

# CS 155 NOTES

ARUN DEBRAY  
JUNE 4, 2015

These notes were taken in Stanford's CS 155 class in Spring 2015, taught by Dan Boneh and John Mitchell. I T<sub>E</sub>Xed these notes up using vim, and as such there may be typos; please send questions, comments, complaints, and corrections to [debray@cs.stanford.edu](mailto:debray@cs.stanford.edu).

## CONTENTS

<b>Part 1. Introduction and Overview</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Introduction, and Why Security is a Problem: 3/31/15	<b>1</b>
2. Control Hijacking Attacks: 4/2/15	<b>4</b>
3. Section 1: 4/3/15	<b>7</b>
4. Run-time Defenses and the Confinement Principle: 4/7/15	<b>9</b>
5. Program Analysis for Computer Security: 4/9/15	<b>11</b>
6. Secure Architecture: 4/14/15	<b>13</b>
7. Security Bugs in the Real World: 4/16/15	<b>16</b>
<b>Part 2. Web Security</b>	<b>20</b>
8. The Browser Security Model: 4/21/15	<b>20</b>
9. Web Application Security: 4/23/15	<b>23</b>
10. Modern Client-Side Defenses: 4/28/15	<b>25</b>
11. Session Management: 4/30/15	<b>27</b>
12. Cryptography Overview: 5/5/15	<b>29</b>
13. HTTPS and the Lock Icon: 5/7/15	<b>33</b>
<b>Part 3. Networking Protocols and Mobile Security</b>	<b>36</b>
14. How to Design Security Prompts and Internet Protocols: 5/12/15	<b>36</b>
15. Network Security Protocols and Defense Mechanisms: 5/14/15	<b>39</b>
16. Denial of Service Attacks: 5/19/15	<b>42</b>
17. Mobile Platform Security Models: 5/21/15	<b>45</b>
18. Mobile Malware: 5/26/15	<b>47</b>
19. Malware, Viruses, and Antiviruses: 5/28/15	<b>49</b>
20. Computer Security in the Real World: 6/2/15	<b>51</b>

## Part 1. Introduction and Overview

Lecture 1.

### Introduction, and Why Security is a Problem: 3/31/15

*"What you would do, is you would take over — well, not you, but..."*

There are no textbooks for this class; the material moves very quickly, and any kind of textbook would quickly become out of date. Instead, our readings will be from papers posted on the website. Additionally, the first programming project is up, though it won't even be explained until Thursday.

Let's start by talking about computer security on a high level. There's lots of buggy software and exploitable systems on the Internet. No single person can keep the software of an entire system in their head, and therefore the boundaries of code written by different people commonly causes these vulnerabilities. In addition to buggy software, social engineering, e.g. phishing, leads people to install software that perhaps they would prefer not to install.

Moreover, finding security vulnerabilities can be incredibly profitable, not just from the opportunities of taking over computers (in many ways) but also discovering vulnerabilities and selling them to others.

This combination of many potential vulnerabilities and very profitable vulnerabilities leads to their importance, and why we're all sitting in a class about it.

Moreover, vulnerabilities are getting more and more common as more and more people and devices use the Internet. About 45% of the vulnerabilities exploit Oracle Java (oops), since the JVM isn't the most secure code in the world and is installed in many browsers. The professor recommends turning off the JVM in your browser. 42% of these vulnerabilities come from browsers in other ways; other remaining common exploits (1% to 5%) come from Adobe Reader (so malicious PDFs!), Adobe Flash Player, Microsoft Office, and the Android OS.

Another large recent trend is mobile malware; for example, banking trojans grew immensely in 2014. These are pieces of software which imitate a bank website or app and record the account information and password for less noble purposes.

Here are some examples. Why would you want to own a personal computer?

**Example 1.1.** The professor's parents run a Windows machine, to his chagrin: every other week they get some sort of malware. Why do all these people want to exploit that machine? It doesn't have anything that scandalous on it — but one can use it for all sorts of things.

For example, one could steal its IP address; now, it looks like a random Internet address, so it's a nice place to send spam from. It'll get blocked fairly quickly, but until then plenty of spam can be created. There are economic studies of the business of spam — so-called "spamalytics" — one email in 12 million (i.e. *very* close to zero) leads to a purchase. But since sending spam is basically free ( $\ll$  one cent), the spammer is happy. Relatedly, one greeting card in 260,000 results in an infection.

Another use of personal computers is as part of botnets which can be bundled up into services. For example, one can group together many personal computers to participate in distributed denial of service (DDoS) attacks, which cost on the order of \$20 an hour.

Yet another use is click fraud; in advertising on the Internet, one earns money per clicks on an ad. However, one could make a bot on someone else's computer which keeps clicking on advertisements. This is fraud, and there's a lot of work in either direction trying to create or combat this.

Just by the way: **the material in this class is for educational purposes. Do NOT do this at home; it is pretty illegal.**

Another use of someone else's machine is to steal their credentials, e.g. by using a keylogger. This could gather one's banking or web passwords, and so on. Alternatively, one could inject one's own ads and make money that way. A good example of this was the SuperFish proxy which spread around fairly recently; we will discuss it further when we discuss web security, later in the class. One way credential stealing can work is by injecting Javascript into a login page that forwards the user's inputs to another site.

A third reason to own one's computer — remember Stuxnet? The trick was that the system they wanted to gain access to was isolated from the Internet, because it was important to keep it isolated. So the perpetrators infected a bunch of random laptops with the hope that one would connect to the isolated system, and then when this happens, come out of dormancy and do Evil Stuff.<sup>1</sup>

One can also infect servers. Why is that? Servers are treasure troves of data: credit card data, user information, etc. One of the classic examples is from 2013 on Target, which retrieved about 140,000,000 credit card numbers! The industry took quite a while to recover from that; it takes quite some time and effort and expense to revoke those credit cards. These kinds of attacks are rampant, and have been since the beginning of the millenium.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Conversation between the professor and one of the tech people: "You guys killed my computer, so that's nice."  
"Yeah, I'm not sure what's going on."

"That's exactly the kind of thing I was hoping not to hear."

<sup>2</sup>"We're back online... or not."

Server-side attacks can be politically motivated, too. Even right now, there was a server-side attack on Baidu where people searching there also generate requests to Github. We don't know who is doing this or why, but it's related to political Github projects, and therefore is politically motivated.

Another "good" reason to infect a server is to infect the users of the website. There's a piece of software called MPack which makes this relatively streamlined, and has been installed on 500,000 websites and countless end-user machines. This is a pretty effective use of a large web server.

A defense mechanism to this is Google Safe Browsing, which blocks sites that it detects with malware; Chrome, Firefox, et al. then refuse to go to those sites.

Insider attacks are created by people who are part of the project. For example, there was one in the Linux kernel a few years ago that "accidentally" gave the user root access. Sometimes, these happen in companies by disgruntled workers, etc. It's particularly hard to detect insider attacks programatically, and the very cleverest ones can be made to look like mistakes (c.f. the Underhanded C Contest).

Now, suppose you've found a vulnerability in code. What can you do now? One option is a bug bounty program; for example, Google has a standard program for reporting bugs and paying the discoverers. The bounty can be quite nice; some people make a living doing this. Microsoft and Mozilla have similar programs. These are examples of *responsible disclosure*, which includes staying quiet about it until the patch is released. One can also sell these exploits to antivirus vendors.

Of course, you (well, one) can also sell it to the black market. These also pay well. But who buys? Use your imagination.

Then, what happens once it's found? There are whole industries to take advantage of them. For example, pay-to-install services (PPI) use these exploits to take over machines, and then the customer's software gets run. Surprisingly, the cost of infecting, say, a thousand machines in America is only \$100, and it's cheaper in Asia (about \$7!).

In this class, we're going to learn a lot about these things, with the goal of being able to know what the threats are and design code or systems that are safer against these attacks. This includes program security, web security, network security, and mobile app security.

Once again, never ever ever try this yourself.<sup>3</sup> First of all, Stanford's security team has no sense of humor at all. Neither does the law. People take this very seriously.

**Ken Thompson's Clever Trojan.** The question is, at its essence, *what code can you trust?*

In Linux there are commands like `login` or `su` that require one to enter one's password, or more generally credentials. How do you know that these are safe and won't send your credentials to another person? Do you trust the Ubuntu distribution?

Well, if not, let's download the code and inspect the source code. We can be reasonably confident that the code is safe, then, and then compile it and get an executable.

Ah, but can we trust the compiler? This is a real question: it's perfectly possible for a compiler to be made malicious, in which it checks if the program is the `login` program and adds some extra code to add the backdoor and compromise your password. Otherwise, it can act as a regular compiler.

Great, so now we need to look at the compiler's source. Then we can compile it — but we're still dependent on the compiler. A C compiler is written in C these days, so consider an attack which does the following: it changes the compiler's source code to the malicious compiler from before, which makes the `login` program with a backdoor and is otherwise secure. But additionally, if it sees *the compiler's* code, it replaces the compiler with its own code, so the regular compiler is built into the malicious one! (Otherwise, it compiles normally.)

Thus, we compile the compiler and end up with the malicious compiler, so `login` is still compromised. Oops.

The compiler back-door has to print out the code for detecting the compiler source code, which is rather nontrivial, since this code contains the backdoor. Thus, it has to be a quine — it has to print out its own code!

Ok, let's go deeper. Now, the attacker removes the malicious source code, because the executable is still malicious, and will poison all compilers that the user tries to compile. The source code is pristine, and secure... but there's nothing we can do.

---

<sup>3</sup>Like, ever.

So the user has one option: to write the login program in assembly. And the entire compiler. Yuck. This is extremely impractical for any real software. But not just text-based assembly: the assembler could be malicious, so you have to write the binary yourself.

In other words, if we don't trust anything, we're going nowhere fast, so we have to have some root of trust that we can base the security on. Well, we can't really trust the compiler, and similarly the OS could be malicious too! We shouldn't trust the hardware, either. . . but at this point, we have no choice, even if we reduce to just trusting the x86 processor. So, better hope Intel doesn't go rogue. There is a lot of work towards reducing how much trust we put in our hardware, e.g. graphics cards, network cards. Perhaps only the x86 processor is the root of trust; that would be all right. This is hard, but would be possible.

Lecture 2.

## Control Hijacking Attacks: 4/2/15

*"The graph stops at 1996, I guess because I got tired of typing in numbers."*

Control hijacking attacks are a very common class of attacks, including buffer overflow attacks, integer overflow attacks, and format string vulnerabilities. These involve using mistakes in a program to gain control of a running program or process.

Buffer overflows are very old vulnerabilities, dating back to 1988. Hundreds are discovered every year, and they are an active area of research. These mostly affect programs written in C and C++.

To understand these, you need to understand a bit about system calls, including the `exec()` system calls, and the stack and heap structure. `exec()` takes a string and then runs the program named by that string in the current address space. This does require knowing what CPU and OS the computer is running, but this is very easy, e.g. connect to a web server or using specialized software. In this class, though, we'll stick with x86 CPUs running Linux or Windows. There are also slight differences between CPUs, e.g. little-endian or big-endian architecture.

Recall the memory map for a typical Linux process, e.g. a web server. The bottom memory is unused; then, the program code is on top of that, loaded from the executable. Then, the runtime heap comes after that, which grows upward, followed by shared libraries and then, at the very top, the user stack, which grows downwards, and is delineated by the extended stack pointer `%esp`.

When one function calls another, another stack frame is created. The following are pushed onto the stack, in order (so, growing downward):

- The arguments to the function.
- The return address of the callee (pointing back to where we were in the caller).
- The stack frame pointer, which points to the previous stack frame, useful for debugging.
- In Windows, exception handlers are pushed next. These are ripe vectors for attacks.
- Next, local variables are pushed.
- Finally, the callee's saved registers are pushed.

This should be familiar to you by this point.

Now, suppose we have a really dumb function in this webserver, as follows.

```
void func(char *str) {
    char buf[128];

    strcpy(buf, str);
    do_something(buf);
}
```

So now, we have 128 bytes of space just below the stack frame pointer. Thus, if the buffer reads more than 128 bytes (specifically, 136 bytes), the return address and stack frame pointer will be overwritten. In particular, the return address can be modified to another address, so a hacker can cause the program to pass to any other point and execute arbitrary code. This is why it's called control flow hijacking.

So how does this turn into an exploit? The hacker submits much more than 136 bytes; in addition to a bogus return address, it should also contain the code for some bogus program *P*, e.g. `exec("/bin/sh")`. The return address should point into the address where *P* is loaded, so that when this function returns, it returns right to the beginning of *P*, and therefore begin executing a shell. Now, the attacker has a shell on the system

with the privileges of the web server and can do what he wants. This is often game over, e.g. the attacker can run its own programs, change websites, and so on.<sup>4</sup>

In practice, it's not just shell; there's some bookkeeping to do, setting `stdin` and `stdout`. This is called a *shell code* more generally. There's no need to write this yourself; there are famous well-known ones, e.g. the one we'll use, by someone called `N1`. The point is to format this into a bogus URL, which also contains *P* and the return address.

Now, there's one more ingredient missing: how does the attacker know what the address of *P* is? If he fills it with a random address, the server will probably just crash. Poor hacker! What does he do? The attack string must be modified in the following way: in addition to the 128 bytes of the buffer, the attacker provides an *approximate* return address (it's possible to get good estimates by running the web server on one's own machine), which points into a 10,000-byte (or so) sequence of `nop` instructions, called the *NOP slide*. Each instruction does nothing, and so it slides into program *P* (which is placed above the NOP slide, i.e. after it in the string). The idea is that as long as the code reaches the NOP slide, it doesn't actually matter where it goes.

Finally, how does the hacker know that the buffer is 128 bytes? This can come from open-source code, or by getting a copy of the web server and playing with it until a vulnerability is found.

Buffer overflows are extremely common, and very difficult to prevent; we're just human, and static analysis has bugs too. Of course, not using `strcpy` is a good idea, but more common is to structure code to weaken buffer overflows, as opposed to preventing buffer overflows. For example, one might try to prevent the processor from executing code on the stack.

There are some tricks that make this a little harder. For example:

- Program *P* cannot contain the null character. Programming without zero is like writing English without the letter *e*; `N1` has already solved this problem, so don't worry about it, but it's an interesting thing to think about. Moreover, since this is a significant restriction on shell codes, one might try to scan for `N1`'s shell code... but this is pretty hopeless too. There are still lots of shell codes and some of them can be very very obfuscated, e.g. one shell code that looks like English poetry in ASCII. Similarly, the NOP slide can be made to look like reasonable English text. Some shell codes even work on multiple processors.
- The overflow should not cause the program to crash before `func()` exits, of course.

There are some well-known remote stack smashing overflows.

- In 2007, there was an overflow in Windows animated cursors, in the function `LoadAniIcon()`. Even though IE was compiled to avoid these issues, this overflow was so optimized as to be undetected, so that if one goes to a website or opens an email containing a specific animated GIF, the adversary gets shell on the user's browser.
- In 2005, there was an overflow in Symantec's antivirus software (huh, that's pretty ironic); from the browser, one could send some Javascript to run code with the privileges of the anti-virus system (which is typically admin!).

This is a very common problem; many of the functions in the C standard library are unsafe, e.g. `strcpy`, `strcat`, `gets`, and `scanf`. There are "safe" versions, e.g. `strncpy` and `strncat`, which copy only *n* characters (*n* supplied by the programmer). However, these don't always leave their strings terminated! Oops. This can cause overly long strings to crash the program anyways, and thus are unsafe. In the Windows C runtime, the safer versions, which do terminate their strings, are called `strcpy_s`, etc.

There are plenty of other places one can find opportunities for a buffer overflow, e.g. on Windows, one can overwrite the addresses of exception handlers in the stack frame, and then invoke an exception. Function pointers are also useful; for example, if a buffer sits right next to a function pointer, then overflowing the buffer can allow someone to change the value of the function pointer. This is harder in practice, not just because of the NOP slide and all that, but also because it involves guessing where things are on the heap, which is difficult and changes. However, there's lots of techniques both to attack (heap spraying, where the heap is filled with vulnerable function pointers and shell code) and defend against these.

This is particularly concerning in C++, because it has methods, i.e. basically compiler-generated function pointers. If the table of function pointers (an object's method) is placed next to a buffer, the result is a buffer overflow — slide in a shell code and you're set.

---

<sup>4</sup>Next week, we'll talk about systems that remain secure even when some of their components are compromised.



**Finding Buffer Overflows.** To find an overflow, one can run a web server on a local machine, and issue it lots of malformed requests. Of course, there are automated tools, called “fuzzers,” which do this. Then, if one of the requests causes the server to crash, the hacker can search through the core dump to look at the state of memory to find the malformed request, which was the location of the buffer overflow. It’s possible, but much, much harder, to look through the binary code, and therefore explicitly construct exploits, but in practice these fuzzers are the most common and powerful way to make this work. There’s a lot of good engineering involved in making a good fuzzer, and a lot of companies should do this but don’t. Of course, the big companies do, and thus catch some of their own vulnerabilities. Keep this in mind, and fuzz your code!

**More Kinds of Control Hijacking Attacks.** There are many different kinds of control-flow hijacking attacks; we just saw stack-based ones, but there are also integer overflow attacks and double free attacks, which can cause the memory manager’s data structure to be messed up and write data to locations that can be discovered. Another related attack is use-after-free, where memory is used after it was supposed to be free. This is very useful, because it means memory is used in two ways, so, for example, a function pointer can be overwritten with something that an adversary wants to point to. It turns out browsers are very vulnerable to this, because of DOM management; last year, this was the largest source of attacks on browsers. Finally, there are format string overflows. These are things which C and C++ developers need to be aware of, and often are not.

Returning to integer overflows, recall that ints are 32 bits, shorts are 16 bits, and chars are 8 bits. If one adds two things that would go outside those bounds, it causes an overflow. Can this be exploited? Yes! Consider the following code.

```
void func(char *buf1, *buf2, unsigned int len1, len2) {
    char temp[256];
    if (len1 + len2 > 256) { return -1;} // length check
    memcpy(temp, buf1, len1); // cat buffers
    memcpy(temp+len1, buf2, len2);
    do_something(temp); // do stuff
}
```

So imagine that the attacker can make `len1 = 0x80` and `len2 = 0xffffffff80`? Then, their sum is zero! Then, `memcpy` will copy an enormous number of bytes into the heap; since the heap grows upwards towards the stack, this will cause things to be written to the stack, at which point the attack continues as before.

How could one check against this?

- If the sum of two positive numbers is less than either number, there is a problem. This is a good way to check this in the above code.
- Alternatively, for signed integers, one can check that their sum is not negative, which indicates an overflow.

Finally, let’s talk about format string issues, which will pop up on the first project. An inexperienced developer might write the following program.

```
void func(char* user) { // i.e. this string was supplied by the user
    fprintf(stderr, user);
}
```

Thus, if the user can supply the format string, it can peek around, since further arguments would come from the stack! Thus, one could supply `“%s%s%s%s%s%s%s%s”`, which means the user can see the memory of the program! However, the program will most likely crash, e.g. if some of the words are 0, so not really pointers.

The correct code is `fprintf(stdout, “%s”, user)`. This is true for any function taking a format string; do not be lazy!

**Platform Defenses.** This is an active area of research: anything that works will probably be useful, so if you have any ideas, go talk to someone! Sometimes this also comes with nice prizes.

The first way to fix this problem is to avoid these bugs in the first place. There are automated tools for this, e.g. Coverity, Prefast, Prefix, and so on. These will catch some bugs, but not all of them!

Another idea is to (re)write code only in type-safe languages like Java. This is nice in theory, but there's so much legacy code that it's not always viable.

It's also possible to defend, e.g. prefer crashing to executing arbitrary code. Then, the worst a hacker can do is a DDoS.

For example, one can mark memory as writable or executable, but not both. This is called W<sup>X</sup> ("W xor X"), which was implemented in Intel and AMD processors a decade ago. Basically, in every page table entry, there's a bit indicating whether it can be written or executed (called the NX or XD bit), and jumping execution into those pages not allowed to execute causes a segmentation fault. These are mirrored in software, with these defenses enabled in Linux and Windows. However, some programs need this ability, such as just-in-time compilers. In Visual Studio, this can be turned off, e.g. with the configuration `/NXCompat:NO`.

As a response, attackers began to figure out how to hijack control without executing code. This is the start of Return Oriented Programming (ROP). The idea is that `libc.so` contains the code for `exec()` and `printf()`, as well as the string `"/bin/sh"`. Thus, an attacker making a buffer overflow can point to the address of `exec()`, and have the argument (just above that) point to the shell string. Of course, this is a simplification, since the input and output streams have to be modified, but the key idea is in place: use code fragments which are already in memory to get a shell code to execute. Shell code basically already exists in memory!

Once again, this gets sophisticated quickly: programs can look through code for certain pieces of a script, and then construct a sequence of stack frames that make the code execute.

One defense against this is to make `exec()` (and other components of `libc`) live at different places in different invocations of the programs: the location of the library is randomized from machine to machine. Attack, defend, attack, defend, like chess or ping-pong. This method is called ASLR (address space layout randomization), where shared libraries are mapped to random locations in process memory.

Of course, randomness is hard; the first deployment in Windows 7 had only 8 bits of randomness, so one attack in about 256 succeeded! That's still pretty good. Now, however, in Windows 8, there are 24 bits of randomness, which is sufficient.

Unfortunately, this is still quite hard to get right: everything has to be randomized, even the locations of basic code in the executable! Thus, these days, when you start a program, it gets loaded into a random place, so the attacker doesn't know where to jump to. And if the attacker can figure out where `libc` is loaded (e.g., by format string vulnerabilities), then he's back in the game.

There are other ways of randomizing against this or protecting against it, but they're under research and not implemented.

Of course, the attacker is still in the picture, and can defeat ASLR cleverly, via a method called memory exhaustion.

Lecture 3.

## Section 1: 4/3/15

Today's section was given by Arun Kulshreshtha.

x86 has about six general-purpose registers, along with three special-purpose ones.

- `$esp` points to the top of the stack (lowest memory location), which is where to push or pop from. This changes a lot, e.g. with every function call or whenever anything is pushed.
- `$ebp` points to the beginning of the latest stack frame, which is where the caller's stack frame is stored. This changes a little less often.
- `$eip` points to the address of the next instruction to execute. Typically, this has a very low value, unlike the stack, which has high memory values.

When you call a function, `$eip` is pushed, `$ebp` is pushed, and then `$ebp` is set to `$esp`. This is useful because it can be unwound: to return from a function, set `$esp` to `$ebp`, and then pop `$ebp` and then `$eip` (since they're now right at the top). This is the calling convention, which we saw in CS 107. Drawing pictures about this will be very useful on the project.

**Setting up the Environment.** The disk images that were provided for the project can be opened with many VMs, e.g. VMWare, VirtualBox, etc. VMWare is usually not free, but it's possible to get a free student copy at [software.stanford.edu](https://software.stanford.edu): search for "VMWare fusion."<sup>5</sup> On Windows, use VM Player, which is also free.

