Protection

Thierry Sans

Why are we still vulnerable to buffer overflows and other memory corruption vulnerabilities?

Why code written in assembly code or C are subject to buffer overflow attacks?

→ Because C has primitives to manipulate the memory directly (pointers ect ...)

Choosing a better programming language

Some languages are type-safe (i.e memory safe)

→ Pure Lisp, pure Java, ADA, ML ...

Some languages isolate potentially unsafe code

→ Modula-3, Java with native methods, C# ...

Some languages are hopeless

→ Assembly languages, C ...

Type-Safe Programs

- → Cannot access arbitrary memory addresses
- → Cannot corrupt their own memory
- ✓ Do not crash

So why are we still using unsafe programming languages?

If other programming languages are "memory safe", why are we not using them instead?

→ Because C and assembly code are used when a program requires high performances (audio, vide, calculus ...) or when dealing with hardware directly (OS, drivers)

How to write better programs with unsafe programming languages?

- Defensive Programming
- Penetration testing
- Formal testing
- Formal development

How to run programs written with unsafe programming languages?

- Fortify Source Functions
- Stack Canaries
- DEP/NX Non Executable Stack
- ASLR Address Space Layout Randomization
- PIC/PIE Position Independent Executables

How to run programs written with unsafe programming languages?

Fortify Source Functions

→ GCC macro FORTIFY_SOURCE provides buffer overflow checks for unsafe C libraries

```
memcpy, mempcpy, memmove, memset, strcpy, stpcpy, strncpy, strcat, strncat, sprintf, vsprintf, gets
```

Checks are performed

- some at compile time (compiler warnings)
- other at run time (code dynamically added to binary)

Canaries

- The compiler modifies every function's prologue and epilogue regions to place and check a value (a.k.a a canary) on the stack
- When a buffer overflows, the canary is overwritten. The programs detects it before the function returns and an exception is raised
- Different types:
 - random canaries
 - xor canaries
- Disabling Canary protection on Linux \$ gcc ... -fno-stack-protector
- Bypassing canary protection: Structured Exception Handling (SEH) exploit overwrite the existing exception handler structure in the stack to point to your own code

DEP/NX - Non Executable Stack

- · The program marks important structures in memory as non-executable
- The program generates an hardware-level exception if you try to execute those memory regions
- This makes normal stack buffer overflows where you set eip to esp+offset and immediately run your shellcode impossible
- Disabling NX protection on Linux
 \$ gcc ... -z execstack
- Bypassing NX protection: Return-to-lib-c exploit return to a subroutine of the lib C that is already present in the process' executable memory

ASLR - Address Space Layout Randomization

- The OS randomize the location (random offset) where the standard libraries and other elements are stored in memory
- Harder for the attacker to guess the address of a lib-c subroutine
- Disabling ASLR protection on Linux
 \$ sysctl kernel.randomize va space=0
- Bypassing ASLR protection: Brute-force attack to guess the ASLR offset
- Bypassing ASLR protection: Return-Oriented-Programming (ROP) exploit use instruction pieces of the existing program (called "gadgets") and chain them together to weave the exploit

PIC/PIE - Position Independent Code/Executables

Without PIC/PIE

code is compiled with absolute addresses and must be loaded at a specific location to function correctly

With PIC/PIE

code is compiled with relative addressing that are resolved dynamically when executed by calling a function to obtain the return value on stack

Confined execution environment - Sandbox

A sandbox is tightly-controlled set of resources for untrusted programs to run in

- → Sandboxing servers virtual machines
- → Sandboxing programs
 - Chroot and AppArmor in Linux
 - Sandbox in MacOS Lion
 - Metro App Sandboxing in Windows 8
- → Sandboxing applets Java and Flash in web browsers

Intrusion Detection/Prevention Systems

- Host-based Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS)
- Host-based Intrusion Prevention systems (IPS)
- ✓ Based on signatures (well known programs)
- ✓ Based on behaviors (unknown programs)
- → Example : Syslog and Systrace on Linux
- Vulnerable to malicious programs residing in the kernel called "rootkits"

How to write better programs with unsafe programming languages?

Defensive programming (I) Adopting good programming practices

Modularity

- → Have separate modules for separate functionalities
- ✓ Easier to find security flaws when components are independent

Encapsulation

- → Limit the interaction between the components
- ✓ Avoid wrong usage of the components

Information hiding

- → Hide the implementation
- Black box model does not improve security

Defensive programming (2) Being security aware programmer

- ✓ Check the inputs, even between components that belongs to the same application (mutual suspicion)
- ✓ Be "fault tolerant" by having a consistent policy to handle failure (managing exceptions)
- ✓ Reuse known and widely used code by using design patterns and existing libraries

Penetration Testing

Testing the functionalities

✓ Unit test, Integration test, Performance test and so on ...

Testing the security

- ✓ Penetration tests
- Try to make the software fail by pushing the limits of a "normal" usage i.e test what the program is not supposed to do

Using formal methods to verify a program

Static analysis - analyzing the code to detect security flaws

- Control flow analyzing the sequence of instructions
- Data flow analyzing how the date are accessed
- · Data structure analyzing how data are organized
- → Abstract interpretation [Cousot]
- ✓ Verification of critical embedded software in Airbus aircrafts

Using formal methods to generate a program

Mathematical description of the problem



Proof of correctness



Executable code or hardware design

Examples

Hardware design (VHDL, Verilog)

✓ Used by semi-conductor companies such as Intel

Critical embedded software (B/Z, Lustre/Esterel)

- ✓ Urban Transportation (METEOR Metro Line 14 in Paris by Alstom)
- ✓ Rail transportation (Eurostar)
- ✓ Aeronautic (Airbus, Eurocopter, Dassault)
- ✓ Nuclear plants (Schneider Electric)

Pros and cons of using formal methods

- ✓ Nothing better than a mathematical proof
- → A code "proven safe" is safe
- Development is time and effort (and so money) consuming
- → Should be motivated by the risk analysis
- Do not prevent from specification bugs
- → Example of network protocols