators, they also suffer from low precision or recall values. Moreover, most of the current approaches operate at the granularity of modules or files, which is too coarse for the directed symbolic execution in *Dowser*.

As observed by Zimmermann et al. [44], we need metrics that exploit the unique characteristics of vulnerabilities, e.g., buffer overflows or integer overruns. In principle, *Dowser* can work with any metric capable of ranking groups of instructions that access buffers in a loop. So, the question is how to design a good metric for complexity that satisfies this criterion? In the remainder of this section, we introduce one such metric: a heuristics-based approach that we specifically designed for the detection of potential buffer overflow vulnerabilities.

We leverage a primary pragmatic reason behind complex buffer overflows: convoluted pointer computations are hard to follow by a programmer. Thus, we focus on ‘complex’ array accesses realized inside loops. Further, we limit the analysis to pointers which evolve together with loop induction variables, i.e., are repeatedly updated to access (various) elements of an array.

Using this metric, *Dowser* ranks buffer accesses by evaluating the complexity of data- and control-flows involved with the array index (pointer) calculations. For each loop in the program, it first statically determines (1) the set of all instructions involved in modifying an array pointer (we will call this a pointer’s *analysis group*), and (2) the conditions that guard this analysis group, e.g., the condition of an `if` or `while` statement containing the array index calculations. Next, it labels all such sets with scores reflecting their complexity. We explain these steps in detail in Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.




Fig. 3: Data flow graph and analysis group associated with the pointer  $\text{p}$  from Figure 1. For the sake of clarity, the figure presents pointer arithmetic instructions in pseudo code. The PHI nodes represent locations where data is merged from different control-flows. The numbers in the boxes represent points assigned by *Dowser*.

### 3.1 Building analysis groups

Suppose a pointer  $\text{p}$  is involved in an “interesting” array access instruction  $\text{acc}_\text{p}$  in a loop. The *analysis group* associated with  $\text{acc}_\text{p}$ ,  $\text{AG}(\text{acc}_\text{p})$ , collects all instructions that influence the value of the dereferenced pointer during the execution of the loop.

To determine  $\text{AG}(\text{acc}_\text{p})$ , we compute an intraprocedural data flow graph representing operations in the loop that compute the value of  $\text{p}$  dereferenced in  $\text{acc}_\text{p}$ . Then, we check if the graph contains cycles. A cycle indicates that the value of  $\text{p}$  in a previous loop iteration affects its value in the current one, so  $\text{p}$  depends on the loop induction variable.

As mentioned before, this part of our work is built on top of the LLVM [23] compiler infrastructure. The static single assignment (SSA) form provided by LLVM translates directly to data flow graphs. Figure 3 shows an example. Observe that, since all dereferences of pointer  $\text{u}$  share their data flow graph, they also form a single analysis group. Thus, when *Dowser* later tries to find an illegal array access within this analysis group, it tests all the dereferences at the same time—there is no need to consider them separately.

### 3.2 Conditions guarding analysis groups

It may happen that the data flow associated with an array pointer is simple, but the value of the pointer is hard to follow due to some complex control changes. For this reason, *Dowser* ranks also control flows: the conditions that influence an analysis group.

Say that an instruction manipulating the array pointer  $\text{p}$  is *guarded* by a condition on a variable  $\text{var}$ , e.g., `if(var<10){*p++=0;}`. If the value of  $\text{var}$  is diffi-

cult to keep track of, so is the value of  $\text{p}$ . To assess the complexity of  $\text{var}$ , *Dowser* analyzes its data flow, and determines the analysis group,  $\text{AG}(\text{var})$  (as discussed in Section 3.1). Moreover, we recursively analyze the analysis groups of other variables influencing  $\text{var}$  and  $\text{p}$  inside the loop. Thus, we obtain a number of analysis groups which we rank in the next step (Section 3.3).

### 3.3 Scoring array accesses

For each array access realized in a loop, *Dowser* assesses the complexity of the analysis groups constructed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. For each analysis group, it considers all instructions, and assigns them points. The more points an AG cumulatively scores, the more complex it is. The overall rank of the array access is determined by the maximum of the scores. Intuitively, it reflects the most complex component.

The scoring algorithm should provide roughly the same results for semantically identical code. For this reason, we enforce the optimizations present in the LLVM compiler (e.g., to eliminate common subexpressions). This way, we minimize the differences in (the amount of) instructions arising from the compiler options. Moreover, we analyzed the LLVM code generation strategies, and defined a powerful set of *equivalence rules*, which minimize the variation in the scores assigned to syntactically different but semantically equivalent code. We highlight them below.

Table 1 introduces all types of instructions, and discusses their impact on the final score. In principle, all common instructions involved in array index calculations are of the order of 10 points, except for the two instructions that we consider risky: pointer casts and functions that return non-pointer values used in pointer calculation.

The absolute penalty for each type of instruction is not very important. However, we ensure that the points reflect the difference in complexity between various code fragments, instead of giving all array accesses the same score. That is, instructions that complicate the array index contribute to the score, and instructions that complicate the index a lot also score very high, relative to other instructions. In Section 6, we compare our complexity ranking to alternatives.

## 4 Using tainting to find inputs that matter

Once *Dowser* has ranked array accesses in loops in order of complexity, we examine them in turn. Typically, only a small segment of the input affects the execution of a particular analysis group, so we want to search for a bug by modifying solely this part of the input, while keeping the rest constant (refer to Section 5). In the current section, we explain how *Dowser* identifies the link

Instructions	Rationale/Equivalence rules	Points
<b>Array index manipulations</b>		
Basic index arithmetic instr., i.e., addition and subtraction	GetElemPtr, that increases or decreases a pointer by an index, scores the same. Thus, operations on pointers are equivalent to operations on offsets. An instruction scores 1 if it modifies a value which is not passed to the next loop iteration.	1 or 5
Other index arithmetic instr. e.g., division, shift, or xor	These instructions involve more complex pointer calculations than the standard add or sub. Thus, we penalize them more.	10
Different constant values	Multiple constants used to modify a pointer make its value hard to follow. It is easier to keep track of a pointer that always increases by the same value.	10 per value
Constants used to access fields of structures	We assume that compilers handle accesses to structures correctly. We only consider constants used to compute the index of an array, and not the address of a field.	0
Numerical values determined outside the loop	Though in the context of the loop they are just constants, the compiler cannot predict their values. Thus they are difficult to reason about and more error prone.	30
Non-inlined functions returning non-pointer values	Since decoupling the computation of a pointer from its use might easily lead to mistakes, we heavily penalize this operation.	500
Data movement instructions	Moving (scalar or pointer) data does not add to the complexity of computations.	0
<b>Pointer manipulations</b>		
Load a pointer calculated outside the loop	It denotes retrieving the base pointer of an object, or using memory allocators. We treat all <i>remote</i> pointers in the same way - all score 0.	0
GetElemPtr	An LLVM instruction that computes a pointer from a base and offset(s). (See add.)	1 or 5
Pointer cast operations	Since the casting instructions often indicate operations that are not equivalent to the standard pointer manipulations (listed above), they are worth a close inspection.	100

Table 1: Overview of the instructions involved in pointer arithmetic operations, and their penalty points.

between the components of the program input and the different analysis groups. Observe that this result also benefits other bug finding tools based on fuzzing, not just *Dowser* and concolic execution.