While you can use open-source alternatives such as VirtualBox, VMWare makes it considerably easier to set it up. Note, however, that the network adapter doesn't always work, *which doesn't match all of the instructions on the sheet*; switch from bridged networking to a shared connection (with your Mac or PC). This should make it boot up faster, and work.

Then, we have a VM! It's a little weird, small font, etc. Instead of working directly, which can be painful or masochistic, you may want to ssh in, and you'll need to scp files back and forth anyways. Use `ifconfig` to get your IP address, and then ssh into `user@IP address`. If this isn't working, come to office hours or make a Piazza post.

You'll notice the machine is very empty. A good start is to download the starter code onto it (e.g. using `wget`). There's a README, and the Makefile makes it easier to submit; see Piazza for more instructions. The important takeaway is that this Makefile is not for building things.

Then, we get some programs, all of which are horribly buggy, and will allow us to own this machine. First, you have to build the programs, and in particular, run `sudo make install`, which will copy the programs over to the `/tmp` subdirectory, disable the stack protector, and `setuid` them to run as root. In particular, the exploits and the grading code will assume these programs run in `/tmp`.

Here's the first target program. It's pretty simple.

```
int bar(char* arg, char* out)
{
    strcpy(out, arg);
    return 0;
}
void foo(char* argv[])
{
    char buf[256];
    bar(argv[1], buf);
}
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    foo(argv);
    return 0;
}
```

There's not much point to modifying the target; instead, the code you want to write will live in the `sploit1.c` file. Since grading will be with scripts, this will be important. This is the bare minimum of executing one program within another; you just pass in your arguments. Make sure the end of the arguments list is terminated with a null pointer.

The next ingredient is the shell code, 46 bytes long (including the null terminator), already linked in each exploit program. This was written by N1; you don't need to know the gritty details about how it works.

So we talked about control hijacking last lecture — there's a problem with this program! (Ominous background music) Let's give the program more than 256 bytes of input. Then, the buffer keeps going, because `strcpy` doesn't bounds-check. In particular, we can overwrite the return address of the function.

One common lesson is that unintended behavior can lead us into doing evil things.

So now, we need to figure out the mechanics of the state of the stack. This is where `gdb`, the GNU debugger, comes onstage. We can run `gdb` on the exploit, but since we're calling `execve` to run the exploit, which overwrites the address space, `gdb` gets confused.

The shell code fits comfortably within the buffer, since it's small, so we don't need to do the more elaborate method from class where it comes after the overwritten return address. Using `gdb`, we can determine what the address that we want to jump to is, as well as where the saved return address is: this is right after the buffer, flush against it.

---

<sup>5</sup>It says "purchase," but the cost is \$0.00.



## Run-time Defenses and the Confinement Principle: 4/7/15

Today's lecture will still discuss control-flow hijacking attacks, but focus on defenses against them. For example, most applications (not JITs) can mark the stack and heap as non-executable, which stops the most basic buffer overflow attacks, but then hackers responded with return-oriented programming (ROP) attacks where hackers use existing code, rather than supply their own code. It even turns out that ROP attacks on standard programs are Turing-complete. Then, ASLR is used to make ROP attacks harder.

This is still a very active area of research, so if you have ideas, feel free to bring them to the professor.

Today's defenses, run-time checking, take the philosophy that buffer overflows and their attacks will always happen; the goal is to convert ownership attacks to crashes, since a DDoS is better than losing control. There are many of these techniques, but we'll only discuss those relevant to overflow protection.

One solution is called StackGuard, or a *stack canary*. This embeds a "canary" in every stack frame, and verifies that it's intact before a function returns; if it isn't, then it crashes. Thus, if a buffer overflows, it's likely that the wrong value will be in place, so the stack compromise is detected.

One common way to do this is to use a random value that's consistent across all stack frames; another is to use entirely null characters, which the attacker would notice, but means that attacks due to `strcpy` can't overflow the buffer: either it contains non-null characters, and the canary causes it to crash, or it does, and the string ends before the buffer is overflowed.

Since the terminator canary (the latter kind) can't protect against `memcpy` attacks, the random canary is almost universal.

StackGuard is implemented as a GCC patch (so programs must be compiled), which is now default; setting and checking the canaries causes a performance tradeoff, though at first this was about 8% on Apache and now is considerably less.

However, it isn't a perfect defense, e.g. if one is allowed to write to an arbitrary index, it's possible to jump the canary entirely, and this doesn't work for function pointer abuse or heap overflows. Some mechanisms (e.g. PointGuard) have been proposed for that, but they're less reliable, much harder to write, and come with a much greater performance overhead.

GCC's `-fstack-protector` flag, part of ProPolice, actually goes farther, rearranging the stack layout to prevent pointer overflow. The stack grows by first copying the pointer arguments, then the local non-buffer variables, then the local string buffers, then the canary. Thus, string buffers do not overflow into pointers; only into each other (which is fine) or a canary, which is detected.

Here's the details of how the check works.

```
function prolog:
    sub esp 8 // 8 bytes for cookie
    mov eax, DWORD PTR __security_cookie
    xor eax, esp // xor cookie with current esp
    mov DWORD PTR [esp+8] // save in stack

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

One has to be careful; initially, these checks were only added in functions that were thought to be vulnerable, but sometimes this isn't aggressive enough; thus, now it is more aggressive.

If one has exception handlers, they're usually placed just after (above) the canary, so that the canary also protects the exception handler (which, as we saw last time, is also a source of potential vulnerabilities). In Windows, when an exception (e.g. division by zero) is fired, execution stops, and the program follows its exception handlers up the stack (linked-list) until it finds an exception handler or crashes with the famous message asking whether you want to report details to Windows (the answer, by the way, is no).

However, if the attacker overflows the canary *and* the exception handler, then manages to cause an exception, then the attacker can use the exception handler space to load his own stuff, specifically an address pointing to code the attacker wants. The issue is that the exception handler runs off before the function returns and the canary can be checked.

Microsoft was just as surprised as anyone else by these attacks, which popped up after StackGuard and ProPolice were implemented. The first idea is to check the canary just before invoking the execution handler, but this has to be checked on every node in the linked-list (in case the attack happens and then other functions are called), so this isn't really efficient.

The solution is that the exception handler can be required to only jump to code that's marked as valid exception handlers (and crash otherwise). This was called `SAFESEH`. This gets rid of many attacks, but there are others that bypass this, e.g. the hacker can reroute the program into another exception. Generally, restricting the program to one of five places to go means an attacker can poke the program into jumping to one of the four wrong ones, which has been the basis of a surprising number of attacks.

Thus, the solution, called `SEHOP`, is to include a dummy final node at the end of the list; then, when an exception happens, it walks up the list to make sure we get to this final node and check that it's valid. It's not really possible to overwrite this stuff or get that final address, since everything is randomized. It's clever and efficient.

Of course, canaries aren't foolproof, since they don't protect against the heap or integer overflows, and some more stuff needs to be done for exception handlers. But they're really useful, and it's very important to compile code with stack canaries enabled.

But what if you don't have the source? Instead, there's a neat library called `LibSafe`, which is a dynamically loaded library (so there's no need to recompile the app) which intercepts calls to `strcpy`, and validates that there's enough space in the stack; if there isn't, it terminates the application. It's possible to calculate the size of the buffer as the address of the frame pointer minus the address of the destination buffer. This might overflow from one buffer into another, which is a problem, but it's less of a buffer.

There are many, many other proposals, e.g. `StackShield`, which copies return addresses into the data segment rather than the stack, and checks that the two are equal when the function is about to return. This can be implemented as an assembler file processor, but again it requires code to be recompiled.

Recently, Microsoft released a new way to handle this called control-flow integrity (CFI), which is a combination of static and dynamic checking; then, it can statically determine the control flow, and dynamically check that the address one returns to is within those options. This is reasonable, but doesn't work in all cases (e.g. if one returns to an address from a function pointer), and it's an active area of research.

We just talked about a lot of flags or compiler stuff; make sure all of them are turned on in your code, or it may be exploitable. This is a common lesson.

**The Confinement Principle.** It seems like there's lots of untrusted code out there that we need to run, e.g. apps or extensions from untrusted sites, exposed applications (e.g. PDF viewers and Outlook) vulnerable to attacks, legacy daemons that are insecure (e.g. `sendmail`), honeypots, etc.

Often, we want to or need to run these, and want to guarantee that, even if they're compromised, only that app or program is compromised, and the rest of the system is unaffected. In fact, we could try to kill the application once it misbehaves.

Confinement can be implemented at many levels. The most basic way (the DoD or Pentagon approach) is called the "air gap:" make sure that an application is run on a completely isolated application or network. This is a very strong defense, though not foolproof: the user could plug a USB stick into an infected side and move it to the isolated side (or a laptop, etc.). The defense is also hardware-based: you use a jar of epoxy to seal the USB ports. Well then.

The next lowest level is to use virtual machines: isolate operating systems on a single machine. Then, you can check your mail on one VM and launch the missiles on another VM, so it's (in theory) all good. This is courtesy of a virtual machine monitor (VMM), though it adds some overhead, and sometimes they have bugs that allow malware to bleed across. However, it is a lot harder for malware to sneak across.

The next level is process-level confinement (e.g. browsers), where processes are less able to spread stuff between each other. Finally, one can implement it on the thread level (software fault isolation, or SFI), which is more interesting to implement because threads can share memory. This is also done in browsers.

All levels of confinement have a few commonalities. There is a *reference monitor* which mediates requests from applications and determines which things are allowed and disallowed, e.g. a certain application may be disallowed from touching `/etc/passwd`. However, it must always be invoked, and it better be tamper-proof (or the attacker can exploit it), so there's a lot of work around building simple, provably secure reference monitors.

The chroot program is an old and useful way to do this. It means that the given user cannot access files above the new root directory. An application called JailKit (or FreeBSD jail) makes this work; early versions had bugs, but FreeBSD jail is the right way to do it.

For example, this is really nice for web servers; they can be jailed to a certain directory, so if the server is compromised, it can't get anything other than that directory itself. It's good to be aware of the jail mechanism.

However, jails don't work so well for web browsers or email (where we want to upload or download files from arbitrary places in the system). The key is that jails are all-or-nothing; we would instead want to determine which kinds of access are allowed or disallowed.

**System Call Interposition.** System call interposition is confinement at the level of a process; thus, the only way it can damage a system or even change it is through the filesystem, i.e. through system calls (networks, writing, reading, etc.). Thus, we'll monitor all system calls and block the ones we don't like.

This can be implemented in many ways: in the kernel (e.g. GSWTK), in user space (program shepherding), or a hybrid of both. We'll look at a hybrid, Systrace.

Linux has a function called ptrace, which listens on a process ID and wakes up when that PID makes a system call. Then, it can signal the monitor, which determines whether it's OK.

There are several issues (nuances, complications?) with this.

- If the process forks, so too must the monitor, which is a growth in complexity.
- If the monitor crashes, the app has to be killed.
- The system calls depend heavily on context; for example, `open("passwd", "r")` depends heavily on which directory we're in, so we have to keep track of state somehow.

ptrace isn't well suited for this application, since it traces all system calls or none. The monitor doesn't need to be woken up for `close`, for example. Additionally, the monitor can't abort the sys-call without killing the app.

Moreover, process monitors have a big security problem: race conditions. Suppose process 1 tries to open file "me", and meanwhile, process 2 symlinks it to `/etc/passwd`. Then, both will pass the monitor, but it is a vulnerability. This is called a TOCTOU (time-of-check, time-of-use) bug, and it's less difficult than it looks to implement. Thus, it's extremely common in multithreaded environments. The issue is that the check isn't atomic to the execution; when implementing things, be sure to keep it atomic!

Systrace is a better solution; it lives in the kernel, and only forwards monitored calls to the monitor, which is more efficient, and it follows symlinks and replaces the paths, so the TOCTOU vulnerability is less possible. Furthermore, when an app calls `execve`, a new policy file is loaded, to deal with the staggering variety of corner cases.

A sample policy file:

