Control Hijacking

Control Hijacking: Defenses

Recap: control hijacking attacks

Stack smashing: overwrite return address or function pointer

Heap spraying: reliably exploit a heap overflow

Use after free: attacker writes to freed control structure,
which then gets used by victim program

Integer overflows

Format string vulnerabilities

⋮

The mistake: mixing data and control

- An ancient design flaw:
  - enables anyone to inject control signals

- 1971: AT&T learns never to mix control and data

Control hijacking attacks

The problem: mixing data with control flow in memory



Later we will see that mixing data and code is also the reason for XSS: a common web vulnerability

Preventing hijacking attacks

1. Fix bugs:
   – Audit software
     - Automated tools: Coverity, Prefast/Prefix.
   – Rewrite software in a type safe languange (Java, ML)
     - Difficult for existing (legacy) code …

2. Platform defenses: prevent attack code execution

3. Add runtime code to detect overflows exploits
   – Halt process when overflow exploit detected
   – StackGuard, CFI, LibSafe, …

Transform:

Complete Breach

⇓

Denial of service

Control Hijacking

Platform Defenses

Marking memory as non-execute (DEP)

Prevent attack code execution by marking stack and heap as **non-executable**

- NX-bit on AMD Athlon 64, XD-bit on Intel P4 Prescott
  - NX bit in every Page Table Entry (PTE)
- Deployment:
  - Linux (via PaX project); OpenBSD
  - Windows: since XP SP2 (DEP)
    - Visual Studio: **/NXCompat[:NO]**
- Limitations:
  - Some apps need executable heap (e.g. JITs).
  - Can be easily bypassed using **Return Oriented Programming (ROP)**

Examples: DEP controls in Windows



DEP terminating a program

Attack: Return Oriented Programming (ROP)

Control hijacking without injecting code:



ROP: in more detail

To run /bin/sh we must direct ***stdin*** and ***stdout*** to the socket:

```
dup2(s, 0)          // map stdin to socket
dup2(s, 1)          // map stdout to socket
execve("/bin/sh", 0, 0);
```

Gadgets in victim code:

Stack (set by attacker):



ROP: in even more detail

dup2(s,0) implemented as a sequence of gadgets in victim code:



What to do?? Randomization

- **ASLR**: (Address Space Layout Randomization)
  - Map shared libraries to rand location in process memory

    ⇒ Attacker cannot jump directly to exec function

  - Deployment: (/DynamicBase)
    - **Windows 7**: 8 bits of randomness for DLLs
      - aligned to 64K page in a 16MB region ⇒ 256 choices
    - **Windows 8:** 24 bits of randomness on 64-bit processors
- Other randomization methods:
  - Sys-call randomization: randomize sys-call id's
  - Instruction Set Randomization (ISR)

ASLR Example

Booting twice loads libraries into different locations:

ntlanman.dll	0x6D7F0000	Microsoft® Lan Manager
ntmarta.dll	0x75370000	Windows NT MARTA provider
ntshrui.dll	0x6F2C0000	Shell extensions for sharing
ole32.dll	0x76160000	Microsoft OLE for Windows

ntlanman.dll	0x6DA90000	Microsoft® Lan Manager
ntmarta.dll	0x75660000	Windows NT MARTA provider
ntshrui.dll	0x6D9D0000	Shell extensions for sharing
ole32.dll	0x763C0000	Microsoft OLE for Windows

Note: everything in process memory must be randomized

stack, heap, shared libs, base image

- Win 8 **Force ASLR**: ensures all loaded modules use ASLR

A very different idea: kBouncer



Observation: abnormal execution sequence

- ***ret*** returns to an address that does not follow a ***call***

Idea: before a syscall, check that every prior ret is not abnormal

- How: use Intel's *Last Branch Recording* (LBR)

A very different idea: kBouncer



Inte's **Last Branch Recording** (LBR):

- store 16 last executed branches in a set of on-chip registers (MSR)
- read using ***rdmsr*** instruction from privileged mode

kBouncer: before entering kernel, verify that last 16 ***ret***s are normal

- Requires no app. code changes, and minimal overhead
- Limitations: attacker can ensure 16 calls prior to syscall are valid

Control Hijacking Defenses

Hardening the executable

Run time checking: StackGuard

- Many run-time checking techniques …
  - we only discuss methods relevant to overflow protection

- <u>Solution 1</u>: StackGuard
  - Run time tests for stack integrity.
  - Embed "canaries" in stack frames and verify their integrity prior to function return.



Canary Types

- Random canary:
  - Random string chosen at program startup.
  - Insert canary string into every stack frame.
  - Verify canary before returning from function.
    - Exit program if canary changed. Turns potential exploit into DoS.
  - To corrupt, attacker must learn current random string.

- Terminator canary: Canary = {0, newline, linefeed, EOF}
  - String functions will not copy beyond terminator.
  - Attacker cannot use string functions to corrupt stack.

StackGuard (Cont.)

- StackGuard implemented as a GCC patch
  - Program must be recompiled
- Minimal performance effects: 8% for Apache
- Note: Canaries do not provide full protection
  - Some stack smashing attacks leave canaries unchanged
- Heap protection: PointGuard
  - Protects function pointers and setjmp buffers by encrypting them: e.g. XOR with random cookie
  - Less effective, more noticeable performance effects

StackGuard enhancements: ProPolice

- ProPolice (IBM) - gcc 3.4.1. (**-fstack-protector**)
  - Rearrange stack layout to prevent ptr overflow.



Protects pointer args and local pointers from a buffer overflow

pointers, but no arrays

MS Visual Studio /GS [since 2003]

Compiler /GS option:

– Combination of ProPolice and Random canary.