We focus our discussion on an analysis group  $AG(acc_p)$  associated with an array pointer dereference  $acc_p$ . We assume that we can obtain a test input  $I$  that exercises the potentially vulnerable analysis group. While this may not always be true, we believe it is a reasonable assumption. Most vendors have test suites to test their software and they often contain at least one input which exercises each *complex* loop.

#### 4.1 Baseline: dynamic taint analysis

As a basic approach, *Dowser* performs dynamic taint analysis (DTA) [31] on the input  $I$  (tainting each input byte with a unique color, and propagating the colors on data movement and arithmetic operations). Then, it logs all colors and input bytes involved in the instructions in  $AG(acc_p)$ . Given the format of the input, *Dowser* maps these bytes to individual fields. In Figure 1, *Dowser* finds out that it is sufficient to treat  $uri$  as symbolic.

The problem with DTA, as sketched above, is that it misses *implicit flows* (also called *control dependencies*) entirely [14, 21]. Such flows have no direct assignment of a tainted value to a variable—which would be propagated by DTA. Instead, the value of a variable is completely determined by the value of a tainted variable in a condition. In Figure 1, even though the value of  $u$  in

line 12 is dependent on the tainted character  $ch$  in line 11, the taint does not flow directly to  $u$ , so DTA would not report the dependency. Implicit flows are notoriously hard to track [36, 9], but ignoring them completely reduces our accuracy. *Dowser* therefore employs a solution that builds on the work by Bao et al. [6], but with a novel optimization to increase the accuracy of the analysis (Section 4.2).

Like Bao et al. [6], *Dowser* implements *strict control dependencies*. Intuitively, we propagate colors only on the most informative (or, information preserving) dependencies. Specifically, we require a direct comparison between a tainted variable and a compile time constant. For example, in Figure 1, we propagate the color of  $ch$  in line 11 to the variables  $state$  and  $u$  in line 12. However, we would keep  $state$  and  $u$  untainted if the condition in line 11 for instance had been either "*if(ch != '/' )*" or "*if(ch < '/')*". As implicit flows are not the focus of this paper we refer interested readers to [6] for details.

#### 4.2 Field shifting to weed out false dependencies

Improving on the handling of strict control dependencies by Bao et al. [6], described above, *Dowser* adds a novel technique to prevent overtainting due to false dependencies. The problems arise when the order of fields in an input format is not fixed, e.g., as in HTTP, SMTP (and the commandline for most programs). The approach from [6] may falsely suggest that a field is dependent on all fields that were extracted so far.




Fig. 4: The figure shows how *Dowser* shuffles an input to determine which fields really influence an analysis group. Suppose a parser extracts fields of the input one by one, and the analysis group depends on the fields B and D (with colors B and D, respectively). *Colors in handlers* show on which fields the subsequent handlers are strictly dependent [6], and the shaded rectangle indicates the colors propagated to the analysis group. *Excluded colors* are left out of our analysis.

For instance, `lighttpd` reads new header fields in a loop and compares them to various options, roughly as follows:

```
while () {
    if(cmp(field, "Content") == 0)
    ...
    else if(cmp(field, "Range") == 0)
    ...
    else exit (-1);
    field = extract_new_header_field();
}
```

As the parser tests for equivalence, the implicit flow will propagate from one field to the next one, even if there is no real dependency at all! Eventually, the last field appears to depend on the whole header.

*Dowser* determines which options really matter for the instructions in an analysis group by *shifting* the fields whose order is not fixed. Refer to Figure 4, and suppose we have run the program with options A, B, C, D, and E, and our analysis group really depends on B and D. Once the message gets processed, we see that the AG does not depend on E, so E can be excluded from further analysis. Since the last observed color, D, has a direct influence on the AG, it is a true dependence. By performing a circular shift and re-trying with the order D, A, B, C, E, *Dowser* finds only the colors corresponding to A, B, D. Thus, we can leave C out of our analysis. After the next circular shift, *Dowser* reduces the colors to B and D only.

The optimization is based on two observations: (1) the last field propagated to the AG has a direct influence on the AG, so it needs to be kept, (2) all fields beyond this one are guaranteed to have no impact on the AG. By performing circular shifts, and running DTA on the updated input, *Dowser* drops the undue dependencies.

Even though this optimization requires some minimal knowledge of the input, we do not need full understanding of the input grammar, like the contents or effects of fields. It is sufficient to identify the fields whose order is not fixed. Fortunately, such information is available for many applications—especially when vendors test their own code.

## 5 Exploring candidate instructions

Once we have learnt which part of the program input influences the analysis group  $\text{AG}(\text{acc}_p)$ , we fuzz this part, and we try to nudge the program toward using the pointer  $p$  in an illegal way. More technically, we treat the interesting component of the input as symbolic, the remaining part as fixed (concrete), and we execute the loop associated with  $\text{AG}(\text{acc}_p)$  symbolically.

However, since in principle the cost of a complete loop traversal is exponential, loops present one of the hardest problems for symbolic execution [19]. Therefore, when analyzing a loop, we try to select those paths that are most promising in our context. Specifically, *Dowser* prioritizes paths that show a potential for knotty pointer arithmetic. As we show in Section 6, our technique significantly optimizes the search for an overflow.

*Dowser*'s loop exploration procedure has two main phases: learning, and bug finding. In the *learning phase*, *Dowser* assigns each branch in the loop a weight approximating the probability that a path following this direction contains new pointer dereferences. The weights are based on statistics on the variety of pointer values observed during an execution of a short symbolic input.