```
path allow /tmp/*
path deny /etc/passwd
network deny all
```

This is nice, but is it used widely? No, because it requires the user to specify policies for all of their apps. In general, asking the user what to do is one of the worst things you can do; the user is not an expert, so it doesn't help anything. Security prompts are a very difficult problem — it's become a whole science, and we'll talk more about it later on. Systrace tries to learn good policies, but of course that isn't perfect.

NaCl (Native Client) is a modern-day example built into Chrome. It looks useful, but people don't use it much, I guess. This allows a website to send x86 code to the browser, which directly executes it on the processor. This is a lot faster than the Javascript interpreter, which is nice, but of course it requires some security to deal with...

There is an outer sandbox which restricts the code's capabilities using SCI, and an inner sandbox which prevents it from accessing memory outside of its own allotted stuff.

There's also isolation via VMs, which we'll talk about next time.

Lecture 5.

## Program Analysis for Computer Security: 4/9/15

*"Would you really want to spend the rest of your life on a tropical island with someone bringing you drinks?"*

In case you weren't aware, software bugs are serious business; witness the Android phone owner who noticed that his phone crashed whenever he tried to call 911!<sup>6</sup> This is both a very important bug to fix and one that's hard to easily test ("oh hello 911 again, no, we're just still testing. Sorry!") Another important bug example was when one guy found a simple way to delete a Facebook photo album using a vulnerability, and got a nice payout for discovering it.

An analogous example of a vulnerability isn't a software bug *per se*, but arises from people doing something wrong, e.g. the kind of thing that you could sell to *The New York Times* for a nice scoop. Should you tell the company before alerting the press? It depends. Is it an honest mistake? What if we're wrong and the company wasn't doing anything bad?

Bugs are important (embarrassing or vulnerable) for the developer, and frustrating or vulnerable for the user. So this is a nice motivation for fixing bugs. So, how do you know whether software is OK to run? Here are two options.

- Static analysis takes a piece of code and some information about what it should(n't) be doing, and then issues a report about some things that look weird, e.g. memory leaks, buffer overflows, SQL injection vulnerabilities, etc.
- Dynamic analysis (e.g. testing software) takes a piece of code and tries some inputs and sees what happens.

Static analysis has some advantages, e.g. it can consider all possible inputs, and can prove the absence of bugs (things which dynamic analysis generally cannot do). However, dynamic analysis can make it easier to choose a sample test input (even guided by static analysis).

Of course, it's much less expensive to find and fix bugs sooner (development or QA) than later (maintenance).

Dynamic analysis can take two flavors, instrumenting code for testing, e.g. Purify for heap memory, Perl tainting (information flow, in which certain data is considered "poisoned" and should be kept away from other pieces of data), and Java's race condition checking, which tries to determine whether an erroneous state is due to a code flaw or a timing error. But there's also black-box checking which doesn't require knowing anything about the code, e.g. fuzz testing or penetration testing, or black-box web application security analysis.

Static analysis is something with a very long research history, because it ties together many disciplines of software development, and it's directly relevant to the compiler's analysis. It's also a nice thing to have, an algorithm that says "this code is correct," or at least something that's somewhere along the way, algorithms that help us write better code. And there's been a decade of commercial or open-source products of static analysis, e.g. Fortify, Coverity, FindBugs, and some of Microsoft's tools.

Let's talk about static analysis for a bit. First, what are the goals and limitations of these tools? We'll look at one example; there are many paradigms, but this one, Coverity, will illustrate a simple and elegant example, which mirrors code execution.

Two particular goals of static analysis are to find bugs, identifying code that the programmer wishes to modify or improve, and to verify correctness of code, e.g. that there are no buffer overflows, etc.

#### Definition.

- A static analyzer is *sound* if it finds all bugs, or, equivalently (since  $A \implies B$  is equivalent to  $(\neg B) \implies (\neg A)$ ), if it reports that there are no bugs, then there are really no bugs.
- A static analyzer is *complete* if every bug it finds is really a bug, i.e. if there are no bugs, the analysis says there are no bugs.

These are pretty nifty notions; we'd love for our analyzers to be both sound and complete. But maybe it's, like, nicer philosophically to have things to work towards, and for programming to still be interesting. Well, it happens that soundness and completeness is undecidable.

However, picking soundness or completeness (or neither) is perfectly decidable, e.g. reporting everything or nothing. So the theory isn't so hot, but the point is we can make reasonable approximations to soundness or completeness, and this is what we in practice aim for.

A program that is sound, but not complete, might report too many bugs. Imagine a piece of software broken up into modules. Because of soundness, we need to approximate their behaviors, but we need to look

---

<sup>6</sup><http://www.android.net/forum/htc-evo-4g/68261-calling-911-crashes-my-htc-evo-4g-every-time.html>.

at all of them. In other words, understanding this program must take into account all of its real behaviors. Thus, it over-approximates the behaviors.

In some sense, we have a big box of behaviors, which is approximated with a bigger box. Then, the errors in the bigger box might be in the program, or only in the approximation. You can also see how complete checkers that are unsound work: they approximate the behaviors by underestimating them, and thus all their errors are real, but they might miss some outside their scope.

This execution-based approach takes code and visualizes it as states, with arrows between them representing execution paths. This gets complicated because of loops (man, why do you guys have to write code with loops in it!?) and because multiple arrows can converge on one state.

Then, at each block  $i$  of code, there's a *transfer function*  $d_i$  which takes in the state and returns the new state; for example, the code  $x \leftarrow x+1$  takes in a state with  $x$  and returns by altering it. Then, two blocks in turn is just function composition. The symbol for what happens when two paths meet at the same block is  $d_i \sqcup d_j$ , called "meet," and "join" comes up when a path can split.

A static analyzer can keep track of how much information it knows about a variable; then,  $\top$  represents knowing nothing, and  $x = \perp$  means we've found a contradiction (too much information). These can be refined into the *Boolean formula lattice*, where we have a lattice of true, false, and  $y = 0$  and  $y \neq 0$ ; then, false is the contradiction and true is the state where we know nothing, and there's a *refined signs lattice* that tracks whether  $x = 0$ ,  $x > 0$ ,  $x < 0$ ,  $x \geq 0$ , or  $x \leq 0$ ; the lattice structure is given by or, i.e.  $x \geq 0$  has arrows from  $x > 0$  and  $x = 0$ .

Now, using these lattices, one can trace through a program and assign what can be known to a program at every point, and use this to fill in more information elsewhere in the program, like a crossword. Thus, one (e.g. a static analyzer) can use these tools to prove things about a program, e.g. that it doesn't crash.

An unsound analyzer, however, can restrict its scope to the kinds of errors that one thinks developers are most likely to care about. For example, the `chroot()` protocol checker intends to use `chroot()` to ensure that a program only has access to certain directories, but if you don't change the current working directory, then, oops. Thus, a protocol checker could go through to make sure that step is taken too, and if not issue an error. Clearly, this isn't sound, but whenever it reports a bug, you'd better go fix it.

Another category of checkers is called tainting checkers, which check where untrusted data is used. The key is to analyze a function before analyzing its caller, and to be practical, it's good to have summaries of standard library functions, to save time. Thus, one can detect where the memory is used.

Given some source code, one can make a *control-flow graph* (CFG), and then run individual checkers (e.g. for buffer overruns, null pointers, and use after free) on the graph. However, of course there would be false positives, e.g. false paths. The control-flow graph might contain paths that will never be executed, e.g. if one knows that an integer might live within a given range, but can't convey this to the static analyzer. Then again, now that we know this, we can implement range checkers.

Another good principle is that "most code is mostly right;" for the most part, everything in the code has a bug in it, but the code basically doesn't fail that badly, for the most part. This is a very fuzzy heuristic, but when well done can reduce the tens of thousands of error messages to something more useful.

When these tools were run on Linux and BSD, people found noticeably many more bugs in Linux than BSD, even serious security vulnerabilities! It turns out this was because there were more device drivers, and both of them are about as secure.

One recent application of this, e.g. by the professor (Mitchell) is program analysis, specifically tainting analysis, for Android apps. This would be hard for source code analysis, because the source code relies so heavily on other libraries, etc. Thus, these libraries were considered as models, using a combination of static and dynamic analysis, in order to make this tractable.

A particularly useful application of this is to determine what exactly goes on in an app's permissions; for example, it may request Internet access to sync Facebook contacts, so it should only access the Facebook API. But what if it also sends your contacts somewhere on the Internet? (This really happened in one case.)

**Isolation and Least Privilege.** This is the notion of putting things in boxes and separating them, so an attack on one component doesn't lead to attacks on others. Another useful concept is defense in depth: if you and Bob are arguing as to which security principle is better, why not do both? That's better yet. Finally, keep in mind simplicity and to fail securely (e.g. a crash is better than root access, etc.).

The *principle of least privilege*, which seems a little obvious in retrospect, is that every component of a system should be given only as much privilege as it needs to do its work. This leads to an idea that the same stuff shouldn't be in control of the network and the filesystem, because then a network vulnerability leads the adversary to be able to read the filesystem.

Thus, it's better to keep everything modular, in separate components that communicate, so if an adversary Mark Yuckerberg wanders into the networking module, it can't do anything more than the API calls that the networking program already had, which is not ideal but better than unfettered access. In this context, a privilege is an ability to look at or modify a resource in the system.

For example, the Unix `sendmail` program has a very monolithic design, and is historically a source of many vulnerabilities, since it doesn't separate its networking parts from its filesystem parts (inbox, etc.), and it has a big list of buffer overflows. An improved design called QMail uses the principle of least privilege.

Recall that in an OS, processes are isolated: each process has a UID, and two processes with the same UID have the same permissions. Thus, a process may access files, sockets, etc., depending on what permissions were granted according to its UID. This is an example of compartmentalization: each UID is a compartment, and defines privileges. In QMail, each module is run as a separate "user." The principle of least privilege encourages minimal privileges for each UID: there's only one program that can set UIDs, and only one root program (i.e., with all privileges).

QMail has eight processes that communicate in a tree structure: two for reading incoming external and internal mail, one for the queue, and five components associated with sending mail (a master, and two each for internal and external mail). Each runs under a separate UID; for example, the queue utility, `qmailq`, can read and write the mail queue, but not all that much else. It reads incoming mail directories and splits the message into a header and a body, and then alerts the `qmail-send` utility, which determines which of its local or external processes to run for an outgoing message. In particular, as few as possible are given root privileges (or any other unnecessary privileges, for that matter).

Another more recent example is the Android application sandbox. Each app not only runs in its own UID, but also in its own VM! This provides memory protection, and communication between apps is limited to Unix domain sockets. Moreover, none of them, except for `ping` and `zygote` (which spawns new processes) can run as root. Then, interactions between apps requires a reference monitor to check permissions. Since apps announce their privileges at install time, the principle of least privilege once again applies. See Figure 1 for a schematic.

**Access Control.** In access control, the idea is that some sort of reference monitor governs all user processes' access to resources. This has some big assumptions: it requires isolated components with limited interaction, so that there's no way for processes to access resources without going through the reference monitor (which has sometimes been the tragic flaw in some implementations of access control). Moreover, we need to know who the user is (via passwords or otherwise).

Now, when you get into a field early, you can have totally obvious things named after you, like Lampson's access control matrix. Each subject (user  $n$ ) is a row, and each object (file  $n$ ) is a column, and the intersection of row  $m$  and column  $n$  is the kind of access that user  $m$  has to file  $n$  (e.g., reading, writing, both). In some sense, we have subjects, objects, and verbs (the privileges). There are lots and lots of papers on access control, because the Department of Defense took an interest in it.

There are two main ways to store these: by column (access column list, or ACL), i.e. per file, or by row (by process). In an ACL, each user has a "ticket" for each resource, and they have to be secured somehow (e.g. using cryptographic protocols). And, intriguingly, since the reference monitor checks only the ticket, it doesn't need to know the identity of the process.

Typically, when a process creates a subprocess, it gets the same UID. However, it's not that easy: we'd like to be able to restrict the privileges of subprocesses; this is a reason that we prefer capability-based systems. This also makes it easy to pass privileges between systems (as parameters, or over a network, or whatever), whereas adding to an access control list is hard. On the other hand, revoking an access is easy if it's file-based






FIGURE 1. A depiction of the components of the Android OS. Different apps not only use different instances of the application framework, but also of the runtime. Source: <http://www.cubrid.org/blog/dev-platform/android-at-a-glance>.

(ACL), since if I own the file I can just remove them from the list. But finding people who have a ticket is hard, unless a ticket is a pointer to a switch I can turn on or off.

Finally, one can use group IDs rather than user IDs (e.g. role in an organization), which can be arranged in a hierarchy (i.e. poset), which make privilege-setting relatively easier. In particular, it's much easier to add or remove users. This is called role-based access control. There's a guy running around who thinks he invented this, at a different university, but apparently it's pretty obvious, so whatever.

**Operating Systems.** In Unix, access control is through processes' user IDs. Each process can change its ID, with a restricted set of options. Then, the root has all permissions. Each file has an owner and a group, and the owner can set its permissions (read, write, and execute for the owner, for the group, and for other, stored as a sequence of bits) — the root may also change permissions, but that's it. There is a utility for setting UIDs, called `setuid`, but unless you're root this has an extremely restricted set of options. These steps, for example, prevent an adversary getting into many systems from one.

One drawback is that it's too tempting to use root privileges, since the permission system is relatively simple. Thus, programs that run as root don't always need to, or could be more compartmentalized, or so on, and this makes buffer overflows more fruitful exploits.

Windows functions similarly to Linux; there's users, groups, and UIDs, but it's a little more flexible: there are also tokens and security attributes, and the result is that it's a lot easier to downgrade one's own privileges (no need to do gymnastics like the daemonized double fork in Unix). The token is akin to the tickets described earlier.

Instead of a user ID, it's called a security ID (SID), but they function similarly. A process executing has a set of tokens, called its *security context*. One could be the SID, and there could be impersonation tokens that allow it to run as different users to temporarily adopt a different security context. These tokens are inputs into the security monitor.

For example, an access token might say that this user is a member of two groups (e.g. admins and writers). Then, if it tries to write a file with a given security descriptor, the descriptor contains an entry in the discretionary access control list (DACL) that can explicitly deny or allow certain users or groups.

Explicit denies take priority, then explicit allows (we're trying to be conservative), followed by inherited denies or allows. (Inherited permissions come from hierarchies among groups.)

Impersonation tokens can be created by the process that is being impersonated, and then it can pass them to the process that should do the impersonating. These can be completely anonymous, for identification, more complete impersonation, or delegation (impersonation on remote systems). The point is, this is nuanced, which is good, but also complicated.

This isn't all sunshine and roses, e.g. registry-based attacks.

**Browser Isolation.** A browser is like another operating system; it executes code on pages or frames. Thus, let's implement security on browsers.

Different frames can interact. Can Frame *A* execute a script that manipulate arbitrary elements of Frame *B*? Can it change the origin (navigate) the content for Frame *B*? The browser's "kernel" is given full access, but other things, e.g. plugins, run with reduced permissions.

This is able to leverage the OS's isolation principles; for example, the rendering engine does some intelligent downgrading of its privileges as it runs. This was implemented in IE first, and so for a while, IE was a bit more secure against arbitrary code execution vulnerabilities (CVEs), especially in the rendering engine, and now this has spread to other browser designers.

Lecture 7.

## Security Bugs in the Real World: 4/16/15

*"Star Wars is a series of movies that used to be good. But you wouldn't know that."*

Today's guest lecturer is Alex Stamos, the chief security officer at Yahoo! Before working there, he was at several other companies (not at once, I think), including one he founded, and before that, he went to Berkeley. Today, he'll talk about the economics of security bugs, with real examples; bug-finding techniques; bug-finding as warfare; and how to leverage this into a lucrative career.

2014 was a huge year for bugs, in things as fundamental as OpenSSL, bash (a bug that was dormant for 17 years, which is amazing!), Apple and Microsoft products, and more. These bugs are fundamental and widespread, which is a huge headache: they have to be patched on a huge number of systems quickly, and without taking a company's product offline. Of course, quick fixes of these bugs cause other things to break, which is, uh, interesting.

One lesson from this is that the big layer cake of abstractions has only been looked at from the very top and the very bottom, but offensive and defensive actors have started looking into the middle.

There have also been lots of breaches, e.g. eBay (which is scary because lots of people use their eBay usernames and passwords on lots of other accounts), P.F. Chang's, and, most surreally, the attack on Sony's *The Interview*. This was (according to Stamos, according to a briefing he couldn't be more specific on) an attack acting under the North Korean government. One lesson here is that North Korea isn't a huge cybersecurity player, and can't mount attacks on the order of China or the United States; however, private companies, even big ones like Sony, aren't really prepared to deal with attacks on the second- or third-tier level.

There were also lots of attacks that were heavy in user impact, e.g. the iCloud leak, which allowed some people to leak private pictures of celebrities; the private impact of stealing content from others' iPhones was likely much greater, and we actually don't know. Apple fixed the bug, of course, and tried to cover up the whole thing. These kinds of things are the scary ones: credit card theft is a headache to a bank, but less so to the cardholder, but this kind of vulnerability, leaking people's photos or otherwise private information, is much more impactful on the personal level: a malicious actor could ruin someone's life in many ways. This is especially important at Yahoo!, since they have the email client.

**So who finds security bugs?** Engineers like to find security bugs: the idea is that software is probably going to be flawed, so they want to cover as many flaws as possible, to reduce the instance of exploitation. Coverage metrics (which are tricky to pin down accurately and completely) are a reasonable way to find some of them. Engineers have access to the source, debugging environments, and so on, and having written

the code, they understand it well, and are a good way to find bugs, but conversely, they are more blind to their own mistakes relative to outside actors.

However, people prefer to care about features rather than security, at least before things go wrong. And engineers are often not judged on the security of their code. This, along with the collaborative nature of writing code and the incredible complexity of modern systems, means that it's basically impossible for any one person to understand enough code to comprehensively call code secure. Even Adobe Acrobat has probably 20 *million* lines of code. To just display a PDF! This code bloat is partly due to some big features for big customers that not many other people use, and these can introduce security vulnerabilities. For example, Acrobat can embed Flash applets into PDFs (and therefore open one PDF inside another PDF), has a whole Javascript interpreter, and even contains a Web browser!<sup>7</sup> Most worryingly, there are video codecs, which are dangerous because they run heavily optimized C or C++, and therefore are almost impossible to make secure.

Well, this seems pretty hopeless. So the solution is basically a jail, where Acrobat exploits can't do too much to other parts of the computer.

Criminals also look for bugs. They want money, and to stay out of jail (i.e. they want reliable bugs that don't expose themselves). Another issue for these actors is that they have a finite amount of time and money, and all decisions need to have a good profit margin.

Security researchers also look for bugs: they want publicity/recognition, preferably in a trendy area. They have good access to engineers, but there are fewer and fewer of them nowadays; they tend to be private now, selling exploits to companies.

Pen testers look for security bugs without knowing the code. Like engineers, they want to get good coverage, though they don't need to worry about fixing the bugs, just finding them. They have access to source code and engineers, as well as permission, which is good.

There are governments, which we'll talk about later.

We also have hacktivism, which has gotten less popular as people have gone to jail for DDoS attacks. They want to do something "good," while also staying out of jail, so they've moved to more targeted and less criminal attacks. They might not be as knowledgeable on the code or techniques as pen testers or engineers.

Academics are interested in security, too, but they theorize, trying to find common flaws and broad classes of techniques, or to develop new crypto. But they have a longer-term time scale for this.

**Bug Finding.** There are two kinds of testing: black-box (no source) and white-box (you can look at the source).

In black-box testing, you probe the program and look for errors, and then try to exploit them. One example is fuzzing, which is basically a walk through the state table for a piece of software; since software is so complicated nowadays, there are way too many states to really test this rigorously, so one might hope to find a path that nobody else has found before.

One way to think about this is as a series of concentric circles: the innermost is the state space that the engineer thinks can happen (what they had in mind), the next is what the QA tester finds (since they test things the engineer might not expect); outside of that is what the security researcher looks for, which tries to find things that nobody expected, e.g. unreasonable input. For example, what if we tell the form that our user's surname is `0'DROP TABLES?`

It used to be that you could do fuzzing somewhat carelessly, by feeding random data to places, but now you have to be a little smarter, because people have gotten a bit better about, e.g., sanitizing input to Web forms. For example, randomly flipping bits in .docx files is kind of unhelpful, because they're just zipped directories, so we'd only be testing the decompressor. So we want to check specific things and compress them, and for each format (e.g. video codecs) there's good and bad ways to fuzz them.

People tend to keep the best fuzzers to themselves, to make money off of their hard work, but APLFuzz and PeachFuzz are good, public fuzzing tools.

Debuggers are also useful for checking whether security bugs are important; some of them are caught before they can do anything dangerous. Related to this is the idea of reverse engineering, e.g. decompilation of high-level languages (.NET, Java, etc.), and sometimes C or C++. Disassembly is also pretty nice, and for people who are experienced, this is probably one of the best ways to do this. For example, you can search for

---

<sup>7</sup>Wow, this is almost approaching the feature bloat of Emacs.

known dangerous sequences of instructions, and then build a call graph of paths that go to that code and whether it's possible to exploit them.

One interesting way to find bugs is to reverse patches, e.g. using a tool called BinDiff, which compares the assembly code of the binary before and after the patch. This means people could download the patch and try to figure out its impact on other parts of the program before the company does. Stuff like this is why Microsoft waits a few days before getting out its patches.

It's possible to restrain or defeat black-box analysis, e.g. programs that determine whether they're being debugged or virtualized (e.g. see how long interrupts take. Were they caught by debuggers?), and then respond accordingly. Alternatively, a program can ask the OS whether the debugger is in operation on it. There are also methods to make code harder to reverse-engineer code, e.g. packing code in shared libraries, doing pointer arithmetic, and encrypted or obfuscated code. This has its own issues, e.g. providing lots of fun security leaks, breaking lots of modern memory protections, and confusing malware detection programs which look for heavily obfuscated code.

There are also anti-anti-debuggers, e.g. the Windows DRM manager connects with Windows the first time it's run to relink everything into one's own personal binary with a unique global ID. This ends up meaning that an exploit on one computer is fine, but doesn't work on any other copy of the program. These kinds of things tend to slow attackers down, rather than stopping them.

Black-box techniques always work better with targeting, which leads to white-box methods (gray-box methods?). These are more helpful, e.g. better understanding of the code or better targeted attacks. But it finds a lot more bugs, which makes it harder to find signal from noise (e.g. an SSL bug on iPhones that nobody caught for years!).

So here's an example of a bug in the wild: let's look at session cookies. HTTP is a stateless protocol, so information such as your username and password, which is sent via an HTTP POST request, needs to be kept as state. This is kept in a "cookie," a little piece of data that represents encrypted security information. The cookie is different for different users, of course. This becomes a crypto problem, where the server has to decrypt the cookie and the user can't, so it can determine the user's name and time of the cookie (just like real cookies, these ones can expire too). So errors in the crypto cause security flaws, too, e.g. just xoring two usernames to undermine RC4 encryption.

The moral of the story is that you never use encryption for integrity protection: encryption  $\neq$  protection. There's a wide world of security protocols, and there are better ones for this sort of stuff. Furthermore, they didn't understand how RC4 works, which, as you can imagine, a problem. A small website can respond by salting each cookie with a random number, but there will be collisions between numbers on large websites fielding millions of connections at once. Thus, they have to use signatures (like Yahoo! does, with ECC) or sometimes other techniques. Encrypting can also be done, to prevent people from mucking about with their cookies.

There are also OS-level bugs. Look at the following code.

```
void attachSuffix(char *userinputprefix, size_t inputSize)
{
    char *withSuffix;

    withSuffix = malloc(inputSize + 2);
    if (withSuffix == NULL)
    {
        // meh, don't care that much
        return;
    }
    memcpy(withSuffix, userinputprefix, inputSize);
    withSuffix[inputSize] = '.';
    withSuffix[inputSize + 1] = '\n';
    // ...
}
```

Here, `size_t` is an unsigned type whose type is large enough to store any address on the system, which is useful because the same code can be written on 32-bit and 64-bit systems. But that means large numbers can be overflowed into small numbers, causing it to return, say, a single byte of memory, and therefore overflow the heap, copying data into places it shouldn't.

Another curious example is a grammar checker which checks whether there are two spaces after each period. One forum used a very bad  $O(n^2)$  algorithm, and had a character limit of 10,000 characters. Thus, submitting 10,000 periods made it hang for a long time...

One interesting consequence on the defensive side is that innovations in warfare tend to decrease the cost for later adopters. For example, the Germans spent lots of time and many engineers in World War II making an assault rifle called the STG-44. But then a soldier named Kalishnikov picked one off of the battlefield and was able to improve on it without nearly as much effort, creating the AK-47. It's much simpler to build, even in a garage or with a 3-D printer. The point is, the first time, it was really hard, and lots of engineering problems had to be solved; now, it's much easier.

The nuclear bomb is another example; it took the best American physicists and engineers many years to develop the math and make the first bomb, and then it was taken by the Soviets and the PRC. Fortunately (ahem), this requires a huge industrial base to make a bomb, so it hasn't trickled down that far (yet).

In cyberwarfare, things are little different. APT attacks, which start with personalized (spear) phishing and then using various techniques to spread the attack horizontally on a network, were on the level of a nation-state in the mid-2000s, but now they can be carried out by, say, any Eastern European gangster in a tracksuit.<sup>8</sup> The idea is that no industry is needed for cyberattacks, so once it's been done once and shared, it can be spread and reimplemented really easily.

Here's some more code, from the Aurora attack code.

```
function window :: onload()
{
    var SourceElement = document.createElement ("div");
    document.body.appendChild (sourceElement);
    var SavedEvent = null;
    SourceElement.onclick = function () {
        SavedEvent = document.createEventObject (event);
        document.body.removeChild (event.srcElement);
    }
    SourceElement.fireEvent ("onclick"); // creates an event handler
    SourceElement = SavedEvent.srcElement;
}
```

This bug relates to how things are stored on the heap, and before IE had process isolation, allowed people to gain complete control over IE. This led to "Operation Aurora," which used social engineering (the weakest link, always) to get someone to click a link, and then escalated privileges using this. Then, it spread, and allowed the attacker to read the important data, which was emails and financial data. This was much easier than getting the data directly, since Windows is the same everywhere, and depends on only one person messing up, rather than confronting the relatively secure email server. This is a typical nation-state attack, in that it goes through a corporate network: the research can be amortized, in the sense that once it's written and implemented, it can spread for a bit, and then hit many companies at once (Aurora hit 35 companies at once!).

Lest you think the Chinese are the only ones to do this, recall Stuxnet, which was likely developed by the United States and Israel and singlehandedly set back the Iranian nuclear program by several years. This might have averted a war, which is kind of insane.

Stuxnet contained *five* zero-days, which is insane: that's a very, very expensive bug. It included two rootkits and a few worms. Even though the nuclear computer networks were airgapped, someone plugged a USB stick into the computer and their own computer, and, well, oops. It was spread all over Iran, just for the purpose of getting to the plant, and had specialized software to check whether the code was running the nuclear centrifuges; then, it ran code to physically damage the centrifuges (and lie to the control system to make this harder to detect), which is why it took so much time to recover. Impressively, Stuxnet also used the same way to get information out: it created files that spread back out into the global network, and could therefore report back to the President. These are scary impressive: another worm embedded itself in hardware!

---

<sup>8</sup>Whenever the *Wall Street Journal* talks about Chinese hacking, they run a stock photo of a bunch of uniformed Chinese soldiers at computers; a closer look at the photo reveals it's a PLA Starcraft tournament.

So the question is: if you find a bug, will you disclose it responsibly (to the company) or fully? Everyone in this class has the privilege to choose a job they agree with, to a degree, and therefore you can't say that you're just trying to feed your family, since it is probably possible to get another job that isn't as amoral. Relatedly, don't go into a big company blindly and overspecialize, so that you can't go somewhere else. This is a good reason to work at a smaller company (running servers, DevOps, and so forth). But on the other hand, most startups fail, so don't naively start your own company: you don't know what you don't know. So if you're doing security as a career, think about what you want to do, what your morals are, and so on.

More advice:

- Before every meeting, spend 30 seconds to know what you want to get out of the meeting. This will help you to get more out of the meeting. If you don't know why you are having the meeting, cancel it!
- If you get an offer, try to negotiate. Ask for a couple days to get back, and then, on the callback, add maybe 5% more (or more, when you're better). This is standard; they'll negotiate too, and sometimes you'll get the raise. Almost always, you'll still have the offer (whether at the original price or a little more), and if a small company can't make a cashflow, ask for more equity.
- Common stock is apparently for commoners. This is last in the line for making equity decisions, so if you work at a startup, ask for founder shares, since this means the same decisions (and same profits or failures) as the founders and the investors.
- Every company is a tech company right now, but you want to be writing products, not plumbing, especially if you specialize. You want your specialty to be the focus of the company: otherwise, nobody will think about you until it breaks, and you'll never be in a position to change the company.

## Part 2. Web Security

Lecture 8.

### The Browser Security Model: 4/21/15

*"I think the interesting thing about this field is that there's a lot of paranoid people."*

A good lesson from the first project is that you should never say, "that's too tricky, nobody would ever do that in the real world," because people will and do.

We'll spend a little time talking about web attacks; they're a large and popular class of attacks, e.g. cross-side scripting vulnerabilities. However, since about 2009 there's been progress, and now there are fewer such attacks, and more system-based attacks. There's an ever-fluctuating mix of different kinds of vulnerabilities, and we'll learn about each in turn. And even though the proportion of web attacks is going down, that's because the amount of other attacks is increasing (especially mobile ones). This is the first of five lectures on web security in various forms.

Web security has two reasonable goals.

- *Users should be able to browse the web safely.* They should be able to visit without having information stolen, or one website compromising a session of another site.
- *Servers should support secure web applications.* This means that applications delivered over the web should be able to achieve the same level of security as stand-alone applications.

Notice this doesn't include protecting the user from bad sites; that's more or less their own problem, and much harder to protect against.

The *web security threat model* explains that there's a property we'd like to preserve (e.g. the balance of my bank account), and an attacker has limited capabilities: it can set up bad websites that the users end up visiting, but it has no control over the network. This adversary is called the *Web attacker*.

The *network threat model* allows the dastardly villain to control (some of) the network rather than the end sites, and can read or affect both directions of traffic. This is a much stronger attack. In this class, we'll discuss security models that are safe against one or both models, so these terms are good to have in mind. These attackers are further divided into passive and active (whether they can read and write, or just read).

The malware attacker can escape browser isolation mechanisms to run independently of it, and directly under the control of the OS.



We all know what a URL looks like, e.g. <http://stanford.edu:81/class?name=cs155 homework>. The different parts have standardized names, e.g. the protocol, the hostname, and several more.

HTTP requests are of the form GET and POST; the former should not have side effects, but the latter may. HTTP requests can also have referral information (e.g. in the case of page redirects) — in this case, it's often quite useful to know that the referrer is what you thought it was, e.g. login information or bank websites.

The browser's execution model divides a page into a bunch of frames: this is the unit of execution. Each frame or browser window is loaded and rendered (this can involve more requests, loading images, subframes, and so on).

Here's some sample code.

```
<!DOCTYPE html>
<html>
<body>

<h1>My First Web Page</h1>
<p>My first paragraph.</p>

<button onclick="document.write(5 + 6)">Try it</button>

</body>
</html>
```

You can do a surprising amount even with just HTML, e.g. any of the applets at <http://phet.colorado.edu/en/simulations/category/html>. These generally use HTML5, and they even work with touchscreens.

The *document object model* (DOM) is an object-oriented interface used to write documents: a web page in HTML is structured data, so this is a reasonable approach, and the DOM provides an interface to that structure. For example, there are properties, such as `document.URL` and `document.forms[]`, and methods, such as `document.write(document.referrer)`. This is a superset of the browser object model (BOM).

Here's another example, using a very small amount of JavaScript.