– If cookie mismatch, default behavior is to call **_exit(3)**

Function prolog:

```
sub   esp, 8     // allocate 8 bytes for cookie
mov   eax, DWORD PTR ___security_cookie
xor   eax, esp      // xor cookie with current esp
mov   DWORD PTR [esp+8], eax  // save in stack
```

Function epilog:

```
mov   ecx, DWORD PTR  [esp+8]
xor   ecx, esp
call  @__security_check_cookie@4
add   esp, 8
```

Enhanced /GS in Visual Studio 2010:

– /GS protection added to all functions, unless can be proven unnecessary

/GS stack frame



Evading /GS with exception handlers

- When exception is thrown, dispatcher walks up exception list until handler is found (else use default handler)

After overflow: handler points to attacker's code

exception triggered ⇒ control hijack

Main point: exception is triggered before canary is checked



Defenses: SAFESEH and SEHOP

- /SAFESEH: linker flag
  - Linker produces a binary with a table of safe exception handlers
  - System will not jump to exception handler not on list

- /SEHOP: platform defense (since win vista SP1)
  - Observation: SEH attacks typically corrupt the “next” entry in SEH list.
  - SEHOP: add a dummy record at top of SEH list
  - When exception occurs, dispatcher walks up list and verifies dummy record is there. If not, terminates process.

Summary: Canaries are not full proof

- Canaries are an important defense tool, but do not prevent all control hijacking attacks:
  - Heap-based attacks still possible
  - Integer overflow attacks still possible
  - /GS by itself does not prevent Exception Handling attacks

    (also need SAFESEH and SEHOP)

Even worse: canary extraction

A common design for crash recovery:

- When process crashes, restart automatically (for availability)
- Often canary is unchanged (reason: relaunch using fork)

Danger:

- canary extraction byte by byte



Similarly: extract ASLR randomness

A common design for crash recovery:

- When process crashes, restart automatically (for availability)
- Often canary is unchanged (reason: relaunch using fork)

Danger:

Extract ret-addr to de-randomize stack location

Extract stack function pointers to de-randomize heap



What if can't recompile: Libsafe

- Solution 2: Libsafe (Avaya Labs)
  - Dynamically loaded library (no need to recompile app.)
  - Intercepts calls to strcpy (dest, src)
    - Validates sufficient space in current stack frame:

      |frame-pointer – dest| > strlen(src)

    - If so, does strcpy. Otherwise, terminates application



More methods …

- **StackShield**
  - At function prologue, copy return address RET and SFP to “safe” location (beginning of data segment)
  - Upon return, check that RET and SFP is equal to copy.
  - Implemented as assembler file processor (GCC)
- **Control Flow Integrity** (CFI)
  - A combination of static and dynamic checking
    - Statically determine program control flow
    - Dynamically enforce control flow integrity

Control flow integrity (CFI) [ABEL'05, …]

Ultimate Goal: ensure control flows as specified by code's flow graph

```
void HandshakeHandler(Session *s, char *pkt) {
        ...
        s->hdlr(s, pkt)
}
```

Compile time: build list of possible call targets

Run time: before call, check validity of s->hdlr

Lots of academic research on CFI systems:

- CCFIR (2013), kBouncer (2013), FECFI (2014), CSCFI (2015), …

and many attacks …

Control Flow Guard (CFG) (Windows 10)

Poor man's version of CFI:

- Protects indirect calls by checking against a bitmask of all valid function entry points in executable

```
rep stosd
mov     esi, [esi]
mov     ecx, esi          ; Target
push    1
call    @_guard_check_icall@4 ; _guard_check_icall(x)
call    esi
add     esp, 4
xor     eax, eax
```

ensures target is the entry point of a function

Control Flow Guard (CFG) (Windows 10)

Poor man's version of CFI:

- Pr… valid fu…

- Does not prevent attacker from causing a jump to a valid **wrong** function

- Hard to build accurate control flow graph statically

```
rep s
mov
mov
push
call    @_guard_check_icall@4 ; _guard_check_icall(x)
call    esi
add     esp, 4
xor     eax, eax
```

…s
…of a

An example

void **HandshakeHandler**(Session *s, char *pkt) {

    s->hdlr = &**LoginHandler**;

    ... Buffer overflow in Session struct ...

}

Attacker controls handler

void **LoginHandler**(Session *s, char *pkt) {

    bool auth = **CheckCredentials**(pkt);

    s->dhandler = &**DataHandler**;

}

void **DataHandler**(Session *s, char *pkt);

static CFI: attacker can call **DataHandler** to bypass authentication

Cryptographic Control Flow Integrity (CCFI)

Threat model: attacker can read/write **anywhere** in memory,
program should not deviate from its control flow graph

CCFI approach: Every time a jump address is written/copied anywhere in memory:
compute 64-bit AES-MAC and append to address

On heap: **tag = AES(k, (jump-address, 0 ll source-address))**

on stack: **tag = AES(k, (jump-address, 1 ll stack-frame))**

Before following address, verify MAC and crash if invalid

Where to store key k? In xmm registers (not memory)

Back to the example

void **HandshakeHandler**(Session *s, char *pkt) {

  s->hdlr = &**LoginHandler**;

  ... Buffer overflow in Session struct ...

}

Attacker controls handler

void **LoginHandler**(Session *s, char *pkt) {

  bool auth = **CheckCredentials**(pkt);

  s->dhandler = &**DataHandler**;

}

CCFI: Attacker cannot create a valid MAC for **DataHandler** address

void **DataHandler**(Session *s, char *pkt);

THE END