Next, in the *bug finding phase*, *Dowser* uses the weights determined in the first step to filter our uninteresting parts of the loop, and prioritize the important paths. Whenever the weight associated with a certain branch is 0, *Dowser* does not even try to explore it further. In the vulnerable `nginx` parsing loop from which Figure 1 shows an excerpt, only 19 out of 60 branches scored a non-zero value, so were considered for the execution. In this phase, the symbolic input represents a real world scenario, so it is relatively long. Therefore, it would be prohibitively expensive to be analyzed using a popular symbolic execution tool.

In Section 5.1, we briefly review the general concept of concolic execution, and then we discuss the two phases in Sections 5.2 and 5.3, respectively.

### 5.1 Baseline: concrete + symbolic execution

Like DART and SAGE [17, 18], *Dowser* generates new test inputs by combining concrete and symbolic execution. This technique is known as *concolic* execution [33]. It runs the program on a concrete input, while gathering symbolic constraints from conditional statements encountered along the way. To test alternative paths, it systematically negates the collected constraints, and checks whether the new set is satisfiable. If so, it yields a new input. To bootstrap the procedure, *Dowser* takes a test input which exercises the analysis group  $\text{AG}(\text{acc}_p)$ .

As mentioned already, a challenge in applying this approach is how to select the paths to explore first. The

classic solution is to use depth first exploration of the paths by backtracking [22]. However, since doing so results in an exponentially growing number of paths to be tested, the research community has proposed various heuristics to steer the execution toward unexplored regions. We discuss these techniques in Section 7.

## 5.2 Phase 1: learning

The aim of the learning phase is to rate the `true` and `false` directions of all conditional branches that depend on the symbolic input in the loop  $L$ . For each branch, we evaluate the likelihood that a particular outcome will lead to unique pointer dereferences (i.e., dereferences that we do not expect to find in the alternative outcome). Thus, we answer the question of how much we expect to gain when we follow this path, rather than the alternative. We encode this information into *weights*.

Specifically, the weights represent the likelihood of unique *access patterns*. An access pattern of the pointer  $p$  is the sequence of all values of  $p$  dereferenced during the execution of the loop. In Figure 1, when we denote the initial value of  $u$  by  $u_0$ , then the input " $//\dots/$ " triggers the following access pattern of the pointer  $u$ :  $(u_0, u_0+1, u_0+2, u_0-2, \dots)$ .

To compute the weights, we learn about the effects of individual branches. In principle, each of them may (a) directly affect the value of a pointer, (b) be a precondition for another important branch, or (c) be irrelevant from the computation’s standpoint. To distinguish between these cases, *Dowser* analyzes all possible executions of a *short* symbolic input. By comparing the sets of  $p$ ’s access patterns observed for both outcomes of a branch, it discovers which branches do not influence the diversity of pointer dereferences (i.e., are irrelevant).

**Symbolic input** In Section 4, we identified which part of the test input  $I$  we need to make symbolic. We denote this by  $I_S$ . In the learning phase, *Dowser* executes the loop  $L$  exhaustively. For performance reasons, we therefore further limit the amount of symbolic data and make only a short fragment of  $I_S$  symbolic. For instance, for Figure 1, the learning phase makes only the first 4 bytes of `uri` symbolic (not enough to trigger the bug), while scaling up to 50 symbolic bytes in the bug finding phase.

**Algorithm** *Dowser* exhaustively executes  $L$  on a short symbolic input, and records how the decisions taken at conditional branch statements influence pointer dereference instructions. For each branch  $b$  along the execution path, we retain the access pattern of  $p$  realized during this execution,  $AP(p)$ . We informally interpret it as “if you choose the `true` (respectively, `false`) direction of the branch  $b$ , expect access pattern  $AP(p)$  (respectively,  $AP'(p)$ )”. This procedure results in two sets of access patterns for each branch statement, for the taken

and non-taken branch, respectively. The final weight of each direction is the fraction of the access patterns that were unique for the direction in question, i.e., were not observed when the opposite one was taken.

The above description explains the intuition behind the learning mechanism, but the full algorithm is more complicated. The problem is that a conditional branch  $b$  might be exercised multiple times in an execution path, and it is possible that all the instances of  $b$  influence the access pattern observed.

Intuitively, to allow for it, we do not associate access patterns with just a single decision taken on  $b$  (`true` or `false`). Rather, each time  $b$  is exercised, we also retain which directions were previously chosen for  $b$ . Thus, we still collect “expected” access patterns if the `true` (respectively, `false`) direction of  $b$  is followed, but we augment them with a precondition. This way, when we compare the `true` and `false` sets to determine the weights for  $b$ , we base the scores on a deeper understanding of how an access pattern was reached.

**Discussion** It is important for our algorithm to avoid false negatives: we should not incorrectly flag a branch as irrelevant—it would preclude it from being explored in the bug finding phase. Say that `instr` is an instruction that dereferences the pointer  $p$ . To learn that a branch directly influences `instr`, it suffices to execute it. Similarly, since branches retain full access patterns of  $p$ , the information about `instr` being executed is also “propagated” to all its preconditions. Thus, to completely avoid false negatives, the algorithm would require full coverage of the instructions in an analysis group. We stress that we need to exercise all instructions, and not all paths in a loop. As observed by [7], exhaustive executions of even short symbolic inputs provide excellent instruction coverage in practice.

While false positives are undesirable as well, they only cause *Dowser* to execute more paths in the second phase than absolutely necessary. Due to the limited path coverage, there are corner cases, when false positives can happen. Even so, in `nginx`, only 19 out of 60 branches scored a non-zero value, which let us execute the complex loop with a 50-byte-long symbolic input.

## 5.3 Phase 2: hunting bugs

In this step, *Dowser* executes symbolically a real-world sized input in the hope of finding a value that triggers a bug. *Dowser* uses the feedback from the learning phase (Section 5.2) to steer its symbolic execution toward new and interesting pointer dereferences. The goal of our heuristic is to avoid execution paths that do not bring any new pointer manipulation instructions. Thus, *Dowser* shifts the target of symbolic execution from traditional *code coverage* to *pointer value coverage*.

*Dowser*'s strategy is explicitly dictated by the weights. As a baseline, the execution follows a depth-first exploration, and when *Dowser* is about to select the direction of a branch  $b$  that depends on the symbolic input, it adheres to the following rules:

- If both the `true` and `false` directions of  $b$  have weight 0, we do not expect  $b$  to influence the variety of access patterns. Thus, *Dowser* chooses the direction randomly, and does not intend to examine the other direction.
- If only one direction has a non-zero weight, we expect to observe unique access patterns only when the execution paths follows this direction, and *Dowser* favors it.
- If both of  $b$ 's directions have non-zero weights, both the `true` and `false` options may bring unique access patterns. *Dowser* examines both directions, and schedules them in order of their weights.