```
<!DOCTYPE html>
<html>
<body>

<h1>My First Web Page</h1>
<p>My first paragraph.</p>

<p id="demo"></p>

<!-- why 11? Go watch Spinal Tap -->
<script>
document.getElementById("demo").innerHTML = 5 + 6;
</script>

</body>
</html>
```

The web has had image tags since pretty much the very beginning, via the `<img>` tag. If you're a paranoid security person, there are a lot of issues there: the image could have some buffer overflows, or so forth. Moreover, the browser tries to help the user, so things which aren't images get processed too.

But the most important point is that the request for the image is sent out to another site on the web, so there's a communication channel out from any web content, e.g. image. Thus, it's impossible to prevent that information from getting out, even if it's sensitive. Oops! And then it might as well have been stolen and broadcast to an adversary. In particular, any argument or return value of a Javascript function can be used to compute the URL of an image that a user requests.

The web wasn't invented by security people, and it's a great place to be an attacker.

Javascript also has error handling and timing, so it can request images from an internal IP addresses, e.g. ``. Then, it can use `timeout` or `onError` to determine success or failure, and therefore know what's going on server-side, even if there's a firewall between the malicious server and the browser.

Another basic thing is remote scripting, with a goal of exchanging data between a client-side application in the browser and some sort of server-side app, but without the user reloading the page. This is a bidirectional path of communication, which by now should strike you as suspicious. This can involve several models, e.g. Flash or a library called RSI. Typically, every (say) ten seconds, the browser asks the server what happens next. Thus, once the browser visits the site, the server can update that code in perpetuity.

We think of websites as isolated: the frame (or iFrame) is the basic unit of isolation. You can delegate part of the screen to content from another place; furthermore, if one frame is broken, the page around it may display properly, which was not. Another example is popped-out open chat windows.

So, while it's good for frames to be relatively isolated, it's also helpful to have them communicate, which makes for nice things like email/chat clients. This sounds like isolation of processes on the OS level!

The security model gives each frame an origin, the website it came from (or more specifically, part of the URL: protocol, hostname, and port number) — the same port is considered the same frame, more or less. Thus, they have access to each others' DOMs, but other frames from other origins do not.

There are some components to this policy, e.g. `canScript(A, B)`, the relation that A can execute a script that manipulates the DOM in B. There's also `canNavigate`, which specializes `canScript` to reloading, and there are protocols for reading and writing cookies. And if you import a library, that has to be considered, too.

The web is filled with these little quirks and gotchas. For example, should [www.facebook.com](http://www.facebook.com) and [chat.facebook.com](http://chat.facebook.com) be considered the same frame? There's a Javascript command which allows a change of origin to just `facebook.com`, so the two can have the same origin. The basic idea has lots of details to it.

How do frames communicate with each other? One way is `window.postMessage`, an API supported by all standard browsers (IE, Safari, Firefox, Opera, Chrome). It is a network-line channel for frames, where one frame can send a message to another, which may choose to read it. This is a way to keep information going only to trusted frames. The protocol includes some information about the origin of the target, so that if an attack frame reloads its inner frame (which submitted the request), it isn't compromised; that is, the protocol requires the origin of the frame to stay the same throughout the whole transaction.

There are also attacks rooted in concerns about navigation. For example, there's the notion of a "Guninski attack," where a legitimate page is run in a malicious frame. The login page of the legitimate page is in its own page, so the malicious page can reload the frame with something else malicious, and thereby steal your login information.

So, when should one frame be able to reload another? You can say "never," but never say never: there are cool programming techniques where it's useful to have something like this. Should frames be able to reload child or sibling frames? How about frame-busting, where it reloads the outermost frame? (This can be useful for promoting a small frame to the whole window.)

Different browsers once had different policies, with not to much sense to them. For example, reloading sibling frames leads to spread of malicious code, but the descendant policy makes sense. Now, though, browsers' policies are more consistent with this idea.

Another good question is, given a web site which looks like your bank's site, is it safe to enter your password there? Does the site have some crypto checked, with the bank's usual website? Or is it a different website? What if the URL changes by one character, and there's no certificate? Sometimes being cautious is also unreliable: the bank might contract out to a website that looks bad, but is authentic.

And of course, you have to be aware of a legitimate site running as a frame within a malicious site.

There are a lot of other mechanisms, e.g. messing with the status bar.

Cookies, which are data from the server stored in the client, can be used for authentication, where the cookie was saved so you don't have to log in each time. This is useful for user authentication and personalization, and some bad stuff like tracking, but we still want to protect them. For example, there are secure cookies: if you mark a cookie as secure, it will only be sent over HTTPS, which is encrypted. This is nice if you have sensitive information in that script. There are also HTTP Only cookies, which are important because they can't be accessed by Javascript, which helps prevent cookie theft via cross-side scripting (XSS). It doesn't do everything, but provides partial protection.

Frame busting is another technique: some sites want to ensure that their content isn't running in a frame around another site, i.e. so they're not victims of some other site's malicious frame reloading. The code for this is really simple, checking if we're not in the top frame, and then replacing the top frame if so. Despite the somewhat sketchy name, this is a legitimate practice, though it's hard to write great frame-busting code:

sometimes it can be defeated by malicious outer frames (e.g. checking for frame-busting scripts and then killing them). It's a good thing to not do by hand; it's another constant attack/defend cycle.

Lecture 9.

## Web Application Security: 4/23/15

According to a web security organization called OWASP, the most common web security vulnerabilities are SQL or SQL-like injections, which are relatively easy to fix; authentication session vulnerabilities; cross-side scripting (which is probably the most subtle and difficult kind); various implementation problems, such as a misconfiguration or exposing sensitive files; and finally (in 8<sup>th</sup> place), cross-site request forgery, which we'll also talk about today. This is the kind of thing that cookie theft falls under.

**Code Injection Attacks.** Command injection uses eval commands to execute arbitrary code on the server. For example, look at the following calculator in PHP.

```
$in = $_GET['exp'];
eval('$ans = ' . $in . ';' );
```

This is pretty great, because you can execute whatever you want, even `rm *.*.`

These aren't usually as stupidly obvious.

```
$email = $_POST["email"]
$subject = $_POST["subject"]
system("mail $email -s $subject < /tmp/joinmynetwork")
```

This is bad because we're evaluating arbitrary system code. For example, one can call it with a URL that reads the password into the email subject.

These are most common in SQL, because many, many websites have a frontend and a database, and SQL is used as the glue to make things work. But it has to be sanitized, or one can inject malicious code.

The basic model is to submit malicious code, which causes the server to execute an unintended query, and therefore either cause damage or reveal stuff to the attacker. For example, CardSystems was put out of business in 2005 because of a powerful SQL injection attack in 2005 that stole millions of credit card numbers. More recently, there are many SQL vulnerabilities in Wordpress sites.

For example, is this code vulnerable?

```
set ok = execute("SELECT * FROM Users WHERE user=' " & form("user") & " ' AND pwd=' " & form
("pwd") & " ' " );

if not ok.EOF
    login.fail
endif
```

So normally you send your username and password, which is as normal, but if you send as your username something like `or 1 == 1 ' --`, this always evaluates to true, and comments out the rest of the line; this forces it to always succeed, which is, as you can imagine, a slight problem. And you can do worse stuff, such as executing code within the statement that gains a root shell or deletes lots of stuff.

Relevant xkcd: <https://xkcd.com/327/>.<sup>9</sup>

So, how do you defend against SQL injections? It's extremely hard to make commands foolproof yourself, and most web frameworks have ways to do this correctly (even PHP!), to make sure everything is properly escaped. In this case, a command is a data structure, so it's a lot harder to mess up and allow someone to run arbitrary data. Alternatively, the command is parsed before the user and password strings are added, so that they're always treated as strings. Strongly typed languages also make this easier, because anomalous queries become type errors.

In other words, to prevent this category of attacks, just do modern programming with databases. But existing websites may still be unsafe. And many of them have huge, complicated logic around them to prevent SQL injections, which only makes it harder to tell whether they're secure.

<sup>9</sup>Ironically enough, this site's HTTPS isn't working this week.

In summary: SQL injections have always been at the top of the web vulnerability list by frequency, but they're oh so preventable.

**Cross-Site Request Forgery.** The most common case for this has to do with cookies and authentication.

Recall that cookies are used to authenticate: each time you make a GET or POST request, your cookie is sent along to ensure that it's really you. However, if the user visits another malicious server and receives a malicious page, that page could retrieve the cookie for the first website, since the cookies are sent for every communication. Therefore the malicious server has the cookie and can use it to impersonate the user to the original server.

You, dear reader — how long do you stay logged into your email, or to Facebook?

Here's a more specific example: suppose the user logs into `bank.com`, so the session cookie remains in the browser's state. Then, the user visits another site with specific HTML code which contains a form that's rendered on the victim's browser, which causes the user's browser to send that form, with that cookie, to the original site (for example, the form could send code to send \$100 to the attacker).

Notice that the cookie isn't stolen by Eve, the malicious server; it just sends the form, and the user haplessly supplies its own cookies. This stretches the baking metaphor, though I guess that's the way the cookie crumbles.

In fact, you don't even need cookies, e.g. one could use this to attack home routers: a computer sets up its home router, and the malicious website uses this ability to reconfigure the router. Thus, when you're buying routers, try not to buy the one where anyone on the internal network can change the configuration! But simple consumer products have some default password, like `password`, so sometimes attackers just use this password, and therefore you should change the password so as not to be vulnerable. This is somewhat surrealistically known as a *drive-by Pharming attack*, and is an illustration of how CSRF attacks are a broad class of attacks, still popular in 2015.

So, how do you defeat it? You have to be sophisticated in your web programming and session management. The simplest way to do this is to add something more than just a cookie or a password to identify a password; one is a secret token that can be placed within a page. This is a hard-to-guess or hidden part of the page, and authentication requires the session to respond with the same token. Many sites do this, e.g. the Rails home page.

These are simple in theory and hard to program, but many web frameworks, such as Ruby on Rails, have methods to handle this automatically.

Facebook and some other places use referrer validation, checking whether the referrer header for a form came from `facebook.com`; otherwise, it rejects the login. This works well, though not all forms come in with a referrer header. One can decide to be lenient or strict, so the story can be more complicated. Some companies block referrer headers from outgoing traffic, which makes strict checking not so helpful. However, referrer heading suppression over HTTPS is actually quite low, according to a study by Professor Mitchell et al., so perhaps it's not a big deal after all. (Companies usually block their referrer headers because they leak information about what the company is searching for or doing on the Internet.)

Here's yet another CSRF type (which actually happened at Stanford): the attacker uses the victim's credentials to log in as the attacker. This means that the attacker can do what it wants (even searching for llamas or other terrible things, in the slide's example) and pin the blame on the user, and if the user has privileges, then so does the attacker. This is an example of an attack which isn't possible just with malicious websites.

This led to the design of another header called the Origin header, which is an alternative to the referrer, but has fewer privacy problems and supersedes it while defending against redirect-based attacks.

In summary, defeat login-based CSRF with referrer/origin header validation, and have login forms submitted over HTTPS. For other things, it would be useful to use Ruby on Rails or another method for which the secret token method has already been implemented. Thus, these are mostly manageable problems, though not as much so as SQL injections.

**Cross-Side Scripting (XSS).** Similarly to CSRF, this attack involves a user visiting a good server and a malicious server: it visits the malicious server first, and gets a malicious link which adds malicious Javascript to the code. For example, one might have a link such as `http://victim.com/search.php?term=<script>bad stuff... </script>`, which, as you can imagine, can do lots of malicious stuff. Then, the victimized server echoes the user input back to the victimized client, which is clearly not a good thing.

An XSS vulnerability is present when the attacker can inject code into a session that isn't its own. This can also happen in email forms, with the same kind of attack (e.g. a PayPal attack, where the link led to a PayPal site that said their email was compromised, but that led to a phishing site).

So the victim can see the URL before clicking, but really, who does? And the link can look very innocuous, but actually leads somewhere else. So that doesn't even make much of a difference.

Sometimes this gets weirder: Adobe Acrobat has a Javascript interpreter, so feeding it a URL that has Javascript in it leads to a script being executed, and it can read local files. So there are lots of ways that scripts can get into one's system and monkey around; this is the hardest kind of attack to defend against, and there's no single silver bullet to get around it.

Another example is for an attack server to inject malicious scripts into a victim server, and then when the user visits the victim server, it ends up sending data to the attacker!

For example, do you remember MySpace? Me neither. Anyways, users can post HTML on their pages, so one guy set up some Javascript that made anyone who visited become his friend... and spread it to their friends. Then, he had millions of friends in 24 hours, which caused MySpace to go offline for a little bit.

One can also use DOM-based XSS, without even dealing with a server. Imagine a script which calls a welcome page with the script `<script>alert(document.cookie)</script>`. In other words, any time there's a call to rendering in a page, the attacker can ask, "how do I put a script in there, and what do I do with it?"

Normally, XSS is considered a vulnerability at the victim site. It's about input/output checking: if you ever receive a script or something that looks like it, turn it into a string that's not a script and remove it, and whatever you do, don't send it back out! For example, in ASP.NET, one can set a flag for pages that should have no scripts in them. This can get complicated, filters don't work very well, etc. And taint analysis or static analysis can be used to make this work as well.

In other words, we need relatively sophisticated tools to defend against these broader and more complicated attacks.

But as a client, you can do something, too! (Or a browser designer.) The browser developer can (and the IE developers did) implement a feature where they check outgoing posts and remove scripts that reflect user input (and send data elsewhere). The vast majority of the time, this works, and has perhaps a few false positives. However, it prevents frame-busting as we talked about last time, which is a useful thing to have. It's nonetheless a great example of how complicated web security really is, and everyone's attempts to do well step on each others' toes.

Because of the importance and complexity of web security vulnerabilities, there are a lot of businesses that check for vulnerabilities; they can't find all of them, but manage to find a significant number of web vulnerabilities (though some companies do a lot better than others). And automated tools also help for many simple vulnerabilities.

Lecture 10.

## Modern Client-Side Defenses: 4/28/15

Today's guest lecture was given by Deian Stefan.

A modern web page has a lot of stuff in it, e.g. code for videos, ads, and so on. They also have lots of sensitive data that would be really interesting to people (hackers, insurance companies, governments). And there are a lot of third-party actors on a site, e.g. library developers, service providers, data providers, ad providers, other users, and even extension developers and CDNs.

So you can imagine that some interesting things happen, leading to the following questions.

- How do we protect pages from malicious ads or services?
- How do we share data with cross-origin pages while protecting them from each other? The point of the same origin policy is that content from different origins should be isolated.
- How do we protect pages from libraries and their CDNs?
- How can we, when we need to, protect users from each other's content?
- Is the same origin policy good enough?

Regarding the last question, one can imagine one page trying to imitate another in various ways, and it turns out that in those cases, the same origin policy isn't enough. These questions lead one to ask what exactly counts as malicious, etc.

However, there are some clearer-cut cases. Third-party libraries, such as jQuery, run with the privileges of the page, and they're often untrusted code of some sort. And code within a page can leak data, especially in the context of libraries we don't know the inner workings of. Finally, isolation of iframes is limited, e.g. we can't isolate a third-party ad or user content.

In summary, the SOP isn't enough, because it's not good at cross-origin responses. Within a frame, one might want to fetch data from a different origin, e.g. loading a script from another website or to share data. This gives that website the power to control that script and therefore also control the website using the script, which, as you may imagine, could be an issue. Thus, modern mechanisms such as iframe sandboxes are used instead.

An iframe sandbox is a way of restricting the actions that an iframe can perform, e.g. disallowing Javascript, allow or disallow form submission, allowing or disallowing popups, frame breaking, and so on. Adding privileges in order is still a bit coarse-grained, but it's better than it was before.

This is a great implementation of the principle of least privilege. For example, one may want a Twitter button but not allow it to run pop-ups and so on. Thus, we can make one where all permissions were removed, and then set the sandbox to allow certain aspects (which can be made part of the HTML!).

A more interesting case is a feed which includes user content inline, which could include scripts. Thus, one could wrap them in a sandbox, so that they can run scripts, but not frame-bust or display pop-ups, and so on. Running scripts is important in order to render the page so that it looks nice, and so forth.

Thus, we can protect pages from malicious ads and services, and from each other's content, which is nice. But there are some difficult questions: how can you determine what privileges are needed to run a page? Being overly restrictive breaks functionality, and overpermissiveness can cause malicious code to get through. It would be nice for privilege-determination to be automatic, and this is even an area of research.

However, we haven't solved everything. Imagine a password strength checker that runs within a frame. It's a library, but it could still write data to some random Russian site or whatnot. So the question is, can we limit the origins that the page (or iframe, etc.) can talk to? This is some pretty-fine-grained privilege isolation! This is where CSP (content security policies) come in, so each page is sent with a CSP security header that contains fine-grained directives restricting certain resources (e.g. preventing leaking information to certain websites). "Fine-grained" isn't an exaggeration: one can restrict where one connects, where one loads images, where one loads fonts, stylesheets, subframes, and so on. There's also a whitelist option, too.

This prevents many XSS attacks: if you only load scripts from a whitelist, and your whitelist is pretty good, then code is only executed from trusted origins. Note that CSP also disallows inline scripts by default, e.g. `eval`, which is good from a security standpoint, but bad because people like using inline scripts, even for legitimate purposes. So people are more reluctant to adopt it. Thus, the goal is to set the most restrictive policies that are permissive enough to not break an app. But this is hard for a large application, so CSP has some reporting directives, which reports what was loaded and doesn't enforce it, so one can determine (more or less) what permissions should be set for normal use.

CSP still doesn't restrict where one can receive messages from, which would be nice, and so this could be used covertly to load further information. This is an area of research.

Another technique is the use of web workers; these weren't originally intended for security, but they can help. There's no sense of iframes here, though.

Nonetheless, CSP isn't sufficient for defending against malicious libraries. For example, the Chinese government once loaded malicious libraries into stuff from Baidu, and this enabled them to block stuff.

The basic idea is to use a checksum to guarantee the integrity of a library. If a check fails, one can simply fail to load the library or report back to the server (depending on the setup of the header). However, Chrome and Firefox may interpret the default instructions differently. One can specify multiple hashes in case the browser doesn't have all hashes.

This is cool, but not terribly backwards-compatible. Do you want to compromise your website for IE6? If not, we have a nice way to protect ourselves from malicious library loading.

However, SRI, or subresource integrity (checking the libraries), only works for stylesheets and scripts; it would be nice if we had the ability to extend to other elements or UI integrity or whatnot, or to downloads. These are active areas of research. Moreover, if we could implement signatures rather than just hashes, it would be possible to update libraries more seamlessly.

Recall that the SOP is quite inflexible, since it causes headaches with cross-origin data. This is reasonable, but sometimes one corporation has several websites (e.g. Amazon's AWS site). Thus, there's a protocol called



CORS which allows one to whitelist certain sites. This interacts with cookies and stuff in nuanced ways: by default, no credentials are sent, but there's a property that enables them to send credentials.

As seems to be a theme, CORS has limitations too; in particular, it's not possible to share data with a sandboxed iframe without making it completely public. Furthermore, it might be better to have a finer-grained scheme than just straight whitelisting, and perhaps to integrate this with crypto. It's again an area of research.

Finally, how do we protect extensions from pages? Extensions sometimes slow down page loading and can be a security problem (e.g. they have access to data, oops), but malicious pages can also try to read into data from extensions. This is different between Firefox and Chrome, but both of them have isolated worlds, keeping their Javascript heaps of the extensions and the pages separate. This helps minimize code where the page gets access to things only the extensions should have access to. Chrome has gone a little further in being secure, by implementing privilege separation and the principle of least privilege. The former is used via breaking an extension into a core extension script, which has access to privileged APIs, and a content script, which doesn't have that access, but can actually modify the script. Thus, messages can pass between them, but the privileges are separated, and it's much harder to exploit both of these at the same time.

But is this working? Extensions have to use this cleverly (and pages can't really protect themselves from malicious extensions, which definitely exist). About 71% of extensions request read/write access for every origin, even though many of them don't need it for all that they do. This tends to make them insecure or more prone to bugs.

This leads to some interesting research questions. Can we build an extension system with a more realistic attacker model? And where do existing mechanisms for it fall short? This is leading to a draft of a spec called COWL which rolls many of these ideas up into a policy that is improved (but still doesn't help in some cases, e.g. third-party libraries or mashups leading to someone leading your data; you can't do anything against jQuery).

Recall the password-strength checker; we would prefer that it doesn't leak the password, and it's more OK if it lies about the password strength. We can confine this with existing mechanisms, but it's unsatisfactory: the library's functionality is limited, e.g. it can't fetch resources from the network, so it has to carry everything with itself, and the library also can't use code it doesn't trust. Furthermore, this policy isn't symmetric (the library is forced to trust the parent).

This is why the new approach, COWL, provides a means for associating security labels and data, and confining code to labels and browser contexts. This is basically one step further than whitelisting.

Lecture 11.

## Session Management: 4/30/15

*"evil.site.com — that's my website."*

Recall that for a DOM, the Same Origin Policy (SOP) means that origin *A* can access origin *B*'s DOM iff it has the same protocol, domain, and port. In this lecture, we'll talk about the SOP for cookies, which is very different, and how it integrates into authentication.

A server can set a cookie, as part of the HTTP header. This includes the domain (when to send), the path (where to send), how secure it is (anything, or cookies that can only be sent over SSL), when it expires, and whether it's HTTP-only (i.e. it can't be accessed by Javascript). This last protocol was intended as a defense against cross-site scripting attacks; it didn't work quite as intended, but is still useful.

The domain and path of the cookie is called its *scope*, and if the expiration date is NULL, the cookie is understood to go away when the tab is closed (a session cookie). A cookie can be deleted by setting its expiration date to the past.

The domain is subtle and important: if one sets the host as `login.site.com`, then `login.site.com` and `.site.com` are allowed, but *not* `other.site.com` or `othersite.com` or `.com`. This seems like the reasonable level of privilege.

This can be an issue for some sites, though; for example, `stanford.edu` sites do not necessarily trust each other (many different things across different departments), but are allowed to play with each other's cookies; there are various ways of addressing this.

Cookies are identified by the tuple (name, domain, path). Thus, related cookies with different paths are considered distinct, and both kept. The browser has a cookie database ("cookie jar?") which the server can

write to. Then, the server reads cookies, too: the browser sends all cookies in scope, i.e. the cookie's domain is a suffix of the server domain, its path is a prefix of the URL path, and HTTPS is used if the cookie is marked as secure. Thus, the goal is for cookies to only be sent when they're in scope. This can get interesting in practice; there may be multiple user IDs coming from a single browser. This is a common source of vulnerabilities: if you stop reading after the first match, you might miss another one, which could be silently attacking.

It's quite easy to set cookies in Javascript, with the `document.cookie` setter. And you can read them by reading this variable (try `alert(document.cookie)` too see some). And setting the cookie with a given name to a long-past expiration date allows one to delete a cookie.

This sounds reasonable, but there are lots of issues with it, which you should be aware of.

First of all, the server only sees name-value pairs. For example, if Alice visits `login.site.com`, then the session-id cookie can be set for `.site.com`. But then, if she visits `evil.site.com`, it can overwrite her cookie with the attacker's session-id. Then, another site, `course.site.com`, assumes the cookie was set by the login site, not the evil site; it only sees the name-value pairs, not who set it. Thus, if you're designing a protocol like this one day, always broadcast who sent it; this is a pretty serious flaw in the protocol.

Moreover, secure cookies are not secure. This is important for a network attacker. The idea is that if Alice has a secure cookie for `https://www.site.com`, but then visits `http://www.site.com`, the attacker can inject something like "Set-Cookie: SSID = attacker; secure" and overwrite the secure cookie. The key (if you design protocols in the future) is that non-SSL sites can set secure cookies. Oops. And you don't even need to visit a site explicitly: Chrome and Firefox visit Google on its own every so often to get the safe browsing list. It's not a problem now, but if they visited over HTTP, there would have been a big problem.

Let's talk about SOP path separation. `x.com/A` cannot see the cookies of `x.com/B`. This isn't a security measure, since it does have access to the DOM. So you can just get the cookie by creating a frame with the other path in it (and then calling `frame[0].document.cookie`). This is fine, and the reason path separation exists is more for performance (and name collisions): most of the time, one path won't want anything to do with the other path's cookies.

Also, keep in mind that cookies have no integrity. There are easy programs to let you modify programs on your browser. Thus, when you're writing server-side code, you must assume that the cookies can be (and have been) modified. This is called *cookie poisoning*. For example, a shopping cart cookie for online shopping might contain the total price, but that's useless, since the user could change its value. (A similar problem appears with hidden fields: the user could change them anyways.) Nobody would make this mistake, right? Well, uh, they did, but it's not nearly as common nowadays.

Thus, for cookies, you have to use crypto. Specifically, the cookie is signed with a MAC (message authentication), akin to a stronger checksum. Then, if the client tries to change the value of the cookie, it gets detected and rejected. The MAC protocol takes in a secret key from the server, the session ID (so one cookie can't be morphed into another), and the name and the value. It's still possible to get this wrong (e.g. if you only store the value in the shopping cart, so it can be saved and then overwritten later), but this is the correct way to do it.

But, of course, you don't have to roll your own cookies; ASP.NET has a nice framework for this, for example, even including a `CookieFactory` class. Remember, you should never roll your own crypto.

**Session Management.** The point of session management is to allow the user to log in once, and then issue many requests, so that, e.g. you wouldn't have to log in every time you refresh your email.

Even in the early 1990s, it was clear there was a need for this, and the HTTP protocol was augmented with a session management protocol called HTTP-auth, where the server sends a response indicating a password required. The browser pops up and asks the user for the username and password, and sends it to the site. Then, the password, either as a base64 encoding or a hash, is sent along with all subsequent HTTP requests. This could be sent over SSL, which is good; sending it in plaintext would be a problem (this is a specified, completely reversible encoding).

There are many reasons this doesn't work. For one, SSL isn't exactly secure. For another, it doesn't work if the subpath is untrusted. And, of course, it needs to be sent over SSL, which doesn't always happen. Also, what about logging out? It's always neglected, and this mechanism doesn't have any way to do so! What if a user has multiple accounts, or multiple users use the same machine? Moreover, you can't customize the dialogue, and it's super easily spoofed. Don't use HTTP-auth.

Here's a more modern way: once you visit e.g. a shopping website, the browser gets an anonymous session token. Then, logging in is a POST request (since it has side effects), and this leads to the cookie being set, etc. But where do you put the session token? It can be set in a browser cookie, or in the URL link, or in a hidden form field.

What if you just use a cookie? Well, we had cross-side request forgery attacks. So you can't just use this. What about embedding it inside a URL link? These aren't particularly secret, which is a problem. In particular, the referrer header means any website sees where the user came from before it. So your session token is leaked to that too. Finally, a hidden form-field doesn't work for longer sessions. So the best answer is a combination of all of them.

Let's also talk about logouts. They're just as important as logging in, and yet are often not done properly. It's important for functionality (so one can log in as a different user), but also for security (so you can end a session token by logging out). The important point is that, on a server, a session token must be marked as expired. For example, if you visit Philz Coffee and visit a website where login is over SSL and everything afterwards is cleartext (e.g. Facebook until 2010), then someone else at the coffee shop could steal the session token and issue requests on your behalf — at least until you log out. This is the key reason for logging out to happen. Scarily, though, many websites allow the user to log in as someone else, but don't expire the session token on the server, so the attack is still possible.

When was the last time you closed your browser? Session cookies last for a long time.

This is called session hijacking, where the attacker can steal the user's session token (e.g. at a coffee shop) and then issue arbitrary requests on the "behalf" of the user. This was made into an attack called FireSheep way back in 2010, but fixing it, making HTTPS everywhere, is nontrivial, and took Facebook two years afterwards.

Another bad idea is using predictable tokens. Surprisingly many websites use counters or weak MACs for cookies, so an attacker can figure out the session tokens for other users. Don't do that! These vulnerabilities can be amplified by XSS attacks. Remember, if you log out, invalidate the token on the server!

One way to combat this is to include the IP address in a session token, and then check that the incoming connection has the same IP address as the one it claims to be. This isn't watertight — two people at the same coffee shop have the same IP address, and it's hard but not impossible for a gangster in a post-Soviet nation to forge your IP address. But it does help against many attacks. It also can make things a headache for legitimate users, e.g. if you want to log into Facebook at home and in class. There are other clever tricks to do this (e.g. bind to the user's time zone, though then the attacker only has 24 options to try, more or less). In summary, these ideas exist, but aren't widely used, and you should be aware of them.

Session fixation attacks are also important to understand. Suppose there's an XSS attack where the attacker can set a cookie for the victim (e.g. running Javascript to modify the cookie store). This sounds like it's exploitable, and of course, it is; for example, the attacker can get an anonymous session token and embed it in your browser. Then, when you log in, the session token is elevated to logged-in, but the attacker also has the session token, so it can do what it wants in your name.

The defense is actually quite simple: when you log in, change the token! Instead, just issue a new one. Thus, the attacker's token isn't elevated. This is an important principle to follow, or you will be vulnerable. Yes, there are a lot of rules, but they're important for making secure web apps.

In summary:

- Always assume the client's data is adversarial. Never trust it.
- Cookies by themselves are insecure, e.g. CSRF. Use crypto.
- Session tokens must be unpredictable and resist theft by a network attacker.
- Finally, ensure logout invalidates the session on a server!

Lecture 12.

## Cryptography Overview: 5/5/15

*"I could teach this whole class off of xkcd."*

You probably know that we have a whole class (CS 255) devoted to crypto; if you want a better overview and discussion of it, take that class. But for this class, we want to understand enough crypto to discuss SSL next lecture.

First of all, what is cryptography? Or rather, what is it useful for? It's a great tool for a lot of security mechanisms, but not all: if you have a buffer overflow, all the crypto in the world won't stop it. Moreover, crypto is extremely brittle: small mistakes in cryptographic protocols lead to complete insecurity. As a corollary, don't invent your own algorithms or implement others' algorithms; instead, use someone else's trusted implementation if possible. Your own ideas are probably vulnerable to various sorts of attacks, especially timing attacks.

One important principle in crypto, called *Kerckhoff's principle*, which states that a cryptosystem should be secure if everything can be known to the adversary except the secret key. That is, even if the adversary figures out everything about the protocol but the password, it's still secure.

Here are some goals of crypto.

- (1) The first goal is *secure communication*, where a client and a server can communicate, but an attacker listening into a network cannot determine what they are saying, nor change the message.
- (2) The second goal is *file protection*, which is in some sense Alice talking to herself later. An attacker Eve shouldn't be able to read the file or tamper with it.

Symmetric encryption is a way for two individuals, Alice and Bob, to communicate without eavesdroppers. In this set of protocols, both the encrypter and decrypter use the same key. Specifically, there is a 128-bit secret key  $k$  and a plaintext  $m$ , so the encryption algorithm produces  $E(k, m, n) = c$ .  $n$  is a nonce (to be explained later), and  $c$  is the ciphertext. Then, the decryption algorithm takes in  $D(k, c, n)$  and produces the original message  $m$  back.

Notice that everything in this algorithm is public except for  $k$ . These are even federal standards! This is in line with Kerckhoff's principle. This secret key can be *single-use*, where a new key is generated for each message (and therefore there's no need for a nonce), or *multi-use*, in which the same key is used for multiple messages. For example, the same key can be used to encrypt multiple files. This is more dangerous, since an attacker can see multiple ciphertexts. This is where the nonce comes in.

The simplest encryption algorithm (that anyone cares about) is the one-time pad, almost 100 years old. In this case we have a plaintext  $m$  and a key  $k$  of the same length; then, the ciphertext is  $c = m \oplus k$  (i.e. bitwise xor). It's important that the key be a randomly generated sequence of bits. Then, one decrypts by taking  $c \oplus k$ , which yields the plaintext back (since  $m \oplus k \oplus k = m$ , because xor is really addition mod 2).