Intuitively, *Dowser*'s symbolic execution tries to select paths that are more likely to lead to overflows.

**Guided fuzzing** This concludes our description of *Dowser*'s architecture. To summarize, *Dowser* helps fuzzing by: (1) finding “interesting” array accesses, (2) identifying the inputs that influence the accesses, and (3) fuzzing intelligently to cover the array. Moreover, the targeted selection procedure based on pointer value coverage and the small number of symbolic input values allow *Dowser* to find bugs quickly and scale to larger applications. In addition, the ranking of array accesses permits us to zoom in on more complicated array accesses.

## 6 Evaluation

In this section, we first zoom in on the running example of `nginx` from Figure 1 to evaluate individual components of the system in detail (Section 6.1). In Section 6.2, we consider seven real-world applications. Based on their vulnerabilities, we evaluate our dowsing mechanism. Finally, we present an overview of the attacks detected by *Dowser*.

Since *Dowser* uses a ‘spot-check’ rather than ‘code coverage’ approach to bug detection, it must analyze each complex analysis group separately, starting with the highest ranking one, followed by the second one, and so on. Each of them runs until it finds a bug or gets terminated. The question is when we should terminate a symbolic execution run. Since symbolic execution of a single loop is highly optimized in *Dowser*, we found each bug in less than 11 minutes, so we execute each symbolic run for a maximum of 15 minutes.




Fig. 5: Scores of the analysis groups in `nginx`.

Our test platform is a Linux 3.1 system with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i7 CPU clocked at 2.7GHz with 4096KB L2 cache. The system has 8GB of memory. For our experiments we used an OpenSUSE 12.1 install. We ran each test multiple times and present the median.

### 6.1 Case study: Nginx

In this section, we evaluate each of the main steps of our fuzzer by looking at our case study of `nginx` in detail.

#### 6.1.1 Dowsing for candidate instructions

We measure how well *Dowser* highlights potentially faulty code and filters out the uninteresting fragments.

Our first question is whether we can filter out all the simple loops and focus on the more interesting ones. This turns out to be simple. Given the complexity scoring function from Section 3, we find that across all applications all analysis groups with a score less than 26 use just a single constant and at most two instructions modifying the offset of an array. Thus, in the remainder of our evaluation, we set our cut-off threshold to 26 points.

As shown in Table 2, `nginx` has 517 outermost loops, and only 140 analysis groups that access arrays. Thus, we throw out over 70% of the loops immediately<sup>3</sup>. Figure 5 presents the sorted weights of all the analysis groups in `nginx`. The distribution shows a quick drop after a few highly complex analysis groups. The long tail represents the numerous simple loops omnipresent in any code. 55.7% of the analysis groups score too low to be of interest. This means that *Dowser* needs to examine only the remaining 44.3%, i.e., 62 out of 140 analysis groups, or at most 12% of all loops. Out of these, the buffer overflow in Figure 1 ranks 4th.

#### 6.1.2 Taint analysis in context of hunting for bugs

In Section 4 we mentioned that ‘traditional’ dynamic taint analysis misses implicit flows, i.e., flows that have

<sup>3</sup>In principle, if a loop accesses multiple arrays, it also contains multiple access groups. Thus, these 140 analysis groups are located in fewer than 140 loops.

no direct assignment of a tainted value to a variable. The problem turns out to be particularly serious for `nginx`. It receives input in text format, and transforms it to extract numerical values or various flags. As such code employs conditional statements, DTA misses the dependencies between the input and analysis groups.

Next, we evaluate the usefulness of field shifting. First, we implement the taint propagation exactly as proposed by Bao et al. [6], without any further restrictions. In that case, an index variable in the `nginx` parser becomes tainted, and we mark all HTTP fields succeeding the `uri` field as tainted as well. As a result, we introduce more symbolic data than necessary. Next, we apply field shifting (Section 4.2) which effectively limits taint propagation to just the `uri` field. In general, the field shifting optimization improves the accuracy of taint propagation in all applications that take multiple input fields whose order does not matter. On the other hand, it will not help if the order is fixed.

### 6.1.3 Importance of guiding symbolic execution

We now use the `nginx` example to assess the importance of guiding symbolic execution to a vulnerability condition. For `nginx`, the input message is a generic HTTP request. Since it exercises the vulnerable loop for this analysis group, its `uri` starts with “//”. Taint analysis allows us to detect that only the `uri` field is important, so we mark only this field as symbolic. As we shall see, without guidance, symbolic execution does not scale beyond very short `uri` fields (5-6 byte long). In contrast, *Dowser* successfully executes 50-byte-long symbolic `uris`.

When S2E [10] executes a loop, it can follow one of the two search strategies: depth-first search, or maximizing code coverage (as proposed in SAGE [18]). The first one aims at complete path coverage, and the second at executing basic blocks that were not seen before. However, none can be applied in practice to examine the complex loop in `nginx`. The search is so costly that we measured the runtime for only 5-6 byte long symbolic `uri` fields. The DFS strategy handled the 5-byte-long input in 139 seconds, the 6-byte-long in 824 seconds. A 7-byte input requires more than 1 hour to finish. Likewise, the code coverage strategy required 159, and 882 seconds, respectively. The code coverage heuristic does not speed up the search for buffer overflows either, since besides executing specific instructions from the loop, memory corruptions require a very particular execution context. Even if 100% code coverage is reached, they may stay undetected.

As we explained in Section 5, the strategy employed by *Dowser* does not aim at full coverage. Instead, it actively searches for paths which involve new pointer dereferences. The learning phase uses a 4-byte-long

symbolic input to observe access patterns in the loop. It follows a simple depth first search strategy. As the bug clearly cannot be triggered with this input size, the search continues in the second, hunting bugs, phase. The result of the learning phase disables 66% of the conditional branches significantly reducing the exponentially of the subsequent symbolic execution. Because of this heuristic, *Dowser* easily scales up to 50 symbolic bytes and finds the bug after just a few minutes. A 5-byte-long symbolic input is handled in 20 seconds, 10 bytes in 42 seconds, 20 bytes in 63 seconds, 30 in 146 seconds, 40 in 174 seconds and 50 in 253 seconds. These numbers maintain an exponential growth of 1.1 for each added character. Even though *Dowser* still exhibits the exponential behavior, the growth rate is fairly low. Even in the presence of 50 symbolic bytes, *Dowser* quickly finds the complex bug.