In 1949, Shannon, the father of information theory, proved that the one-time pad is secure against ciphertext-only attacks. In other words, if one takes an arbitrary plaintext and xors it against a random string, the result is independent of the plaintext.

This is great! But the key has to be the same size as the plaintext, which is unfortunate — and if Alice and Bob have a way to securely send a huge key, then they might as well send the plaintext that way, right? Especially because this is very insecure if the key is reused.

The way to make this practical is to reformulate it into a *stream cipher*. Here, one takes a short (128-bit) key  $k$  and uses a pseudorandom number generator (PRG) to expand the key  $k$  into a pseudorandom (not quite random, but close in a sense that can be made precise)  $\text{PRG}(k)$  that is large enough to use as a one-time pad, i.e.  $c = \text{PRG}(k) \oplus m$ . This can be made secure by choosing a good PRG, but the ciphertext is no longer statistically independent from the plaintext, so some stream ciphers are insecure. Here, running time becomes important, unlike for the one-time pad.

Well-known stream ciphers include RC4 (which is insecure, but still used on the Web), Salsa 20/12 and a variant called ChaCha.<sup>10</sup>

Using stream ciphers is dangerous, because people often implement them wrong. For example, the "two-time pad" where the same key is reused is completely insecure, because by xoring two ciphertexts with the secret key, one obtains  $m_1 \oplus m_2$ , and this can be used (thanks to statistical properties of English text) to retrieve  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ .

Stream ciphers are very fast, but require single-use keys and are hard to get right.

The next primitive is a *block cipher*, where plaintext blocks are fed into the encryption algorithm, and each block is fed into the encryption algorithm for the next one (and then the same works for decryption and blocks of the ciphertext). The block size  $n$  has to be large enough that it can't be brute-force searched, and it should be at least 128 bits for now, or larger! The key size is called  $k$ ; larger  $k$  is more secure, but slower; the size of the encrypted message is the same.

<sup>10</sup>Apparently the guy behind this really likes Latin dance; see <https://eprint.iacr.org/2007/472.pdf>.

Block ciphers are the workhorse of crypto, including 3-DES (which has too small keys to be secure these days), and the golden standard, AES. This has 128-, 192-, or 256-bit keys.

The idea behind a block cipher is that the key is expanded into several different rounds, and the key is expanded into many *round keys*  $k_1, \dots, k_m$  (e.g. for DES,  $m = 16$ , and for AES,  $m = 10$ ). Then, the encryption algorithm (for small texts) is applied  $m$  times ( $m$  rounds, so to speak), producing the ciphertext.

You can then just do this on blocks, but then if  $m_1 = m_2$  (two blocks in the same plaintext), then  $c_1 = c_2$ . This can be a problem, e.g. you can tell where people are silent in a voice conversation. Encrypting pictures makes this even more obvious; see Figure 2.



FIGURE 2

FIGURE 2. Example of an incorrect use of block ciphers leaking information for a picture.

Source: [http://www.kingston.com/us/landing/secure/most\\_secure\\_encryption](http://www.kingston.com/us/landing/secure/most_secure_encryption).

Thus, the correct way to do this is to take the result  $c[0]$  of the first block and xor it with the next plaintext block  $m[1]$ , and use it to get  $c[1]$ . Then  $c[1] \oplus m[2]$  is used for the next plaintext block, and so on.

**Exercise 12.1.** To decrypt you should run this in reverse. Write down exactly what this entails.

However, we also want to start with something to begin the xoring. If the key is single-use, you don't even need to start with anything interesting, but for multiple-use keys, you'd need to change this beginning thing (called an IV). You can generate random IVs, or sometimes use a counter, where the  $n^{\text{th}}$  message is encrypted with the IV  $n$ ; however, then, you need to encrypt the IV so that it's secure.

Block ciphers and CBC mode is ancient (dating back to the 1970s); the more modern way to encrypt is called counter mode. Most new encryption methods use counter mode. In this mode, encryption takes in the key and the IV, but for the  $n^{\text{th}}$  block, we use  $k$  and  $\text{IV} + n$ , producing a one-time pad. Then, to decrypt, you know the IV and the key, so you can get the pad back and then xor it with the ciphertext. Decryption is important, but this time we only need an encryption algorithm (since we're just generating a reasonable one-time pad).

People like stream ciphers because they're fast; Salsa20/12 is fast, and 3DES and AES are slower. But AES is so important that it has actually been implemented in hardware, and that makes it about  $8\times$  faster. This means realtime AES on live video data, which is pretty cool.

**Data Integrity.** Everything we've said applies to secure transmission of data, but what about data integrity? Suppose Alice and Bob want to send a message (e.g. downloading a piece of software), where the message is not secret, but they don't want it to be changed.

The typical way to do this is a checksum, but this isn't secure enough against adversaries, so we want a cryptographic checksum, called a MAC. The idea is to produce a tag  $t = S(k, m)$  (where  $m$  is the message and  $k$  is a key, and  $S$  is the signing protocol); then, verification  $V(k, m, t)$  should report true or false.

Security for MACs means that the attacker can see as many messages and signatures as it wants, but nonetheless cannot produce signatures itself without the secret key.

The most common implementation is a CBC MAC (cipher-block chaining). This is basically like a block cipher, but instead of retaining the ciphertext along the way, we just feed it into the next round, so what comes out at the end is a tag that is much smaller than the original message (so it's not too slow or memory intensive). This can be reasonably secure, and banks love using this to verify checks.

Another common construction is HMAC (hash MAC), the most widely used MAC on the Internet (even more so than Apple's?). Here,  $H$  is a hash function, e.g. SHA-256, and a MAC is built out of it by concatenating the message, the key (xored against some small one-time pads, i.e. randomly generated data) and maybe a nonce and hashing that together. Thus, even though  $H$  is public, it's hard to forge keys. The key property (heh) that  $H$  needs to have is *collision-resistance*, i.e. it's very improbable for signatures to work by coincidence.

As for why these are secure, take CS 255.

**Authenticated Encryption.** So now we have confidentiality and integrity, but how can we do both at the same time? Don't just casually mix them together, or things can go wrong in subtle ways. For example:

- (1) The original version of SSL computed the MAC (via HMAC), append it to the message, and encrypt. Then, the decrypter decrypts, and then verifies.
- (2) IPsec encrypted, and then appended a MAC of the ciphertext.
- (3) SSH encrypted, and then appended a MAC of the plaintext.

There are several more, one per project! But of all of these, encrypt-then-MAC is the only correct one. The idea is that we know the ciphertext hasn't been tampered with. However, MAC-then-encrypt requires decryption first, and there are some very strange plaintexts that have the property that decrypting them actually leaks information about how to forge signatures! This leads to many of the original problems with SSL, and related to an attack called the Poodle attack.<sup>11</sup>

That was about five weeks of CS 255.

**Public-key Cryptography.** This section addresses the question, "how did Alice and Bob agree on a shared key anyways?"

The idea here is that a key generator produces two keys, a public key  $pk$  and a secret key  $sk$ . Everyone can encrypt using the public key, and only Alice can decrypt with the secret key. For example, Alice and Bob can generate a shared public key: Bob generates a key and encrypts it with Alice's public key; then, Alice can decrypt it, but nobody else can.

But there are other ways of doing this, e.g. in encrypted file systems, it's possible to make file-sharing possible: if Bob owns a file  $F$  encrypted with a secret file key  $k_F$ , he can give Alice access to it by encrypting  $k_F$  with Alice's public key and sharing it with her.

A third application is called key escrow, where a company where Bob works can recover data without Bob's key if Bob isn't there in person (or leaves the company). The company can require data to be encrypted such that the company can be recovered later: basically, Bob encrypts the file key under the escrow public key, and the escrow secret key is kept offline by one person in the company. Thus, if Bob runs out the door (or even calls in sick), then the company's data can be recovered, and there isn't very much encryption done.

Notice that, since public-key encryption is slow, it's better in this and many other cases to do symmetric encryption, and then encrypt that key with public-key encryption.

Now, how do these methods actually work? We'll give a common example.

**Definition.** A *trapdoor function*  $X \rightarrow Y$  is a triple of efficient algorithms  $(G, F, F^{-1})$ , where:

- $G$  is a randomized algorithm that outputs a public key  $pk$  and a secret key  $sk$ ,
- $F(pk, \cdot)$  determines an algorithm for a function  $X \rightarrow Y$ , and
- $F^{-1}(sk, \cdot)$  determines an algorithm for a function  $Y \rightarrow X$  that inverts  $F(pk, \cdot)$ .

Moreover, we require  $F(pk, \cdot)$  to be a one-way function (i.e. extremely difficult to invert) if  $sk$  isn't known.

---

<sup>11</sup>There are some great names out there for attacks, e.g. Heartbleed, Beast, Freak, and so on... they are usually named by their discoverers, and the better the name, the better the media attention, especially if you can come up with a cool logo. So your goal is to come up with a catchy name and a cool logo if you discover a vulnerability!



The idea is that anyone can encrypt with the public key and  $F$ , but only the person with the secret key can decrypt.

Using a trapdoor function  $(G, F, F^{-1})$ , a symmetric encryption scheme  $(E_s, D_s)$  with keys in  $K$ , and a hash  $H : X \rightarrow K$ , we can create a public-key encryption system  $(G, E, D)$ . Here,  $G$  generates public and secret keys as before.

Then,  $E(pk, m)$  first generates a random  $x \in X$  and computes  $y = F(pk, x)$ . Then, let  $k = H(x)$ ; then, the ciphertext is  $c = E_s(k, m)$  (notice we use symmetric encryption here, since it's much faster than the trapdoor function will ever be). Finally, output  $(y, c)$ .

To decrypt,  $D(sk, c)$  computes  $x = F^{-1}(sk, y)$ ; then, we recover  $k = H(x)$ , and can use it to run  $D_s$  and get the message back. Notice that the header, the public-key part, is very small, and symmetric encryption is used for most of the message.

The security of these kinds of ciphers is wrapped up in the following result.

**Theorem 12.1.** *If  $(G, F, F^{-1})$  is a secure trapdoor function,  $(E_s, D_s)$  provides secure authenticated encryption, and  $H$  is a random oracle, then  $(G, E, D)$  is secure.*

This security is in a sense that will be discussed in CS 255.

A related idea is that of digital signatures, e.g. contract signing. Here, Alice signs a file with her secret key, and anyone can verify with her public key. The way to make this secure is to make the signature depend on the (hash of the) contract, so that you can't use one signature to forge another.

Once again, we use a trapdoor permutation (TDP)  $(G, F, F^{-1}) : X \rightarrow X$  and a secure hash function  $H : M \rightarrow X$ . The signature is  $s = F^{-1}(sk, H(m))$ , which means that, assuming the TDP is secure, only the person with the secret key can produce valid signatures, so this satisfies the required security properties, i.e. this has existential unforgeability under a chosen message attack.

Decryption is also simple: one takes  $F(pk, s)$ , and checks whether it is equal to  $H(m)$ . Thus, anyone can verify, but only the signer can sign. We'll use this a lot next lecture.

This leads to a way to distribute public keys securely, using a certificate authority, which is a trusted third party. Thus, people globally know what Alice's public key is, assuming they trust the signatures of the certificate authority. Thus, Bob can access Alice's public key.

Keep in mind, however, that crypto isn't everything, e.g. <http://xkcd.com/538/>.

Lecture 13.

## HTTPS and the Lock Icon: 5/7/15

*"These days, I like calling malicious entities Nancy, because it resembles a certain three-letter agency."*

HTTPS is probably the most successful security protocol in existence; you've probably heard of it, and almost certainly used it. Thus, it makes for a good case study; it's pretty cool, but not perfect.

Today, our model for the attacker is a network attacker, who can control the network infrastructure and eavesdrop, block, inject, or modify packets. This is a reasonable model at your favorite coffee shop, tavern, or hotel. Keep in mind that, even though the attacker has complete control over the network, SSL or HTTPS provide some security.

Recall that in public-key encryption, Bob has a public key that Alice (or anyone) can use to encrypt message that only Bob can decrypt, since only Bob (presumably) knows the secret key used for decryption. This is cool, but how does Bob guarantee that Alice gets his public key, even when an attacker called *cough* Nancy can control the network?

This is where certificates come in: a commonly trusted entity called the certificate authority (CA) has a secret key, and its public key is well-known (e.g. baked into the browser). Then, Bob sends his public key and proof that he is Bob (e.g. notarized letter, or some other kind of physical process) to the CA, which issues a certificate that it has signed. Then, Bob can send the certificate to Alice, who can verify that the certificate wasn't tampered with, using the CA's public key. Certificates tend to expire after about a year, and therefore have to be renewed.

For example, Google is a CA, since it has so many servers, so it's pretty sensible for it to issue certificates for its own servers... though it could issue certificates for Bing if it chose to. So who watches the CAs? This turns out to be an area of research; right now, CAs endorse other CAs, with a "root CA" that verifies CAs which verify CAs (and these are the CAs whose public keys are baked into the browser).

Notice that in a certificate, there's a common name, a serial number (for revoking the certificate if need be), a public key (for Bob), and then the signature that's used to verify the certificate.

The common name is actually one of the most important fields: it's the name of the domain to which the certificate was issued, e.g. `cs.stanford.edu`. More expensively (but just as hard to generate), there are also "wildcard certificates," e.g. for `*.stanford.edu`. Notice that `*.a.com` matches `x.a.com` but not `y.x.a.com`.

There's a lot of CAs out there: maybe sixty top-level CAs, and 1,200 intermediate-level CAs. Many of them are international, from far-flung places like China. Google is an intermediate CA.

What happens if Nancy creates his (her?) own suspicious CA? This means that Nancy can issue certificates for Gmail, or even anything, and then break encryption (since they would really use Nancy's own public key to encrypt). This was behind the SuperPhish attack that happened not too long ago, where a spurious CA was actually baked into the out-of-the-box software for certain systems.

One thing that is scary is that if an intermediate CA were compromised, then an attacker could issue certificates for anyone, and that would be a problem. So this is a lot of things to keep secure.

The protocol itself will be discussed further in 255. The browser sends a message called "client-hello" to the certificate, and the server responds with a "server-hello" and its public-key certificate. Then, they do a key exchange, where they send some messages back and forth, and *poof*, a key appears. (Take CS 255 for some more details.) Then, they both agree that the protocol finished correctly, so they have a shared session key, and then use it to send encrypted HTTP data.

This sounds easy, but there are immediately complications.

- (1) Many people, particularly in corporate networks, use proxies to access the network: they connect to the proxy, which connects to the network. This is fine, but think about how SSL works: the proxy receives a client-hello message, which doesn't include the server name, so it's stuck. (Normally, the HTTP header tells it where to forward the packet to.) However, the inventors of HTTPS anticipated this and provided a workaround: they included the server name in the client-hello. Specifically, the browser sends a message indicating where to connect, followed by the client-hello.
- (2) The second problem wasn't anticipated, and we're still paying the price. This is the issue of virtual hosting, where multiple sites are hosted at the same IP address. This is nice if we're running out of IP addresses (which, for IPv4, we have been for a while), but then how does a server who sees an HTTPS hello message know which host to send the message to? Without SSL, the host header is used for this, but now we're stuck — which certificate does the server send back? The connect message described above only happens when the browser is being forwarded through a proxy (and some proxies drop the connect message!), so it doesn't help us out at all. The same idea works: the client-hello is extended to an SNI (server name indication), which tells the host which server to connect to, and therefore which certificate to send back. This was proposed in 2003, and quickly implemented in Chrome, Firefox, and IE7, but it's still not implemented in IE6, which is still used, and this causes a big headache to virtual hosts. So HTTPS connections between IE6 and virtual hosts were dropped — and so a decision made in 1995 made virtual hosting nearly impossible until even last year (when XP was finally formally unsupported). This considerably increased the cost of SSL, and is one reason why it's still not used everywhere.

So why isn't SSL used everywhere? Why shouldn't all traffic be encrypted?

- First, and probably least importantly, the extra cost of crypto slows things down a little. This doesn't make a huge difference anymore.
- More significantly, some ad networks don't support HTTPS, so using it would substantially reduce revenue for publishers. There's no particular reason to encrypt ads, after all; if Nancy can read them, well, who cares? But it makes this harder for their clients. And you can't separate them: insecure content inside a secure webpage can undo the security of an entire page, and these days browsers complain about mixed content for this reason. Think of it this way: a page over SSL with Javascript not over SSL is quite vulnerable to a network attacker, and undoes the security of the entire page. Remember that insecure active content renders the whole page insecure.

People are working on making SSL happen everywhere, and it's getting more and more viable.

The user is made aware of HTTPS via the lock icon, which indicates that all elements of the page were served over HTTPS, with a valid certificate whose common name matches the domain in the URL. Errors

such as mixed content make for a broken lock icon, but your grandparents probably don't notice that, so now browsers tend to block mixed content altogether.

An extended validation certificate costs more, but makes things a little more secure; these require a human to approve the request, and cannot be wildcarded. These are the locks with information on the company name, and help protect against websites such as PayPal and so on.

These locks are called positive security indicators: they tell the user that they're secure. These tend not to work, because the user doesn't know where to look, and in particular is not good at telling whether the website is insecure. For one sadly hilarious example, there are "picture-in-picture" attacks where a picture of a website with the correct icon (and green address bar) is embedded within the fake website. People fall for this, and there are two lessons.

- Don't ask the user for advice if it doesn't know stuff.
- Positive security indicators aren't helpful; instead, have a negative indicator and a clear reason why.

Coming up with good security information that people follow is one of the hardest problems in HCI. And of course, implementers of course can do things wrong too — people associate locks with SSL, but sometimes a website will put a lock near the login form, even if the website is served over HTTP. Certainly, the form can be made to be submitted over SSL, but the user wouldn't know that. The correct thing to do is redirect the login page to HTTPS, no matter how the user accessed it.

HTTPS has several issues you should be aware of. The first one is just what we were talking about, where someone connects with HTTP and is redirected to the HTTPS version of the site. Then, a man-in-the-middle attacker can talk SSL to the bank, but can downgrade the SSL to cleartext when talking to the user, so the user only has an HTTP connection (for all websites, links, and form actions). Thus, there's no way for the user to access the site with SSL, and the server sees the SSL side. This is called an SSL strip attack. Some clever versions can replace favicons with lock icons, which makes it look okay, but oops. You're supposed to look for the lock in the right place (not near where the favicon is), but that doesn't help for your grandparents. Partly because of this, the favicon is in a tab, rather than next to the URL. These attackers could also delete cookies, which forces the user to reenter its login and password.

In one study of 10,000 users, *none* of them detected the SSL strip attack. Positive security indicators aren't very useful. The best way to prevent these kinds of attacks is to not involve the user at all. In this case, a protocol called Strict Transport Security (HSTS), which allows a header to require users to always connect to that site with HTTPS: the browser refuses to connect over HTTP or using a self-signed certificate, and requires the entire site to be served over SSL. This is a very good thing for you to use in your websites, and doesn't allow the user to ignore warnings — the browser just refuses to connect.

However, HSTS leaks just a little information, whether you've been to a website before. This isn't all that nefarious, but it means that when a user clears private data, the flag is lost. It is possible to use this to track users uniquely, which is why clearing private data clears the HSTS flags, which suddenly makes them less secure. So often, one must balance privacy and security.

One could imagine closing port 80, which is for unsecure HTTP, but the SSL stripping attack can work around that quite easily, and in fact is only a false sense of security.

Of course, the best way to fix this would be for SSL to be universally supported, or even make it default, but that's some years away.

One caveat to be aware of for HSTS is that many pages use explicit HTTP requests in links. This means that no matter what security you use, anytime the user clicks on something, it downgrades to HTTP. But there's an 'upgrade-insecure-requests' part of the content security policy, which automatically replaces all internal links with HTTPS. More generally, though, one should always use protocol relative URLs, e.g. `//site.com/img`, which respects the protocol the user connected with. Try to never, never use protocol-absolute URLs, even though this is a not too well-known trick.

There are also lots of things that can go wrong with certificates. With 1200 CAs, if any of them get broken, we have a serious problem on our hands, and this happens more frequently than we might like. For example, an attacker got into CAs called Comodo, DigiNotar, TurkTrust, and so on, and often they can retrieve bogus certificates for sites like Gmail. Attacks continue, and there's even been one this year already.

Google is starting to take punitive action against these: the root CAs revoke the compromised CAs' certificates, which puts it out of business, but Google can force Chrome to block certificates that are issued by untrusted (or to untrusted) CAs. Chrome doesn't even recognize a root certificate after it issued some bogus certificates for Gmail.

Google finds out about these by hardcoding in its certificate into Chrome (even before these attacks came out, in 2011), which is called “certificate pinning.” This mandates that only one CA can issue certificates to Gmail, and therefore any invalid cert errors caught in Chrome are sent in, and Google can deal with it. This has worked quite well.

There’s also a man-in-the-middle attack (from CS 255), where a network attacker can issue a certificate for a site that the user connects to, and then read traffic between the user and the server. Two ways of fighting against that are Google’s pinning, which it has released to the rest of the world, and something called certificate transparency. The moral of the story is, if you serve stuff over SSL, pin your certificates somewhere!

### Part 3. Networking Protocols and Mobile Security

Lecture 14.

#### How to Design Security Prompts and Internet Protocols: 5/12/15

Before we turn to network protocols, let’s briefly finish up our discussion of SSL and certificates. Remember that if a CA is compromised, then there’s a man-in-the-middle attack where the user can’t tell that anything is going on.

Basically, the server has a certificate, but the attacker has obtained a bogus certificate that the browser thinks is valid (since it came from a compromised CA). Thus, the attacker can intercept the user’s connection and send back its certificate, and then set up the connection with the bank, using the bank’s certificate. Then, the attacker does a key exchange with both sides, and thereafter can read the messages they send by decrypting. But the attacker also forwards the things it reads, so nobody can tell. The attacker can even post requests, so your bank account could be compromised!

This isn’t just hypothetical; for example, some nations have spied on their citizens using man-in-the-middle attacks with bogus CAs, and the SuperFish exploit on Lenovo used something like this to inject ads. But since Chrome pins Gmail’s certificate, Google can tell which CAs issue the wrong certificates (since each certificate bears a CA’s signature), and thereafter can take punitive actions.

So, what can we do? There are lots of ideas, including public-key pinning, like what Gmail does. That is, there is exactly one CA that Chrome recognizes for Gmail. Another way is for a site to issue a list of CAs on first connection; then, the browser remembers that header and checks where the certificate came from on subsequent connections. This is sort of like HSTS from last time, and illustrates a more general principle called Trust on First Use (Tofu!). Tofu is a good model: it works pretty well in practice, and users don’t have to do anything. Thus, the only issue is that you have to connect to the bank over a trusted connection the first time. For example, if you’re taking a new laptop to a country where these MITM attacks are more commonplace (e.g. corporate trips), then the first time you connect, it’ll already be over a dubious connection. So remember to open your laptop and connect to important websites before leaving the country.

Another idea is certificate transparency. This is a complicated proposal, but the idea is that CAs should publish the list of all the certificates it publicly issues, and browsers will only accept certificates posted to the repository. Then, at any time, Google can monitor the repository for certificates for Gmail that it didn’t issue, and then sound the alarm bells. This sounds like a lot, but expired certificates can be thrown out, and some magic using Merkle hash trees makes this actually pretty efficient, and so on.

There’s also the issue with mixed content. Suppose one loads a page over HTTPS, but contains a script that loads via HTTP. Then, an attacker sees that script, and can modify it plainly, rendering the entire page vulnerable. A lot of pages have mixed content, which is a huge problem! Some browsers block mixed content by default (except images, which aren’t active content), but IE7 and other older ones have a pop-up, which is useless (people click through anyways). The proper solution is to use protocol-independent links, i.e. starting with the // rather than the protocol.

Finally, there are some problems that just aren’t fixable. Network traffic reveals the length of the HTTPS packets, and therefore at least a little information about the size of your request. TLS does support up to 256 bytes of padding. For example, on a tax form website correctly served over HTTPS, an attacker can more or less figure out which tax forms you need, because the application logic is so complicated that each path through it results in a differently-sized request and response. (This is an actual paper, not just a hypothetical example!) Another example is two images, one of which is “transaction executed,” and one of which is

“transaction not executed.” The hashes of these images have different sizes, and so an attacker can tell which is used.

**Designing Security Prompts.** This is a bit of UI/HCI issue, but it’s become a huge one: it can make a huge difference, as we’ve already discussed, and there’s even a whole conference devoted towards it.

There are many security prompts out there; ask yourself, what would my (grand)parents do when presented with the prompt? Most people just click “OK” blindly on most error messages, after all. Here’s a common problem, e.g. IE6’s mixed content message.

- The insecure option (go forward anyways) is highlighted by default.
- The threat is very vaguely described, and doesn’t explain what tools could be used to determine whether it is safe.

In IE8, there’s a better error message, with a “More Info” button, and the default action only loads the secure content. So then, why are we bothering the user? It can’t make an informed decision, especially for most users. So the best interface, which IE9 and above (and modern Chrome, etc.) use, is to skip this, load only the secure content, and then use a gold bar on the bottom which can allow the user to load the insecure elements after a manual process that most people don’t even know how to make happen.

Notice the lesson: *don’t bother the user*, and *if the user doesn’t have any knowledge that the system doesn’t know*, *don’t ask the user*; it won’t help. This is a very important guideline. And if you must involve them, given them the tools.

The mnemonic is NEAT:

- Is it **N**ecessary? Can the system take action without the user?
- Is it **E**xplained? Does the user have any idea what is going on?
- Is it **A**ctionable? Does the user have the tools to make an informed decision?
- Is it **T**ested on users?

If you follow this, you’ll design better prompts than most web pages have, even nowadays.

For example, IE6’s prompt about certificate failure isn’t really understandable unless you’ve taken a course akin to CS 255! That’s not a good thing. The user is given the decision, but doesn’t know what the problem is, nor what the consequences are. Nowadays, they’re doing a lot better: explaining more what is happening, what could go wrong, and what is not recommended, along with extra information about what could happen. Chrome, though, doesn’t even bother, and makes the decision to block the webpage entirely.

Another problem is bad explanation. Then, the attacker can abuse an explanation, causing bad user decisions, e.g. the AutoPlay dialog in Vista, which managed to confuse the professor! The key is that the attacker’s program icon looks like a benign icon, and this can be exploitable. The key is that the OS let the USB drive determine the icon and the program text that is displayed, which leads to people setting up fake options. Windows 7 did away with this dialogue entirely. Thus, in summary: don’t give the attacker control of the UI!