In practice, symbolic execution has problems dealing with real world applications and input sizes. The number of execution paths quickly overwhelms these systems. Since triggering buffer overflows not only requires a vulnerable basic block, but also a special context, traditional symbolic execution tools are ill suited. *Dowser*, instead, requires the application to be executed symbolically for only a very short input, and then it deals with real-world input sizes instead of being limited to a few input bytes. Combined with the ability to extract the relevant parts of the original input, this enables searching for bugs in applications like web servers where input sizes were considered until now to be well beyond the scalability of symbolic execution tools.

## 6.2 Overview

In this section, we consider several applications. First, we evaluate the dowsing mechanism, and we show that it successfully highlights vulnerable code fragments. Then, we summarize the memory corruptions detected by *Dowser*. They come from six real world applications of several tens of thousands LoC, including the `ffmpeg` videoplayer of 300K LoC. The bug in `ffmpeg`, and one of the bugs in `poppler` were not documented before.

### 6.2.1 Dowsing for candidate instructions

We now examine several aspects of the dowsing mechanism. First, we show that there is a correlation between *Dowser*’s scoring function and the existence of memory corruption vulnerabilities. Then, we discuss how our focus on complex loops limits the search space, i.e., the amount of analysis groups to be tested. We start with a description of our data set.

**Data set** To evaluate the effectiveness of *Dowser*, we chose six real world programs: `nginx`, `ffmpeg`,

Program	Vulnerability	Dowsing			Symbolic input	Symbolic execution		
		AG score	Loops	Loc		V-S2E	M-S2E	Dowser
nginx 0.6.32	CVE-2009-2629 heap underflow	4th out of 62/140 630 points	517	66k	URI field 50 bytes	> 8 h	> 8 h	253 sec
ffmpeg 0.5	UNKNOWN heap overread	3rd out of 727/1419 2186 points	1286	300k	Huffman table 224 bytes	> 8 h	> 8 h	48 sec
inspircd 1.1.22	CVE-2012-1836 heap overflow	1st out of 66/176 625 points	1750	45k	DNS response 301 bytes	200 sec	200 sec	32 sec
poppler 0.15.0	UNKNOWN heap overread	39th out of 388/904 1075 points	1737	120k	JPEG image 1024 bytes	> 8 h	> 8 h	14 sec
poppler 0.15.0	CVE-2010-3704 heap overflow	59th out of 388/904 910 points	1737	120k	Embedded font 1024 bytes	> 8 h	> 8 h	762 sec
libexif 0.6.20	CVE-2012-2841 heap overflow	8th out of 15/31 501 points	121	10k	EXIF tag/length 1024 + 4 bytes	> 8 h	652 sec	652 sec
libexif 0.6.20	CVE-2012-2840 off-by-one error	15th out of 15/31 40 points	121	10k	EXIF tag/length 1024 + 4 bytes	> 8 h	347 sec	347 sec
libexif 0.6.20	CVE-2012-2813 heap overflow	15th out of 15/31 40 points	121	10k	EXIF tag/length 1024 + 4 bytes	> 8 h	277 sec	277 sec
snort 2.4.0	CVE-2005-3252 stack overflow	24th out of 60/174 246 points	616	75k	UDP packet 1100 bytes	> 8 h	> 8 h	617 sec

Table 2: Applications tested with *Dowser*. The *Dowsing* section presents the results of *Dowser*’s ranking scheme. *AG score* is the complexity of the vulnerable analysis group - its position among other analysis groups; X/Y denotes all analysis groups that are “complex enough” to be potentially analyzed/all analysis groups which access arrays; and the number of points it scores. *Loops* counts outermost loops in the whole program, and *Loc* - the lines of code according to *sloccount*. *Symbolic input* specifies how many and which parts of the input were determined to be marked as symbolic by the first two components of *Dowser*. The last section shows symbolic execution times until revealing the bug. Almost all applications proved to be too complex for the vanilla version of S2E (V-S2E). *Magic S2E* (M-S2E) is the time S2E takes to find the bug when we feed it with an input with only a minimal symbolic part (as identified in Symbolic input). Finally, the last column is the execution time of fully-fledged *Dowser*.

`inspircd`, `libexif`, `poppler`, and `snort`. Additionally, we consider the vulnerabilities in `sendmail` tested by Zitser et al. [45]. For these applications, we analyzed all buffer overflows reported in CVE [26] since 2009. For `ffmpeg`, rather than include all possible codecs, we just picked the ones for which we had test cases. Out of 27 CVE reports, we took 17 for the evaluation. The remaining ten vulnerabilities are out of the scope of this paper – nine of them are related to an erroneous usage of a correct function, e.g., `strcpy`, and one was not in a loop. In this section, we consider the analysis groups from all the applications together, giving us over 3000 samples, 17 of which are known to be vulnerable<sup>4</sup>.

When evaluating *Dowser*’s scoring mechanism, we also compare it to a straightforward scoring function that treats all instructions uniformly. For each array access, it considers exactly the same AGs as *Dowser*. However, instead of the scoring algorithm (Table 1), each instruction gets 10 points. We will refer to this metric as `count`.

**Correlation** For both *Dowser*’s and the `count` scoring functions, we computed the correlation between the number of points assigned to an analysis group and the existence of a memory corruption vulnerability. We used

the Spearman rank correlation [2], since it is a reliable measure that is appropriate even when we do not know the probability distribution of the variables, or when the association between the variables is non-linear.

The positive correlation for *Dowser* is statistically significant at  $p < 0.0001$ , for `count` — at  $p < 0.005$ . The correlation for *Dowser* is stronger.

**Dowsing** The *Dowsing* columns of Table 2 shows that our focus on complex loops limits the search space from thousands of LoC to hundreds of loops, and finally to a small number of “interesting” analysis groups. Observe that `ffmpeg` has more analysis groups than loops. That is correct. If a loop accesses multiple arrays, it contains multiple analysis groups.

By limiting the analysis to complex cases, we focus on a smaller fraction of all AGs in the program, e.g., we consider 36.9% of all the analysis groups in `inspircd`, and 34.5% in `snort`. `ffmpeg`, on the other hand, contains lots of complex loops that decode videos, so we also observe many “complex” analysis groups.

In practice, symbolic execution, guided or not is expensive, and we can hardly afford a thorough analysis of more than just a small fraction of the target AGs of an application, say 20%-30%. For this reason, *Dowser* uses a scoring function, and tests the analysis groups in order of

<sup>4</sup>Since the scoring functions are application agnostic, it is sound to compare their results across applications.




Fig. 6: A comparison of random testing and two scoring functions: *Dowser*'s and `count`. It illustrates how many bugs we detect if we test a particular fraction of the analysis groups.

decreasing score. Specifically, *Dowser* looks at complexity. However, alternative heuristics are also possible. For instance, one may count the instructions that influence array accesses in an AG. To evaluate whether *Dowser*'s heuristics are useful, we compare how many bugs we discover if we examine increasing fractions of all AGs, in descending order of the score. So, we determine how many of the bugs we find if we explore the top 10% of all AGs, how many bugs we find when we explore the top 20%, and so on. In our evaluation, we are comparing the following ranking functions: (1) *Dowser*'s complexity metric, (2) counting instructions as described above, and (3) random.

Figure 6 illustrates the results. The random ranking serves as a baseline—clearly both `count` and *Dowser* perform better. In order to detect all 17 bugs, *Dowser* has to analyze 92.2% of all the analysis groups. However, even with just 15% of the targets, we find almost 80% (13/17) of all the bugs. At that same fraction of targets, `count` finds a little over 40% of the bugs (7/17). Overall, *Dowser* outperforms `count` beyond the 10% in the ranking. It also reaches the 100% bug score earlier than the alternatives, although the difference is minimal.

The reason why *Dowser* still requires 92% of the AGs to find *all* bugs, is that some of the bugs were very simple. The “simplest” cases include a trivial buffer overflow in `poppler` (worth 16 points), and two vulnerabilities in `sendmail` from 1999 (worth 20 points each). Since *Dowser* is designed to prioritize complex array accesses, these buffer overflows end up in the low scoring group. (The “simple” analysis groups – with less than 26 points – start at 47.9%). Clearly, both heuristics provide much better results than random sampling. Except for the tail, they find the bugs significantly quicker, which proves their usefulness.

To summarize, we have shown that a testing strategy based on *Dowser*'s scoring function is effective. It lets us find vulnerabilities quicker than random testing or a

scoring function based on the length of an analysis group.

### 6.2.2 Symbolic execution

Table 2 presents attacks detected by *Dowser*. The last section shows how long it takes before symbolic execution detects the bug. Since the vanilla version of S2E cannot handle these applications with the whole input marked as symbolic, we also run the experiments with minimal symbolic inputs (“Magic S2E”). It represents the best-case scenario when an all-knowing oracle tells the execution engine exactly which bytes it should make symbolic. Finally, we present *Dowser*'s execution times.

We run S2E for as short a time as possible, e.g., a single request/response in `nginx` and transcoding a single frame in `ffmpeg`. Still, in most applications, vanilla S2E fails to find bugs in a reasonable amount of time. `inspircd` is an exception, but in this case we explicitly tested the vulnerable DNS resolver only. In the case of `libexif`, we can see no difference between “Magic S2E” and *Dowser*, so *Dowser*'s guidance did not influence the results. The reason is that our test suite here was simple, and the execution paths reached the vulnerability condition quickly. In contrast, more complex applications process the inputs intensively, moving symbolic execution away from the code of interest. In all these cases, *Dowser* finds bugs significantly faster. Even if we take the 15 minute tests of higher-ranking analysis groups into account, *Dowser* provides a considerable improvement over existing systems.

## 7 Related work

*Dowser* is a ‘guided’ fuzzer which draws on knowledge from multiple domains. In this section, we place our system in the context of existing approaches. We start with the scoring function and selection of code fragments. Next, we discuss traditional fuzzing. We then review previous work on dynamic taint analysis in fuzzing, and finally, discuss existing work on whitebox fuzzing and symbolic execution.

**Software complexity metrics** Many studies have shown that software complexity metrics are positively correlated with defect density or security vulnerabilities [29, 35, 16, 44, 35, 32]. However, Nagappan et al. [29] argued that no single set of metrics fits all projects, while Zimmermann et al. [44] emphasize a need for metrics that exploit the unique characteristics of vulnerabilities, e.g., buffer overflows or integer overruns. All these approaches consider the broad class of post-release defects or security vulnerabilities, and consider a very generic set of measurements, e.g., the number of basic blocks in a function’s control flow graph, the number of global or local variables read or written, the maximum nesting level

of `if` or `while` statements and so on. *Dowser* is very different in this respect, and to the best of our knowledge, the first of its kind. We focus on a narrow group of security vulnerabilities, i.e., buffer overflows, so our scoring function is tailored to reflect the complexity of pointer manipulation instructions.

**Traditional fuzzing** Software fuzzing started in earnest in the 90s when Miller et al. [25] described how they fed random inputs to (UNIX) utilities, and managed to crash 25–33% of the target programs. More advanced fuzzers along the same lines, like Spike [39], and SNOOZE [5], deliberately generate malformed inputs, while later fuzzers that aim for deeper bugs are often based on the input grammar (e.g., Kaksonen [20] and [40]). DeMott [13] offers a survey of fuzz testing tools. As observed by Godefroid et al. [18], traditional fuzzers are useful, but typically find only shallow bugs.

**Application of DTA to fuzzing** BuzzFuzz [15] uses DTA to locate regions of seed input files that influence values used at library calls. They specifically select library calls, as they are often developed by different people than the author of the calling program and often lack a perfect description of the API. Buzzfuzz does not use symbolic execution at all, but uses DTA only to ensure that they preserve the right input format. Unlike *Dowser*, it ignores implicit flows completely, so it could never find bugs such as the one in nginx (Figure 1). In addition, *Dowser* is more selective in the application of DTA. It’s difficult to assess which library calls are important and require a closer inspection, while *Dowser* explicitly selects complex code fragments.

TaintScope [42] is similar in that it also uses DTA to select fields of the input seed which influence security-sensitive points (e.g., system/library calls). In addition, TaintScope is capable of identifying and bypassing checksum checks. Like Buzzfuzz, it differs from *Dowser* in that it ignores implicit flows and assumes only that library calls are the interesting points. Unlike BuzzFuzz, TaintScope operates at the binary level, rather than the source.