**Internet Protocols.** Today, we’ll give an overview of networking protocols: what they are, and why they exist.

The Internet is a large network, where computers connect to ISPs, which connect to a backbone network. There are protocols called TCP/IP and BGP for local and interdomain routing, and a few others.

Let’s talk about TCP. It’s a protocol divided into layers.

- The lowest layer is the link layer, e.g. Ethernet data links between different computers. This is the physical, wired network.
- On top of that, there’s a network layer (IP), with packets and stuff.
- On top of that is the TCP (or UDP) header which is a segment of a message.
- Finally, the application sends messages back and forth.

Let’s think about the IP header, which creates packets that travel around the Internet. There’s IPv4, which we’ll talk about, and IPv6, which we won’t. Each packet has a bunch of fields. This is a connectionless protocol, unreliable and built on best-effort forwarding (each packet contains its source and destination address, though not its source and destination port). IP also handles packet fragmentation and defragmentation (i.e. if your packet is too fat to fit through the bandwidth of a given router), and has an error-correcting code built in. Finally, there’s a TTL field (time-to-live), which is decremented after every hop. This prevents packets

from going in cycles; otherwise, the network would become dominated by packets going in cycles (which happened once, long ago).

One issue with IP is that there's no source authentication. The client is trusted to embed the source IP, but it's not so hard to write the wrong source just using raw sockets. In particular, anyone who owns their machine can send packets with an arbitrary source IP, and therefore the packet is sent back to that spoofed address. This is a way that certain worms with cool names (e.g. the slammer worm) are propagated, and it's very hard to trace, because there's no honest source address. This is a relatively fundamental problem in IP.

Now let's talk about TCP (transmission control protocol). This introduces the source and destination ports, as well as the *sequence number* and *ACK number*, which will be important when we discuss DoS attacks. There are two flags SYN and ACK that can be set on or off; if the SYN flag is on, the packet is called a SYN packet, and similarly for ACK. If both are on, it's called a SYN/ACK packet.

Then, the client and server establish a connection via a "three-way handshake," where the client sends a SYN packet where the sequence number (SEQ) is randomly chosen and the ACK number is zero. Then, the server stores this, and sends back a SYN/ACK number, where the SEQ number is randomly chosen, but the ACK number equal to the client's SEQ number (i.e. acknowledging). Then, the client sends back an ACK packet which has as SEQ number the client's original SEQ number plus one, and the ACK number equal to the server's SEQ number. Thus, a connection is established, and now packets are sent, incrementing the client and server's sequence numbers with each packet.

This has lots of security problems: sending network packets in the clear isn't the best idea. A listener can get the sequence numbers of both the client and the server, and therefore an attacker can inject packets into the connection, which enables spoofing or session hijacking, and even without that there's spoofing. And the three-way handshake is very vulnerable to a DDos attack, which we'll talk about next lecture.

We required the initial sequence numbers ( $SN_C, SN_S$ ) to be random. Why? Suppose the initial numbers are predictable; then, there's an attack where the attacker can create a TCP session on behalf of a forged source IP, even if the attacker is far enough away that it can't eavesdrop on the connection. Here, the attacker sends a SYN packet where the source IP is the victim. Thus, the server sends the SYN/ACK packet to the victim. Here, the attacker can predict the server's  $SN_S$  in this scenario (which is why it's important for it to be random), so the attacker can send an ACK packet to the server with that  $SN_S$ , with the victim's IP again. Thus, the server thinks the connection is established, and the attacker can issue commands as if it were the victim. This is why we require the initial sequence numbers to be random.

Notice that this provides absolutely no defense against eavesdropping attackers. However, this does protect against some IP address masquerading, including plenty of classes of spam attacks.

One interesting angle into this is that you need a good source of randomness, and this isn't always available, e.g. the first few times you boot up a router.

The victim might notice the SYN/ACK packet; sometimes it just drops the packet on the floor, and sometimes it closes the connection, but this is a race with the attacker's connection, so there's only so much it could do.

The Internet is divided into twenty of twenty or so ASes (autonomous systems), e.g. AT&T, Earthlink, and apparently Stanford. These are connected groups of one or more IPs, which are connected with a routing protocol called BGP, which determines how to connect between ASes, and a protocol called OSPF determines the protocol within an AS, determined e.g. based on the network topology. The idea is flexibility: new paths through the network may appear or go offline, and this information is propagated through AS nodes in the network.

BGP is one of the biggest security problems in the Internet; it assumed all of the autonomous systems are friends. Specifically, there's no authentication whatsoever in it. So if AS 7 advertises the wrong protocol to AS 6,<sup>12</sup> then it'll be accepted, and even propagate through the network. This means that your traffic from (for a real example that was in effect for several hours) Guadalajara, Mexico to Washington, DC went through Belarus. Awkward. The reverse path didn't change, which meant it wasn't possible to trace this through an IP trace route. In particular, you don't necessarily know that messages sent to you haven't been rerouted.

We don't know that these are attacks; some are certainly misconfigurations, but you do have to wonder. They happen periodically, and all cleartext traffic is vulnerable to this. We don't know who is doing this or why; just that it is happening. The moral of the story: use SSL. Even if this isn't malicious, it could cause, for

---

<sup>12</sup>Why is 6 afraid of 7?



example, all traffic to Youtube to be sent to Pakistan (again, this happened!), and they didn't know what to do with it, which is perfectly reasonable, but this meant they dropped all the connections and Youtube was down for two hours. But these can be used for DoS, spam, and eavesdropping.

There are proposed ways of fixing these security issues, such as RPKI, which requires the BGP messages to be signed, but this isn't implemented yet.

We also have the DNS (domain name system). There are thirteen root servers, and then there's a tree-like server. Each of these is supported by hundreds of machines that act like one, so bringing down a root server is difficult, though (alarmingly) it has been attempted.

The whole point is the DNS lookup protocol, where the client wants to look up, say, [cs.stanford.edu](http://cs.stanford.edu), and sends this to the local DNS resolver. This breaks it down, asking a root server who's at .edu, and asks that server who's at stanford.edu, and then asks stanford.edu where's the CS site. Each response is called a name server response (NS), but there are other records: A (address) records for a specific IP address, and a few others (generic text, TXT; email address stuff, MX). This has no encryption, which is a problem; in a future lecture, we'll learn about a proposed security upgrade.

DNS responses are cached, which makes life nicer. Negative queries are also cached, which is helpful: since positive queries are cached, then the top-level domain (TLD) servers typically get mostly typos, which are helpful to cache. People are pretty creative in their misspellings, however.

One basic vulnerability is called cache poisoning: if the local resolver can be confused into pointing people to the wrong address, then lots of things can go wrong, e.g. the attacker can redirect requests to their own IP address. This is possible if, for example, the attacker can intercept and edit requests, since this stuff is done over plaintext. There's a query ID field which is used to tie the requests and responses together.

So the attacker can send responses to the local DNS resolver with random query IDs reporting that a bank's site is actually the attacker's IP. But this replaces the name server in the cache! Notice that the attacker isn't even eavesdropping on the traffic. The attacker wins if there's a query out with the given ID, which is 16 bits; it can submit 256 responses, so it has a 1/256 chance of winning. But then it can try again with b.bank.com, and so on, so after not all that much time, the severe consequence of redirection happens, even though this is a probabilistic attack. This exploits the birthday paradox, which is why it's so scarily effective.

You could add more bits to the query ID (QID), but this breaks backwards compatibility, so you have to cheat: in addition, the source port number is randomized, providing an additional eleven bits of entropy. This makes the attacker's chances much slimmer; it takes several hours. So the attack isn't prevented, but it's made harder. There are other proposals; one good one that hasn't been implemented is to ask each query twice, which makes for 32 bits of entropy.

Lecture 15.

## Network Security Protocols and Defense Mechanisms: 5/14/15

*"[WPA] sounds like a Roosevelt-era social program."*

Last time, we talked about how things work in a network and what the attacks are, so we can also talk about network security. A network is about connecting two people for exchanging information, so it going wrong means the connection failing or the wrong data being seen, but there's also three points of confidentiality of information, authenticity (I'm really talking to who I think I am), and integrity (the message sent is the message received). Another important point is availability, which is relevant to DDoS attacks.

We'll discuss how these are attacked, and what can be done. We'll also go protocol by protocol, e.g. WiFi has WPA2 and 802.11i, BGP and DNS are used for routing, and so on, as were discussed last time. There are also firewalls and intrusion detection, which we didn't talk about last time.

Many of these protocols were designed to be secure (e.g. with "SEC" in the acronym), but this may or may not make them more secure. The Internet wasn't designed with security in mind, and so the basic protocols, e.g. BGP and TCP/IP, are very insecure. So we need to ask ourselves, how can we build secure protocols on top of these insecure primitives? For example, there's no source authentication for TCP/IP, and packets can be sniffed and connections spoofed, e.g. abusing sequence numbers. UDP and other basic protocols have their issues too. For BGP, we saw last time that it's possible to advertise bad routes, which is confusing or frustrating, but can also allow one to read traffic that wasn't supposed to pass by a given

router.<sup>13</sup> BGP/SBGP is an excellent example of the fact that security wasn't the original point of the protocol, so we need to build a more complicated, secure version, but then it takes a while to adopt, and so on.

When you think about networking, think about the layers of network protocols. This is important. The protocols at, e.g. the link layer is very different than that at the network layer. This goes from setting the voltage on the wire to the more abstract attacks on web sites. However, this means it's easy to say "that's a different layer and someone else's problem," so be aware of that.

First, let's talk about link layer connectivity and how that works. For example, we have the WPA2 or 802.11i protocol. This is an IEEE protocol standard for connecting a little device (called the *supplicant*) to a network, with the device called the *authenticator*, and often with an authentication server. The supplicant and authenticator form an 802.11 association to determine whether the supplicant can join the network. But since this is before any IP exists, they have to talk via an EAP/802.1X connection, more rudimentarily, so that they can establish authentication. This is another four or five steps back and forth, but means there's a master shared key between the supplicant and the authentication server. This key is then used to generate a short key for the supplicant and the authenticator. There's a "four-way handshake" (actually a two-way, four-step handshake; be careful!) and possibly another group key handshake. So after these 20 or so steps, we have some shared keys that make communication over WiFi pretty secure. Since this was a good protocol, it became pretty ubiquitous, so it became important to make it secure.

Let's briefly talk about virtual private networking (VPN), making a secure private network over an insecure connection. There are three different modes of use, e.g. remote access clients, inter-networking via LAN cables, and such. The idea is that you might want the same effect from a security standpoint as if you were part of the same secure local network. This can exist on multiple layers of the networking stack; for example, IPSEC is a protocol extending IPv4 or IPv6 to allow packets to be authenticated, made confidential, and given integrity using standard cryptography. Thus, your email or webpage is divided into packets, and extra headers and junk are added at each layer to make sure it gets to its destination.

There are two modes for IPSEC; the first replaces the insecure headers with secure ones. This sits between the TCP layer and the purely IP layer. The standard TCP/IP headers are just replaced. This is called *transport mode*, which is OK, but both endpoints need to know they're running IPSEC. Another mode, called *tunneling mode*, works around this, hence the term "VPN tunnel," but is a little more complicated: there are some extra headers added, and then the IP packet is on top of the IPSEC packet.

There's a subprotocol of IPSEC called IKE (Internet key exchange), which is cryptographic and allows two endpoints of the connection to share a secret key. This is derived from Diffie-Hellman, which is a pretty impressive way to get something from nothing. Since exponentiation is easy in modular arithmetic, but taking logarithms is hard, then Alice can send Bob  $g^a \bmod p$  and Bob can send Alice  $g^b \bmod p$ , so they can both compute  $g^{ab}$ , but nobody seeing just  $g^a$  and  $g^b$  can efficiently calculate  $g^{ab}$  (as far as we know). This is cool, but how does each know that they're talking to each other? They end up signing their messages, which means they do have a shared secret with the other party, as opposed to, say, a middleman.

This is a little more of a headache with mobile networks: when you move around with your phone, your IP address changes, and this disrupts a lot of things. So there's a proposed protocol to keep a mobile device's IP address constant, but this comes with its own issues, and so on.

In a local area network, how do you protect it from attackers from the outside? One way is a firewall. For example, one common configuration is a screened subnet: there are two routers separating out the internal network from a perimeter network, such that everything that must go to the internal network is routed through the firewall in the perimeter network. This can be a software or hardware protocol.

Firewalls basically work via packet filtering; that is, they use transport-layer information only, including but not limited to the IP source or destination, the protocol (TCP, UDP, and so on), the source and destination ports, TCP flags, and so on. For example, since DNS uses port 53, a firewall can block port 53 except for known DNS servers. This also blocks some address forgery, e.g. if a packet comes from the rest of the Internet with a source coming from the internal network, it will get filtered.

Understanding some network conventions is a good way to learn how to build good firewalls. Typical servers have a low port numbers, e.g. 23 for Telnet and 80 for HTTP. Clients, however, can use whatever port

---

<sup>13</sup>It's hard to tell what makes a "bad" route in BGP, because traffic, outages, etc. mean that it may actually be a good idea to reroute intranational traffic out of the country. There are also weird corporate reasons, e.g. one routing company may want to avoid having to pay another, at a very slight cost of traffic.

they want, and often do. So if you have an SMTP server and only want people on the internal network to read your email, you can assign it to port 25 and then block incoming packets on that port.

Packet filtering can also be stateful (also dynamic). For example, you can tell whether a packet is part of a video, but video that wasn't asked for is likely part of a DoS attack, so the firewall can try to block video packets that weren't asked for. More generally, the firewall can use memory to check what users on the network asked for, and then block nonrequested traffic.

FTP is a little complicated; it has two TCP connections, one for commands and one for data. Correct use of this protocol has a very specific pattern; in particular, a firewall can check if this is suspiciously out of order and therefore know what to block. This defense often makes or breaks a good firewall, since it's so complicated.

Last time, we talked about packet fragmentation: packets that are too large are broken up, with instructions on how to patch them together. Sometimes, people make maliciously incorrectly broken packets to fool firewalls, e.g. you can change the header of the final fragment when the packets are reassembled, and therefore send packets that appear to get through the firewalls, but actually shouldn't; this is another example of something to be aware of when writing firewalls.

Some firewalls are application level, and therefore work as proxies. This means they can reassemble whole messages, not just packets, and therefore see viruses and such on a higher level. Nowadays, people also can scan web traffic more generally.

Next, let's talk about intrusion detection. This is basically about telling whether an attack is going on; then, you can decide to block and/or how to repair any damage. The point is to monitor the network and then take preventative or corrective action.

There are two ideas: the most reliable, but least general, is to keep a list of known attacks and block those. A more general way to do this is to keep track of what looks normal, and block things that aren't normal. This is trickier and less reliable, since it's hard to tell what normal is, but it can find new attacks. A common open-source monitor, called Snort, can combine these two, testing incoming packets against a boatload of rules that make packets look more or less suspicious.

A Snort rule has a list of headers and options that determine whether a packet satisfies a rule; then, the header determines whether to alert if it was flagged, and whom to alert. For example, one could create an alert if there's a TCP packet aiming for the `mountd` daemon (on port 111, with a specific bit pattern indicating the suspicious action); then, you can alert someone or automatically block these.

Misuse detection (the database) works great, but the database keeps getting larger, and anomaly detection, the other idea, is still an open area of research.

Let's talk about BGP, where big autonomous systems tell other autonomous systems how to route their packets, e.g. what their neighbors are. This ends up working like a heartbeat, with everything constantly updated; it's used extremely widely, so infrequent errors still happen.

To protect this, we need to sign all of the messages from one node to the other, and propagate this along the network. This is called address attestation, so that each node validates all the messages it receives (i.e. "I am a valid path from *A* to *B*"). However, this isn't all that useful unless everyone in the world switches to SBGP more or less at once, just like switching from driving on the left to driving on the right.

We also talked about DNS lookup, where a someone asks the local DNS resolver where a given URL is, and receives an IP address to connect to. The local server asks other servers, so there's lots of caching. This is thoroughly insecure and open to manipulation, especially by network attackers, who could rewrite packets to send people to the wrong places all the time. Basically, there's no checking of anything, and so you can even send random forged packets with the hope they match people's requests.

Hence DNSSEC, which hopes to add integrity of messages, by signing the messages to and from DNS servers. In each reply, there's a signature of the information, and therefore it can be verified. For example, when you have a statement exists, you sign "*A* exists," but what if it doesn't exist? Most DNS lookups are for things that don't exist, thanks to caching. But saying "*B* doesn't exist" can leak some information. NSEC3 hashes the owner names, so that information isn't leaked to anyone listening. This can be incrementally adopted.

Another interesting attack is called DNS rebinding: Alice has a firewall which ought to protect her corporate web server from Eve. But Alice visits an evil website, and thus issues a DNS lookup for it, which also has a TTL (time to live), so that the resolvers have to refresh occasionally. A week is a reasonable length of time for this, but the attacker at the evil DNS server sets its TTL to zero. Then, the website issues an image

request for the evil server, but thanks to the lack of TTL, it has to be looked up, and therefore gets a different IP address corresponding to an internal network, violating the same origin policy.

This is a great example of an attack: it uses two good ideas in security in twain to cause unintended behavior. But a defense is for the browser to ignore the TTL if it's too short. This is called DNS pinning and isn't a great solution, but is nice. And HTTPS will also eliminate a lot of problems.<sup>14</sup> But this can also be blocked with Alice's firewall: specifically, it can look for DNS packets that say an external name maps to an internal IP address (since it knows its internal hostnames), and then block those.

Lecture 16.

## Denial of Service Attacks: 5/19/15

*"Fortunately, there was a solution, so we're still alive. If there wasn't, we wouldn't be alive."*

Recall that a network denial of service (DoS) attack is an attack where someone tries to just crash a server, rather than gaining access to something. There are many reasons people may want to do this, beyond just trolling, e.g. political stuff, online gaming, and eBay auction engineering. The reason this is interesting is that typically it is done with a small origin network, and amplified somehow. In particular, we want to look at bugs which make DoS attacks considerably easier, rather than just possible (a large enough network can DoS anything, right?).

Let's look at the WiFi protocol 802.11b, which makes just about every mistake in the book. There are trivial radio jamming attacks, but that's a different course. The protocol includes a NAV field (navigation allocation vector). Then any node in the network can reserve the entire channel for that many seconds. This is badly designed, but in this particular case isn't a problem, because clients just ignore it!

A more alarming problem, not anticipated by the designers of the protocol, is the de-authentication bug: any node can send a de-authentication packet to remove itself from the network, but the de-auth packet is unauthenticated! So Eve can send a de-auth packet pretending to be Alice, and then Alice's laptop is kicked off the network. This is all right, since Alice can reconnect, but it takes time, and Eve can just keep sending de-auth packets to keep Alice off the network. Thus, this is even a targeted DoS attack. This was fixed in 802.11i, and the protocol doesn't allow unauthenticated de-auth packets.

There's an amplified attack called (for some reason) a Smurf attack, which works as follows. The DoS source sends a request to the broadcast address (which is usually used to set up printers, etc.), which is only possible thanks to a misconfiguration in some networks. This means that the broadcast address generates a request to everyone on the (large) network. For example, sending a ping request whose source is the DoS target means that every reply in the network goes to the DoS target, which suddenly gets hundreds of packets hitting it at once, thanks to the misconfiguration: the correct defense is to never have the broadcast defense open to the outside world, which would make your network a tool for DoS attacks against other systems. It's better to just keep that address within the network. In this attack, the target doesn't even know who's targeting him! There's no attribution on the Internet, which is an important thing to remember (e.g. for DoS attacks that appear to be politically motivated).

A more modern-day example is to do an amplification attack with a DNS server. Here, the attacker sends a DNS request, but with the source IP that's equal to the DoS target. DNS requests are small, but if you ask for an extended DNS request (EDNS), the response is 3 KB, which is a pretty effective amplification. Moreover, since there are tens of millions of open DNS resolvers, this can make some impressive amplifications. For example, in March 2013, there was an attack using over a million resolvers sending 309 *gigabits* per second for half an hour. These kinds of DoS attacks have been growing and growing until this huge one. A similar attack works against NTP servers (imagine thousands of people telling you what time it is).

Recall that in an IP header, every address has a source address and a destination address, and for TCP, the header has SYN and ACK flags, used in the TCP handshake. Recall that the sequence numbers were chosen at random, and are stored on the server, used to acknowledge that packets reached their destination.

Imagine that a SYN was received, but an ACK wasn't. This is called a *half-open connection* (how optimistic!), and stays in a buffer with 16 slots until it times out, about a minute later. This enables a devastating DoS attack, where you send 16 different SYN packets every minute with random source IP addresses; then, new SYN packets are dropped, and nobody else can connect. So a single person could send sixteen SYN packets

<sup>14</sup>As a security consultant, you can make a lot of money just telling people (and more importantly why) to use SSL.

to a server, and therefore nobody can connect. Multiply by 100, and a single machine can certainly send 1,600 packets and bring down 100 servers!

This is called a SYN flood attack, and has been around since the late '90s. It was also a big issue for eBay for a little while. Another example was the MS Blaster worm of 2003, which DDoSed the Windows update website that would have fixed it.

It's hard to make the buffer variable-sized, since this is all happening in the kernel, but fixed-size buffers of any size are vulnerable to DoS attacks in general (a useful website to keep in mind).

The key is that the server has to allocate resources when the client makes a connection, and we can't really change the clients. So how do we make the clients hold state, while staying within TCP/IP? The solution is called "Syncookies," in which a secret key and data in the packet is used to generate the server's sequence number, instead of just passing the sequence numbers around in the SYN and ACK fields. The reason they'd been passed around was to verify them, but we can do that with a MAC. Let  $k$  be the server's secret key; then, the server computes

$$L = \text{MAC}_k(\text{SAddr}, \text{Sport}, \text{Daddr}, \text{Dport}, \text{SN}_C, T),$$

which is 24 bits, and looks completely random to anyone without the key. Thus, the server can use these values to check any ACK packets, and in particular does not need to save any state on the server! Syncookies are pretty important for these attacks, so you should definitely be using them.

However, 24 bits is a little small, since we have no space. Since these are dropped after a minute, one chance in sixteen million is acceptable.

But remember the lesson: *if you implement things with fixed upper bounds, an attacker could exploit things with a DoS attack*. Thus, attackers might try to grab hundreds of thousands of computers with a botnet and use them to flood a server with SYN packets (this is the real SYN flood, and is the more common use of that name). Thus, the server dies for their SYNs. Again, with spoofed source IP addresses, it's not clear where the flood comes from and we don't know who to block.

A paper out of San Diego had a beautiful idea: they wanted to check how often this happens. A server under a SYN flood sends a SYN/ACK to a random IP address — and if you randomly receive a SYN/ACK packet, something fishy is going on. They called this *backscatter*, and in fact listened to  $2^{24}$  unused addresses for SYN/ACK packets that shouldn't be received, and used this to determine who was under attack and how large or frequent the attacks were.

When they wrote this in 2001, there were 400 attacks a week; nowadays, a company makes these measurements, and discovered that there are 700 different addresses attacked by SYN floods every day. These aren't science fiction; they're happening all the time! There are attackers who, given a credit card and an IP address, will do the DDoS attack for you.

One famous example of DDoS was the Estonia attack, even if it's not particularly interesting. In 2007, Estonia wanted to move a statue of a Russian hero from the center of town to the outskirts; this upset some Russians, and so *the whole country* came under a DDoS attack: ICMP floods, TCP SYN floods, and the like. It targeted banks, newspapers, and government sites, coming from outside the country. The scale of the attack isn't large now, but was huge back then.

The four Estonian ISPs noticed that traffic within Estonia was normal, but everything else was crazy, so they cut traffic off from the rest of the world; thus, Estonian intranational traffic could carry on as normal, if not anything else. (Fortunately, the bots weren't from inside the country!) Then, after two weeks, the attack dwindled, and the ISPs opened back traffic again.

For another example, BetCris.com was a betting site in Costa Rica, one of many. These sites aren't really protected by law, so they got threatened to be DDoSed by an attacker or pay up (two weeks before the Super Bowl!). This site didn't pay, so the attacker used 20,000 bots to generate two gigabits of traffic per second. This caused all traffic to Costa Rica to crash, including all other betting sites, which therefore put pressure on BetCris to pay the ransom.

But from this came a solution, and even a business, ProLexic! The idea is the business owns a lot of routers, so that they can handle extremely high-rate SYN floods, and then smaller sites can hide behind them. The idea is that this business establishes data to a website only when a full TCP connection is established (rather than just SYN packets for a flood: there may be many SYNs, but few ACKs). Then, the website isn't even fully accessible to the outside Internet, just behind the proxy. This gets complicated in practice, but this is the general idea.

There are other ways to flood, e.g. TCP SYN packets to a closed port, which generates a reset packet to the DoS target, or null packets, or resets, or echo requests! As long as you keep the server busy, it doesn't really matter what you send. Prolexic keeps these away from the server, so as long as you have this protection, this is the end of simple SYN floods.

But an attacker has hundreds of thousands of bots, so why not issue ACK requests, too? They can complete the connection and then send plenty of requests! These are a lot harder to tell from real users, so this bypasses the SYN flood protection — but now we know what the IP addresses are that are generating lots of traffic, so you just block those IPs (or rate-limit them), and the bot army can't do anything. Prolexic does track this.

There's even a way around this, which is what happened to GitHub two months ago. The attacker controls the network that connects to a popular server; then, when someone connected to the server, the attacker injected a little Javascript code that causes the DDoS.

```
function imgflood() {  
  var TARGET = 'github.com/index.php?'  
  var rand = Math.floor(Math.random() * 1000)  
  var pic = new Image()  
  pic.src = 'http://' + TARGET + rand + '=val'  
}  
  
setInterval(imgflood, 10)
```

This means that the user's computer asks for an image from GitHub every 10 seconds while the user is at the popular website. GitHub negotiates the connection, and then issues a 404 — but it has to keep doing that. And since the bots are different every 30 seconds, it's hard to block IPs.

The first idea is to turn on SSL, which is a great idea until you realize the country that is orchestrating this attack (as far as we can tell) owns a CA. Welp. The next idea is to use CSP, but the attacker can strip the CSP header, and then the attack continues as planned. SSL, at the very least, would enable us to know who was behind it, not that they seem to care much.

So it's hard to come up with ideas. SSL seems to be the best idea; this CA is no longer trusted: not quite revoked, but reduced in what it can sign. And this is so easy it could have been Project 3!

**Route Hijacking.** Another way to make a DDoS is through route hijacking.

Youtube is at the IP address 208.65.152.0/22, i.e. it owns this and the next  $2^{10}$  IP addresses (since  $32 - 22 = 10$ ). The main one is 208.65.153.238. At some point in 2008, a Pakistani telecom wanted to block Youtube by advertising a BGP path for 208.65.153.0/24, which is  $2^8$  IP addresses, so that they could reroute the requests from within Pakistan to a website claiming Youtube is down.

But what happens is that for BGP, the more specific address propagates, and therefore soon enough, the entire Internet thought that was Youtube. The Pakistani server went down pretty quickly. Then, the folks at Youtube started yelling at their service providers, and then the attack was fixed within two hours (manually deleting the erroneous route).

There's a proposal to make these changes only possible if you can prove you own that domain, but right now it's still an open vulnerability.

DoS can happen at higher layers, too, e.g. the SSL handshake. The client does SSL encryption, and the server does SSL decryption, which is about  $10\times$  harder. Oops, so one client can amplify computation, e.g. by decrypting way too many SSL requests. In fact, the client can just send garbage without encrypting, but the server has to check by decrypting before throwing it out, so one client can make a lot of work for a server! And using something like Prolexic would be tricky, because that means it could read your data, becoming an authorized man-in-the-middle. Thus, this isn't exactly an option for banks, though there are ways to keep things encrypted.

But all is not completely hopeless; there are many defenses, and one of particular note. The problem with DoS is that the client can force the server to allocate resources before the client does, so if we force the client to do work, then the situation is made more equal (sort of like some spam solutions). For example, the server won't do RSA decryption before it's convinced the client has also done work. These are actually very similar to Bitcoin puzzles.

One example is, given a challenge  $C$ , find an  $X$  such that the first 20 bit of the SHA-256 hash of  $(C, X)$  are zero. This is basically only possible by trying lots of values, and checking a solution is very easy. These



can be implemented during heavy DDoS attacks to rate-limit clients, and this can be made fine-grained by controlling the number of bits needed. However, this does require a change both to clients and to servers, and it hurts low-power, legitimate clients. This particularly hits cell phones, tablets, and now smart watches. The issue is that the CPU power ratio of a good server to a cell phone is huge (e.g. 8,000), but the memory-access time ratio is much closer to 2. Thus, better puzzles are the ones that require lots of main memory accesses (e.g. computations on a large table  $S$ ), which take roughly the same amount of time on all computers, and are more recommended.

Lecture 17.

## Mobile Platform Security Models: 5/21/15

*"I don't get it? What's so hard about being cool?"*

The last project and last homework are up — the latter is again relatively straightforward.

On mobile platforms, different OSes do things differently, so we'll talk about the approaches given by Android, iOS, and Windows.

One lesson is that things take time: the early adopters of the Apple Newton carried around an impressively modern-looking smartphone, back in 1987. Twenty years later we really had the smartphone; arguably the biggest thing to make a difference was a realistic keyboard, and because we can use it as a phone, even though we usually don't. Maybe it's a general trend: we went from very expensive memory to very inexpensive memory, but then computers shrank, so memory became important. Then it was solved, and became important again on laptops, and then twenty years later is important again on mobile phones. And now we have the first smart watches. . .

So you might think that the questions we ask today about mobile protocols and decisions are a little bit transient, but they're the same kinds of questions we end up asking ourselves every other decade in a different guise.

Anyways, in the smartphone world, Android is becoming the most dominant, and the rest are more or less holding market share; see Figure 3. Along with phones, we have a whole new class of software, mobile apps, and with them a whole new kind of vulnerabilities. For example, there's a business in malware involving paid-for SMS messages, attacks involving location, and even recording phone calls or logging messages. The scarier of these attacks have been fixed, more or less.

In the seven months ending in March 2014, Kaspersky et al. detected 3.5 million attacks in 1.0 million users; more scarily, this was heavily weighted towards the end of the period (though the number of users also greatly increased). About 60% of the attacks involved stealing someone's money, typically involving premium SMS. The largest numbers of reported attacks were in Russia, India, Kazakhstan, Vietnam, Ukraine, and Germany.

A typical SMS-like scenario is low-tech: you take over a phone and send garbage to make money for someone else. Specifically, the attacker creates an affiliate website, inviting Internet users to become their accomplices; for each accomplice, a unique modification of the malware is made, with a custom landing page. Then, participants have to trick Android users into installing the malicious app, and receive a cut of the profits made from the SMS attacks that result. There's no way of knowing how fair the cut is, but some studies have shown that they end up being fairer than you might expect.

One famous iOS worm was called Ikee. Hilariously, it RickRolled its users while also exploiting an ssh vulnerability.

The different kinds of phones made have important differences. Of course, the base OS is different, Windows or Unix, but there's also the different restricted parts of the App Store or Google Play, and the programming languages, .NET, or Objective-C (and Swift), or Java. There's also a big ecosystem of object-oriented support, media and graphics layers, voice, databases, and so on.

One important, but generic, concept is that of a sandbox. For example, the hardware and firmware is separated from the software layer, so, e.g. encryption isn't as vulnerable to software attacks, and the kernel is isolated from other software. This sandboxing means that the security model is actually pretty good; we were able to take the best parts of years of security research and start anew.

There are several security models in play for mobile devices.

- Device security (e.g. a lockscreen), which prevents unauthorized use of the device.
- Data security, protecting the data, including erasing it if it's stolen.




FIGURE 3. Global smartphone market share over the past six years.

- Network security and software security is as discussed before.

App security includes yet more sandboxing for runtime protection, so that the system resources and kernel are shielded from user apps, and apps can't access each other's data. Moreover, some things, such as code prevention, are disabled. For iOS, all apps must be signed with an Apple-issued certificate, and apps can leverage built-in hardware and encryption.

Let's talk more about the iOS sandbox. It's really not about code control as much as file isolation: each app has its own idea of what the filesystem looks like: its own root directory, etc. This means that it can't access or interact with the data for another app. Moreover, the content of a file is encrypted, and its metadata with the filesystem key, and the metadata of all files is encrypted with a hardware key (for use in on-demand erasure of data, if need be). This means that getting access to the file requires two keys; it looks like a lot of encryption and protection, but remember: who has the keys?

The surprising thing here is that all of the keys are sitting on the device somehow, so if someone has a binary dump of data from an iPhone, they can recover the keys: most of the data in the dump won't be random-looking, but the keys will be, making it possible to try only a few possible keys.

Another attack, the "Masque attack," used the fact that iOS didn't check certificates for apps with the same bundle identifier, and therefore a malicious app could use ad-hoc replacement to overwrite other apps (where they had the same bundle identifier). For example, this would take advantage of automatic software update mechanisms. People were prompted with a popup to ask whether to trust the user, but of course they always did, and so forth.

Android's structure is quite similar, but with a C runtime and the JVM for running apps. One major difference is that it doesn't try to prevent bad apps from running (e.g. apps are self-signed), but rather gives

users the ability to see what privileges an app has. Of course, people aren't the best about understanding and using these effectively.

The open-sourceness of the code and libraries helps prevent security through obscurity and find bugs, and there's some degree of overflow protection. Android apps are isolated: each application runs as a different user on the OS, for example. This is stronger sandboxing than iOS, e.g. apps have to announce how they interact with each other, and this has to be approved by the central system. Application 1 asks Application 2 to do something for it, and each has some set of permissions. For concreteness, assume Application 1 can read and write a file, and Application 2 can read a file; thus, it's OK for 1 to call 2. In generality, we have a partial ordering of permissions, where  $A \geq B$  if  $A$  has all of the permissions  $B$  does (and possibly more); then, component  $A$  can call component  $B$  iff  $A \geq B$ .

The heap also has some overflow protection: the heap is a doubly linked list of memory statements, and the processor continuously checks that back-forward-back is equal to back, and similarly with forward-back-forward, which preserves heap integrity. There are a few security mechanisms baked right into the JVM, which protect against array overflows, amongst other things.

Thus, the major differences between the two are the approval process for iOS, and Android's finer-grained application permissions.

For a third approach, let's talk about Windows. There's a lot of similar stuff going on: device encryption, signed binaries, secure booting, etc. There's also a policy of least privilege and isolation, with the *chamber*, a grouping of software that share security policies, the basic unit of security. Different chambers have different amounts of privilege: there's a Trusted Computing Base (TCB), things that implement security mechanisms, which we have to trust, and other levels: elevated rights, standard rights, and a Least Privilege Chamber (LPC). There are some dynamic permissions in the LPC. Apps in the Windows Phone Marketplace also list their permissions.

Each application runs in its own isolated chamber; all apps have basic permissions. However, there's no communication between different apps, or even between one app and the keyboard cache of another. Moreover, when the user switches apps, the previous app is shut down, which not only saves battery, but prevents some vulnerabilities.

One interesting aspect of the .NET framework is the notion of managed code. It also appears in Android's Java, and it's really hard to find out where it originally came from. Anyways, the idea is to govern when one piece of code is allowed to ask another piece of code to do something. Thus, in the .NET environment, a piece of code can be annotated with permissions to indicate whether it is allowed or disallowed to do certain things. For example, to call unmanaged code, one needs the unmanaged security privilege. But you could restrict the permissions, and anything that runs around the permissions is caught by the system.

This gets a little more interesting when  $A$  calls  $B$  which calls  $C$ , and  $C$  tries to do something sensitive. .NET requires that, in this case, the entire stack of code has the privilege that  $C$  needs. This "stack-walk" primitive prevents  $B$  from lying to  $C$ , so to speak, and using it to do something it shouldn't. But this applies just as well to  $A$  duping  $B$ , and so on. This managed execution happens in .NET and Java, but not on iOS's Objective-C. Sometimes, stack walking goes too far (e.g. carefully constructed code is known not to be malicious), such as asserts that code is safe, which seems like something that could be misused.

Lecture 18.

## Mobile Malware: 5/26/15

There are several major motives for installing mobile malware, including a few to obtain money, a few to steal private data, and a few to propagate malware. Recently, adware has been increasing, along with data theft, but there's been fewer SMS attacks.

One of the big trends associated with mobile platforms is that many institutions, corporate and governmental, try to interact with their employees' phones, and therefore there has been malware that tries to get into individual devices to gain information on organizations. For example, there was an attack on jailbroken iPhones called XAgent, which collects texts, contact lists, geolocation data, and can turn on voice recording. In fact, it can send messages and receive commands thanks to the phone's Internet connection. This is the idea of command and control (C & C) configuration, which was pioneered in botnets and allows trend analysis or en masse collection of data.

An example for Android was an app circulated by email from friends to friends that contained an app containing the schedule to the World Uyghur Conference, which looks perfectly reasonable on first glance. But it also has command and control behavior, once again collecting data for espionage. We don't know how this got started, but it circulated as an honest app from user to user, making it hard to detect with automated tools.

Now that these exist, we'd like to be able to identify them, especially at the app store level rather than the platform level. For example, Aiken, Mitchell, et al. made a system called STAMP which combines static and dynamic analysis to determine how libraries behave, and then looking at the apps that run on top of that. The goal is to have an abstract model of program execution as a state machine, with actions associated with each transition, and therefore determine which applications are most suspicious (e.g. reading sensitive data).

One result of running this is dataflow analysis, e.g. the geolocation data can be sent to SMS or the Internet in plausible runtime conditions, which is a useful thing to know. Other sinks include email, browsers, the filesystem, broadcast messages, and so on. Thus, we don't really know whether the information sent is exactly the location, but sometimes it's changed somehow, e.g. a function computed on it. This can automatically generate fine-grained privacy policies, and can discover some vulnerabilities (e.g. untrusted data from the Web is used in an unescaped SQL call). One can also look at this to determine whether the app's permissions are reasonable for its purpose (e.g. why is a conference app reading my voicemail?) — but it's hard to get a good consensus on what is reasonable. When you have user discretion, you'll get all kinds of answers.

Directly analyzing the app can be too cumbersome, and sometimes this means it can be approximated with models of the device and the hardware. Whole-program analysis is also an option sometimes.

Another example was a contacts sync app for Facebook and Android contacts. Out of the possible flows from permissions, it seems suspicious: it asks for way more permissions than reasonable, and sure enough, it does write Facebook contacts to one's contact book, but also reads contacts and sends them to the Internet.

So now, we can define malware as those apps which have behavior that disagrees with what a sensible, reasonable user has agreed to. This is what code analyzers have been trying to detect.

In Android apps, a tool called WebView allows one to embed a browser of sorts into an app. This means that Java code calls Javascript code (on the website), which can call the Java code on the phone it's loaded on. Of course, this can cause some security fun: it's important for the phone app and the website to be coordinated in some way. This is a really valuable way to get a whole class of mobile apps: not just remote access to the web, but also a good way to build an app, mostly as web content and then a shell app on the phone, to avert storage size issues.

In the browser, we have isolation based on the Same Origin Policy, to prevent, e.g. ads on a page interacting with the page itself. But in WebView there's no SOP, and this means all code on the site has access to the app, which can cause some security issues; this idea just isn't designed for mixed content, just a web backend for an app frontend, where the site and app developers are the same person. It turns out that, out of 737,828 apps available on Google Play, over 560,000 load a browser, and many of these use the Javascript bridge, so this is pretty common.

But this comes (of course) with vulnerabilities. For example:

- (1) Sometimes, this could cause the app to load untrusted web content, e.g. some malicious website. At this point, you can probably imagine what could happen, so it's imperative that if you use WebView, you need to have a whitelist for which websites to load. This means looking for vulnerabilities in untrusted data being passed into the function that loads URLs. It turns out that out of the 40,000 apps that use the JavaScript bridge, about 34% can reach untrusted content (no override, or an incorrect override). One common issue was that not all code paths passed through a whitelist method.
- (2) Another issue is that the program can leak the URL data to the outside world.

The analysis often comes down to the difficult question of what a trusted source actually means. Relatedly, should these connections be served over HTTPS? If it can be forced to be sent over HTTP when it should be HTTPS, that's considered a vulnerability, and this affects a reasonable number of them. The trick is that the UI is left to the app developer, so often these errors (or the certificate error, below) are just ignored.

Another, more significant (and alarming) issue is SSL errors, e.g. being presented with an incorrect certificate. Then, the certificate warning that would be typical in the browser is sometimes silently ignored on an app.

But there are lots of apps that nobody cares about, right? Maybe the situation is that the larger and more popular apps are more secure. But then they did a survey, and there's not much of a correlation between security and popularity: the biggest apps are only slightly more secure than the apps downloaded by one or two people. Some of this is because common vulnerabilities can come from libraries, rather than from individual code mistakes.

So the conclusion is that, of course, you don't want to have someone be able to load untrusted content onto your app's connection to the website, but we can use static analysis to determine whether these things are safe. Even though the static analysis can be somewhat formal, this is a very concrete subject.

Lecture 19.

## Malware, Viruses, and Antiviruses: 5/28/15

Since this is Dan Boneh's last lecture (next lecture is a guest lecture), we're going to summarize some fundamental and important security principles.

- (1) **Never mix control and data.** In 1971, AT&T ruled the telecommunications industry, and had a fairly open network, where anyone on the network was trusted, e.g. when you hang up the phone, it generates a signal which tells the operator to disconnect the call. This was a 2600-Hz signal embedded along with the voice content. But in 1971, Cap'n Crunch cereals came with a whistle that sounded at 2600 Hz, so people would make international calls, sound the whistle (so it stopped charging for the call), but keep talking, so they got nearly free international calls.<sup>15</sup> The error was that the control signal was part of the voice data, not a separate band of data.

Another example of this is a buffer overflow, where data (a buffer or local variables) overflows the return address (which is control); the issue is data being kept together with control on the stack. SQL injections could also be thought of in this way. Cross-side scripting is another great example: content is confused for script, where the user's content is interpreted as Javascript and changes the page.

The takeaway is that when you design systems, keep data from the user in one place, and control structures in another, and don't mix them, so that these sorts of attacks don't happen.

- (2) **Isolation and least privilege.** Always run with the minimum privilege needed.
  - Consider an HTTP server, which needs to read and write to sockets, but at first it needs to bind to port 80. This requires root privileges, but is basically the only reason it needs them. It would be bad to give it root access just for that, since it makes your system more vulnerable; instead, bind to port 80 and then shed the privilege, so that an attacker who successfully gets shell access only has user privileges.
  - **Defense in depth:** if one component of a system is compromised, it doesn't give arbitrary privileges. For example, `qmail` is divided into components, not all of which need root access: thus, if you compromise most of the components, you get no additional privileges: to write to port 25, you need to take down the specific component that writes to that port, but that's the only component which makes it possible.
  - Beware the "confused deputy," in which part of a system is compromised, so that an attacker can send input to an uncompromised part and use it to do whatever it wants. Thus, you should verify that a call of one component comes from an authorized source before just using it to do arbitrary things, though this can be a difficult thing to design sometimes.
- (3) **Threat modeling.** This is important for designing systems in large groups. The idea is to think about different kinds of attackers; for example, what if we know that an attacker who can compromise *X* can access *Y* too? Then, we should harden *X*'s security or decide that *Y* isn't important. We didn't talk about this too much in this class, but it's important: consciously look for different kinds of attacks in your system and place security accordingly.
- (4) **Does obscurity actually help?** Should the system design and the source be kept secret? This is not an easy question: there's no right or wrong answer, and different situations require different approaches. Here are two examples where the results need to be different.
  - (a) One business is credit-card fraud prevention, where heuristic tests are used on spending patterns to determine if a credit card number has been stolen (e.g. purchases from Palo Alto suddenly

<sup>15</sup>This is the origin of the name of 2600, a famous hacker group.

change to those in Kyrgyzstan). If the attacker knew which heuristics were used to determine how likely it was for a card to be stolen, the attacker can inject other transactions in that make it seem less suspicious, so this one should be kept closed-source.

- (b) For access-control systems (i.e. an implementation of a cryptographic protocol), it should be open-source, so that everyone can verify. This is because there is a correct way to do it, rather than the cat-and-mouse games that happen in the previous example, so it's better for people to know how correct the implementation is.

The theory is that if more people look at the code, the bugs will be found faster. But maybe the attackers will find some vulnerabilities we don't know about, and they wouldn't have found them if not for the source. Since attackers are very able to analyze binary code these days, though, releasing the source doesn't make too much of a difference to the attackers, but it's not a very clear-cut question nonetheless.

On to malware. Here are some things malware can do.

- (1) It can propagate, so that it infects more machines.
- (2) It could log keystrokes, and therefore also figure out passwords (e.g. one called Zeus for banks, which is from 2007, but still can be found here and there today).
- (3) Ransomware encrypts your disc (the best ones use public-key encryption), and will release the decryption key if you pay them. Interestingly, there are whole sites reporting the "customer experience" (e.g. how easy it was after you paid); some accept payment only in Bitcoin, and therefore have elegant pages about how to install Bitcoin. The best way to subvert ransomware is backups.
- (4) Click fraud generates fake clicks on ads, to generate revenue for the advertisers.
- (5) Sabotage, e.g. Stuxnet or CIH (from 1998), which overwrote BIOS code.

Malware also lives at many layers, e.g. the data level (malicious Office documents or PDFs, which can contain executable code!); the application level (more common viruses which attack Outlook or so on); rootkits, which infect the OS; the master boot record (which runs right after the machine boots, and can be a target for malware), which can be defended with something called trusted computing; and most fundamentally, the BIOS.

BIOS infections are very interesting, because once the BIOS is overwritten, there's very little you can do to save the computer, reinstall things, etc. In 2004 and 2006, there were malware and rootkits that targeted the BIOS; since there were many different kinds of BIOS, it's hard to target all of them, but the BIOS is uncompressed and then run to save space, so the attackers realized that all of them used the same uncompression algorithm. Thus, they wrote code targeting the decompression algorithm, which was the common vector, and so they could successfully inject malware.

There's a modern version of this called UEFI, which means the BIOS can be signed (verified hardware?!): before any module is loaded into a running system, its signature is verified. This is nice in theory, but there are lots of vendors and so a few lost their signing keys (e.g. one put their secret key on a public website). So now we need to send revocation messages to machines across the world — the spec has support for revocation, but it's not clear how to get the revocation data onto everyone's machines. Right now, the best solution appears to be software update. Notice the lesson: there are lots and lots of issues that come with implementing systems at scale, and often they require more work and more code, which are important to do before your code is deployed or your customers infected.

We can also talk about the exploit life cycle, which starts at the release day. A *zero-day exploit* is one discovered in the wild, not by the software company. Then, machines get infected, and a patch is released and spreads, but the exploit never quite goes away, just asymptotically tails off, because not everyone updates their software, etc.

A public disclosure (also called a responsible disclosure) is where a researcher informs people what went wrong, so the patch comes out first. Of course, then an exploit is developed soon after, and the same graph with the infections and then the asymptotic tail happens, but it's often less severe. This reduced severity is why responsible disclosure is so important.

## Defenses.

- (1) An antivirus engine often runs by signature scanning. Then, the scanner has a list of virus "signatures," i.e. a bunch of regular expressions. The scanner just checks for anything that matches those regular



expressions. What's most important is that they stay up to date, which they do by downloading new signatures all the time. This was the first kind of antivirus software.

- (2) The next generation of viruses were encrypted viruses (also packed viruses, packed malware), where there is a little decryption code followed by a body of encrypted code (which could be huge). Thus, on every infection, it changes the encryption key and therefore gets a new encrypted body, so using a signature is rather difficult. To defend against this, antivirus writers targeted the decryption code.
- (3) Now, of course, virus writers wrote *polymorphic viruses*, where the decryption code was randomized too: now no signature will work. The solution is emulation of the code, so that when something is run, the first time it is run in an emulator; if it doesn't do anything suspicious, then it is blessed and can run in the future. This is slow, but was able to fend off this generation of viruses.
- (4) Now, there are ways around this: e.g. run benignly the first time, or wait 10 minutes to become malicious (which won't be caught by the emulator), or be malicious on Tuesdays (so it's unlikely the emulator notices the first time). This last one is a very important technique, because the attacker only has to be malicious once in a while, but the defender has to be on guard all the time, which is the fundamental asymmetry of these kinds of viruses.

Notice this cat-and-mouse game keeps happening. Just as there is no perfect virus, there's no perfect virus detector. In fact, it's *provable* that the cat-and-mouse game will go on forever.

**Claim** (Cohen '87). There is no program that can tell whether any piece of software is malicious..

These are always proven by contradiction (as detailed in CS 154).

*Proof.* Suppose  $A$  is a perfect virus detector, i.e. if  $A$  is run on a file  $F$ ,  $A(F)$  is "yes" if  $F$  contains malware and is "no" otherwise. Then,  $A$  is a public algorithm,<sup>16</sup> so the attacker can build a virus  $P$  embedded in a file  $F$  that will fool  $A$ .

$P$  will run the following algorithm.

- Run  $A(F)$ .
- If  $A(F)$  returns "yes," (so that  $F$  is malicious), then exit.
- If  $A(F)$  indicates that  $F$  is benign, then spread and attack.

That is,  $P$  calls  $A$  on itself.

What happens when we run  $A$  on  $F$ ? If  $A(F)$  says "yes," then  $F$  contains malware, and therefore  $P$  doesn't do anything, and thus  $A$  was wrong. But if  $A(F)$  says "no," then  $P$  does something malicious, so  $A$  is also wrong. Thus, no such  $A$  can exist.  $\square$

Some partial defenses exist, however, e.g. the scanners mentioned above. There's also whitelists, or checksummers, where a system only runs "approved" code which is run only if its hash is on a list, so if the code is modified by a virus, it's no longer on the list. This is great for your grandparents, who use only Facebook and Skype, but you are probably reading this because you write your own code, and so whitelisting wouldn't work for you: your programs are unique!

So there's a long tail: many people only run common programs, so whitelisting is a really good solution, but there are some people who are the only people using a given program, and for those people, whitelisting is not a good solution.

Finally, there's a method called behavioral blocking: a system learns what normal user behavior is, and then kills the applications that deviate from normal user behavior. This, of course, has many false positives, simply because humans sometimes do things differently. So far, nobody has managed to get this to work right.

Lecture 20.

## Computer Security in the Real World: 6/2/15

Today's lecture was given by Oded Horovitz, at Facebook, who talked about insights and trends that are happening in security in industry, right now. He's worked on computer security for seventeen years,

<sup>16</sup>All virus scanners are public, e.g. a good one at [virustotal.com](http://www.virustotal.com), so in fact attackers use this service to test whether their software will be caught by detectors!

and before Facebook worked at PrivateCore, VmWare, McAfee, and Entercept. Since he likes software development, he prefers the defensive side, building cool stuff rather than proving things can be broken.

Here are a few industry trends you may or may not be aware of.

- **Mobile is the new desktop**, and iOS is the new Windows. We started with an elegant and clean security model, but then came the users and the apps, and then the iCloud. Though these were unbelievable breakthroughs and mobile security does get a lot of stuff right compared to desktops, things never go quite so perfectly. All the things that could fail did somewhere. Ask yourself: can you trust your device with certainty? People don't think that as much anymore. Do people care more about cost/performance or security? Who really owns your device and your data? And is it possible for there to be an ideal security model for mobile? People seem to want something that just works, for the cheapest price, and security is an afterthought. For example, have you personally looked at the root certificate of your phone?
- **SaaS** (software-as-a-service, à la Dropbox or Facebook) **is killing shrink-wrapped software** (literally shrink-wrapped, that is). This leads to a radical change of data ownership: if you use software you installed with a CD on your computer, it's your data on your computer, and you're licensing the software. Nowadays, whose data is it? You often don't pay for SaaS, and the data is on their servers. Moreover, all the complexity in the environment is shifted to the server, which affects how you write code. But also, how is this made secure? It basically seems to be "security by insurance," via trusting that someone else has secure servers.
- **Cloud infrastructure adoption** — especially for small startups, it's much easier to rent server space rather than buy and administer servers.<sup>17</sup>
- Though virtualization made the cloud, **the cloud is killing virtualization**; virtualization isolation and mobility enabled AWS, maybe the largest cloud service (courtesy of Amazon), and this fueled the development of SaaS, but as more and more things became embedded in the cloud, there's less and less need to use virtualization. For example, a startup that's growing quickly can rent an expanding amount of server space if need be, which makes growing a lot nicer. But this too is a cycle: maybe fifteen years from now you'll be able to purchase a CPU with the abilities of a healthy part of AWS. And when that happens, we won't need the cloud anymore, right? And then this cycles back to more powerful cloud servers, and so forth.
- **Security breaches are becoming existential**. As an example, look no further than *The Interview*, which led to Sony getting hacked by... someone. As a result, the movie was published for free, and a lot of other information was published too. The idea that someone can make this happen is pretty scary, so security people are working hard to try and prevent things like this. And when you do clean a system, how do you know it's clean? There are so many ways to infect a system and they can interact in weird and wonderful ways. As another disturbing example, today there was a worry that United's network was hacked into, and therefore all of their flights were grounded for an hour.

Here are some stories that come from the front line.

- **It's hard to sell future-proofing**. We learned in this class and CS 255 about all sorts of things that we have to do or else our code will get attacked. But convincing management or the customers or accounting that this is necessary is often pretty difficult. If you work in security, you'd better get used to butting up against people. For example, in a startup called Entercept, people knew that buffer overflows were possible as early as 1998, but nobody cared, until the code-red worm in 2001. After this problem, it was a lot easier to convince people to be careful about security. Little is different today: people aren't taking a whole lot of action. As a countermeasure, we need some logical security controls around things like networking or syscalls.
- **The art of hooking and/or interposition**: learn to write malware like a black-hat, and you'll be better at writing defensive software. Can you interpose on a syscall? Can you inject into an already running process? Try to hook a function that might never return, and therefore it's important to support transparent removal of hooks. Can you do this when others might hook into the same location?
- **Having tools is useful** — given a packet or a binary source, can you discover the vulnerability? Can you do this with a vendor patch? If you know the vulnerability, what's the best hook? These are

---

<sup>17</sup>Relevant xkcd: <http://xkcd.com/908/>.

made considerably easier if you have some tools to assist you. On the offensive side, there's a rapid shellcode development toolchain; doing it just in assembly takes forever.

- **The Cat-and-Mouse Game** is something we've talked about before, where the attacker and the defender work around each other and get more and more complicated. Can we put an end to this back-and-forth? At VmWare in 2007, people worked to do this by innovating to make the OS's execution more transparent, allowing executed pages to be read. The virus is trapped in a VM, and file accesses are kept in another VM, and so on, which makes the cat-and-mouse game considerably harder to play. There are some cool systems innovations, scanning code and either whitelisting or blacklisting to make sure that malicious code isn't run.

These innovations are cool, but can they be sold as a product? Convincing people to buy into this stuff is hard, but these developments also had operational advantages (e.g. the antivirus lives on a single system in the network, rather than the whole thing, and this has scheduling and other advantages), and this helped convince people to try it. This is easier than producing and marketing a piece of shrink-wrapped software, which is an advantage of working with an infrastructure company: you're probably creating an API, which will be driven by someone else, but have some liberty there.

- **Can one compute privately in the cloud?** This was the premise of PrivateCore, a small startup that was brought by Facebook not that long ago. Basically, it's hard to trust an anonymous cloud server, and here people are trying to build guarantees for secure coding. Related to this is providers of "bare metal as a service" and "infrastructure-as-a-service," along with SaaS, which provide varying levels of physicality or software. In these levels of application along the stack, how do you verify trust? How do you know that there's not a backdoor? Another question is the physical perimeter: basically, there's a guy at the front of the building (datacenter? cage? CPU?) who checks badges. Where is the best security boundary for this? Relatedly, where does the responsibility for infrastructure-as-a-service go? It's sort of in the middle, so it could arguably be pushed onto the provider or onto the user.

PrivateCore decided the CPU was the perimeter of computation, and that physical security was the CPU package itself. This was the reasonable conclusion when they tried to make the most minimal yet natural physical security domain. They managed to load the software stack into the cache (which was a little bit tricky) and then could test it, testing the integrity of the system, provision secret keys, and add some security, e.g. filtering things from the device I/O, and a device called DMA protection, restricting which code can access what memory. There are a lot of different parts of the physical infrastructure (!) that we can't trust and might assume to be malicious, and this is where this stuff becomes important; for example, device drivers accept input from everywhere in the device, so are often vulnerable. Finally, of course, since the CPU is the boundary of physical security, everything outside of the CPU was encrypted.

There are other companies that want to secure the cloud stack, but PrivateCore is the only one that pins its certificate for the cache and encrypts things that are on top of that. Other services often encrypt the disk, and sometimes even the registers, but the cache seems to be relatively unexplored.

Finally, what makes a good security engineer? Your first step, but not last step, is to have good fundamentals, such as this class. Along with this, general software skills don't hurt, and lots of experience is a good thing. Finally, constructing your own security model from your projects by abstracting from your various projects is also a good thing to do.

An important component of this is knowing your domain. It's a castle: you ought to know what goes in and out; what is inside of it that you can leverage or need to protect; and who might want to break in. These are often overlooked.

Vertical integration is nice, but also play both sides: be aware of offense and defense. Of course, that doesn't mean one should go to Bulgaria and become a black-hat, but try to find weaknesses in your system, and try to attack the attackers too. Don't be overconfident about everything, especially your defenses, but meanwhile if you do suffer a setback it's not necessarily the end of the world. Installing "road-bumps" to slow down attackers can be helpful, but sometimes isn't.

Finally, be able to write or use your tools, and understand the difference between writable and read-only data: where can you place your sensors? And good input is the most critical success measure.