**Symbolic-execution-based fuzzing** Recently, there has been much interest in whitebox fuzzing, symbolic execution, concolic execution, and constraint solving. Examples include EXE [8], KLEE [7], CUTE [33], DART [17], SAGE [18], and the work by Moser et al. [28]. Microsoft’s SAGE, for instance, starts with a well-formed input and symbolically executes the program under test in attempt to sweep through all feasible execution paths of the program. While doing so, it checks security properties using AppVerifier. All of these systems substitute (some of the) program inputs with symbolic values, gather input constraints on a program trace, and generate new input that exercises differ-

ent paths in the program. They are very powerful, and can analyze programs in detail, but it is difficult to make them scale (especially if you want to explore many loop-based array accesses). The problem is that the number of paths grows very quickly.

Zesti [24] takes a different approach and executes existing regression tests symbolically. Intuitively, it checks whether they can trigger a vulnerable condition by slightly modifying the test input. This technique scales better and is useful for finding bugs in paths in the neighborhood of existing test suites. It is not suitable for bugs that are far from these paths. As an example, a generic input which exercises the vulnerable loop in Figure 1 has the `uri` of the form “`//{arbitrary characters}`”, and the shortest input triggering the bug is “`//.../`”. When fed with “`//abc`”, [24] does not find the bug—because it was not designed for this scenario. Instead, it requires an input which is much closer to the vulnerability condition, e.g., “`//...{an arbitrary character}`”. For *Dowser*, the generic input is sufficient.

SmartFuzz [27] focuses on integer bugs. It uses symbolic execution to construct test cases that trigger arithmetic overflows, non-value-preserving width conversions, or dangerous signed/unsigned conversions. In contrast, *Dowser* targets the more common (and harder to find) case of buffer overflows. Finally, Babić et al. [4] guide symbolic execution to potentially vulnerable program points detected with static analysis. However, the interprocedural context- and flow-sensitive static analysis proposed does not scale well to real world programs and the experimental results contain only short traces.

## 8 Conclusion

*Dowser* is a guided fuzzer that combines static analysis, dynamic taint analysis, and symbolic execution to find buffer overflow vulnerabilities deep in a program’s logic. It starts by determining ‘interesting’ array accesses, i.e., accesses that are most likely to harbor buffer overflows. It ranks these accesses in order of complexity—allowing security experts to focus on complex bugs, if so desired. Next, it uses taint analysis to determine which inputs influence these array accesses and fuzzes only these bytes. Specifically, it makes (only) these bytes symbolic in the subsequent symbolic execution. Where possible *Dowser*’s symbolic execution engine selects paths that are most likely to lead to overflows. Each three of the steps contain novel contributions in and of themselves (e.g., the ranking of array accesses, the implicit flow handling in taint analysis, and the symbolic execution based on pointer value coverage), but the overall contribution is a new, practical and complete fuzzing approach that scales to real applications and complex bugs that would be hard or impossible to find with existing tech-

niques. Moreover, *Dowser* proposes a novel ‘spot-check’ approach to finding buffer overflows in real software.

## Acknowledgment

This work is supported by the European Research Council through project ERC-2010-StG 259108-ROSETTA, the EU FP7 SysSec Network of Excellence and by the Microsoft Research PhD Scholarship Programme through the project MRL 2011-049. The authors would like to thank Bartek Knapik for his help in designing the statistical evaluation.

## References

- [1] CVE-2009-2629: Buffer underflow vulnerability in nginx. <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2009-2629>, 2009.
- [2] ACZEL, A. D., AND SOUNDERPANDIAN, J. *Complete Business Statistics*, sixth ed. McGraw-Hill, 2006.
- [3] AKRITIDIS, P., CADAR, C., RAICIU, C., COSTA, M., AND CASTRO, M. Preventing memory error exploits with WIT. In *Proceedings of the 2008 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy* (2008), S&P’08.
- [4] BABIĆ, D., MARTIGNONI, L., MCCAMANT, S., AND SONG, D. Statically-directed dynamic automated test generation. In *Proceedings of the 2011 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis* (2011), ISSTA’11.
- [5] BANKS, G., COVA, M., FELMETSGER, V., ALMEROOTH, K., KEMMERER, R., AND VIGNA, G. SNOOZE: toward a stateful network protocol fuzzZEr. In *Proceedings of the 9th international conference on Information Security* (2006), ISC’06.
- [6] BAO, T., ZHENG, Y., LIN, Z., ZHANG, X., AND XU, D. Strict control dependence and its effect on dynamic information flow analyses. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Software testing and analysis* (2010), ISSTA’10.
- [7] CADAR, C., DUNBAR, D., AND ENGLER, D. KLEE: Unassisted and automatic generation of high-coverage tests for complex systems programs. In *Proceedings of the 8th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation* (2008), OSDI’08.
- [8] CADAR, C., GANESH, V., PAWLOWSKI, P. M., DILL, D. L., AND ENGLER, D. R. EXE: Automatically generating inputs of death. In *CCS ’06: Proceedings of the 13th ACM conference on Computer and communications security* (2006).
- [9] CAVALLARO, L., SAXENA, P., AND SEKAR, R. On the Limits of Information Flow Techniques for Malware Analysis and Containment. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Conference on Detection of Intrusions and Malware & Vulnerability Assessment* (2008), DIMVA’08.
- [10] CHIPOUNOV, V., KUZNETSOV, V., AND CANDEA, G. S2E: A platform for in vivo multi-path analysis of software systems. In *Proceedings of the 16th Intl. Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems* (2011), AS-PLOS’11.
- [11] COWAN, C., PU, C., MAIER, D., HINTONY, H., WALPOLE, J., BAKKE, P., BEATTIE, S., GRIER, A., WAGLE, P., AND ZHANG, Q. StackGuard: Automatic Adaptive Detection and Prevention of Buffer-Overflow Attacks. In *Proceedings of the 7th USENIX Security Symposium* (1998), SSYM’98.
- [12] CWE/SANS. CWE/SANS TOP 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors. [www.sans.org/top25-software-errors](http://www.sans.org/top25-software-errors), 2011.
- [13] DEMOTT, J. The evolving art of fuzzng. DEFCON 14, [http://www.appliedsec.com/files/The\\_Evolving\\_Art\\_of\\_Fuzzing.pdf](http://www.appliedsec.com/files/The_Evolving_Art_of_Fuzzing.pdf), 2005.
- [14] FERRANTE, J., OTTENSTEIN, K. J., AND WARREN, J. D. The program dependence graph and its use in optimization. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* 9 (1997), 319–349.
- [15] GANESH, V., LEEK, T., AND RINARD, M. Taint-based directed whitebox fuzzing. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Software Engineering* (2009), ICSE’09.
- [16] GEGICK, M., WILLIAMS, L., OSBORNE, J., AND VOUK, M. Prioritizing software security fortification through code-level metrics. In *Proc. of the 4th ACM workshop on Quality of protection* (Oct. 2008), QoP’08, ACM Press.
- [17] GODEFROID, P., KLARLUND, N., AND SEN, K. DART: directed automated random testing. In *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM SIGPLAN conference on Programming language design and implementation* (2005), PLDI’05.
- [18] GODEFROID, P., LEVIN, M. Y., AND MOLNAR, D. A. Automated Whitebox Fuzz Testing. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium* (2008), NDSS’08.
- [19] GODEFROID, P., AND LUCHAUP, D. Automatic partial loop summarization in dynamic test generation. In *Proceedings of the 2011 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis* (2011), ISSTA’11.
- [20] KAKSONEN, R. A functional method for assessing protocol implementation security. Tech. Rep. 448, VTT, 2001.
- [21] KANG, M. G., MCCAMANT, S., POOSANKAM, P., AND SONG, D. DTA++: Dynamic taint analysis with targeted control-flow propagation. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium* (2011), NDSS’11.
- [22] KHURSHID, S., PÄSÄREANU, C. S., AND VISSER, W. Generalized symbolic execution for model checking and testing. In *Proceedings of the 9th international conference on Tools and algorithms for the construction and analysis of systems* (2003), TACAS’03.
- [23] LATTNER, C., AND ADVE, V. LLVM: A compilation framework for lifelong program analysis & transformation. In *Proceedings of the international symposium on Code generation and optimization* (2004), CGO’04.
- [24] MARINESCU, P. D., AND CADAR, C. make test-zesti: a symbolic execution solution for improving regression testing. In *Proc. of the 2012 International Conference on Software Engineering* (June 2012), ICSE’12, pp. 716–726.
- [25] MILLER, B. P., FREDRIKSEN, L., AND SO, B. An empirical study of the reliability of UNIX utilities. *Commun. ACM* 33 (Dec 1990), 32–44.
- [26] MITRE. Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVE). <http://cve.mitre.org/>, 2011.
- [27] MOLNAR, D., LI, X. C., AND WAGNER, D. A. Dynamic test generation to find integer bugs in x86 binary linux programs. In *Proceedings of the 18th conference on USENIX security symposium* (2009), SSYM’09.
- [28] MOSER, A., KRUEGEL, C., AND KIRDA, E. Exploring multiple execution paths for malware analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2007 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy* (2007), SP’07, IEEE Computer Society.
- [29] NAGAPPAN, N., BALL, T., AND ZELLER, A. Mining metrics to predict component failures. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on Software engineering* (2006), ICSE’06.

- [30] NETHERCOTE, N., AND SEWARD, J. Valgrind: A Framework for Heavyweight Dynamic Binary Instrumentation. In *Proceedings of the Third International ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS Conference on Virtual Execution Environments* (2007), VEE'07.
- [31] NEWSOME, J., AND SONG, D. Dynamic taint analysis: Automatic detection, analysis, and signature generation of exploit attacks on commodity software. In *Proceedings of the Network and Distributed Systems Security Symposium* (2005), NDSS'05.
- [32] NGUYEN, V. H., AND TRAN, L. M. S. Predicting vulnerable software components with dependency graphs. In *Proc. of the 6th International Workshop on Security Measurements and Metrics* (Sept. 2010), MetriSec'10, ACM Press.
- [33] SEN, K., MARINOV, D., AND AGHA, G. CUTE: a concolic unit testing engine for C. In *Proceedings of the 10th European software engineering conference held jointly with 13th ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on Foundations of software engineering* (2005), ESEC/FSE-13.
- [34] SEREBRYANY, K., BRUENING, D., POTAPENKO, A., AND VYUKOV, D. AddressSanitizer: A fast address sanity checker. In *Proceedings of USENIX Annual Technical Conference* (2012).
- [35] SHIN, Y., AND WILLIAMS, L. An initial study on the use of execution complexity metrics as indicators of software vulnerabilities. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Workshop on Software Engineering for Secure Systems* (2011), SESS'11.
- [36] SLOWINSKA, A., AND BOS, H. Pointless tainting?: evaluating the practicality of pointer tainting. In *EuroSys '09: Proceedings of the 4th ACM European conference on Computer systems* (2009).
- [37] SLOWINSKA, A., STANCESCU, T., AND BOS, H. Body Armor for Binaries: preventing buffer overflows without recompilation. In *Proceedings of USENIX Annual Technical Conference* (2012).
- [38] SOTIROV, A. Modern exploitation and memory protection bypasses. USENIX Security invited talk, <http://www.usenix.org/events/sec09/tech/slides/sotirov.pdf>, 2009.
- [39] SPIKE. <http://www.immunitysec.com/resources-freesoftware.shtml>.
- [40] SUTTON, M., GREENE, A., AND AMINI, P. *Fuzzing: Brute Force Vulnerability Discovery*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2007.
- [41] VAN DER VEEN, V., DUTT-SHARMA, N., CAVALLARO, L., AND BOS, H. Memory Errors: The Past, the Present, and the Future. In *Proceedings of The 15th International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses* (2012), RAID'12.
- [42] WANG, T., WEI, T., GU, G., AND ZOU, W. TaintScope: A Checksum-Aware Directed Fuzzing Tool for Automatic Software Vulnerability Detection. In *Proceedings of the 31st IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy* (2010), SP'10.
- [43] WILLIAMS, N., MARRE, B., AND MOUY, P. On-the-Fly Generation of K-Path Tests for C Functions. In *Proceedings of the 19th IEEE international conference on Automated software engineering* (2004), ASE'04.
- [44] ZIMMERMANN, T., NAGAPPAN, N., AND WILLIAMS, L. Searching for a Needle in a Haystack: Predicting Security Vulnerabilities for Windows Vista. In *Proc. of the 3rd International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation* (Apr. 2010), ICST'10.
- [45] ZITSER, M., LIPPmann, R., AND LEEK, T. Testing static analysis tools using exploitable buffer overflows from open source code. In *Proc. of the 12th ACM SIGSOFT twelfth international symposium on Foundations of software engineering* (Nov. 2004), SIGSOFT '04/FSE-12.