

Reverse Engineering (RE) and Binary Patching

Log into your VM (user / 1234), open a terminal and type in infosec pull ex-reversing.

- When prompted, enter your username and password.
- Once the command completes, your exercise should be ready at /home/user/ex-reversing/.

When you finish solving the assignment, submit your exercise with infosec push ex-reversing.

Reminder - IDA

In the recitation, we've seen the basics of using IDA for reverse engineering a binary, and for figuring out where and how to patch it. In this homework assignment we will use IDA a lot. Make sure you re-review the slides/video if you need a refresher.

Luckily for you we've already installed it on your machines. After downloading this exercise, you'll be able to launch IDA from the terminal¹, by typing the command idapath/to/your/binary (with the path to the binary you wish to disassemble). If IDA complains that it can't find your file, try to use it's <u>absolute path</u> (you can use \$pwd/path/to/your/binary).

Question 1 (60 pt)

In this exercise you will reverse engineer an example program that validates files using some logic. You will unravel the dark magic of what's happening inside the binary, and experience how this information can be exploited in various ways.

- All files belonging to this question are under the **q1/** directory.
- The binary we will be working on is the q1/msgcheck program; this program receives a path to a file to validate, and returns 0 if the file is valid and 1 if it's invalid.

```
/home/user/3/q1$ ./msgcheck 01.msg
valid message

/home/user/3/q1$ echo $?

Print the exit code
← It's indeed valid
```

¹ You will need to close and then re-open the terminal, for this to work.



```
/home/user/3/q1$ ./msgcheck 02.msg
invalid message
/home/user/3/q1$ echo $?
1
```

Run the program on 02.msg
← File seems to be invalid

Print the exit code
← It's indeed invalid

Part A (20 pt)

First, reverse engineer the msgcheck program to understand which messages it considers valid and which messages it considers invalid.

Then, inside q1/q1a.py, implement the check_message(path) method, so that it receives a path to a .msg file and returns True on valid messages and False on invalid messages. You don't need to handle issues with invalid paths or files that can't be opened.

Document your solution (briefly!) inside q1/q1a.txt.

Part B (10 pt)

Now, we'll write a Python script to fix .msg files so that they become valid. Inside q1/q1b.py, implement the fix_message_data(data) method, so that it receives the data of a .msg file and returns a fixed message.

Note: Fixing does NOT mean destroying the content of the message - it means making a small change while keeping the most of the content unchanged. In case of doubt, or for more details, see the <u>Appendix</u>.

```
/home/user/3/q1$ ./msgcheck 02.msg
invalid message
/home/user/3/q1$ echo $?
1
/home/user/3/q1$ python3 q1b.py 02.msg
done
/home/user/3/q1$ ./msgcheck 02.msg.fixed
valid message
/home/user/3/q1$ echo $?
0
```

Document your solution (briefly!) inside q1/q1b.txt.

Part C (10 pt)

Find another way to fix .msg files, implement the fix_message_data(data) method in q1/q1c.py, and document your solution (briefly!) inside q1/q1c.txt. Note that two methods should be different conceptually and not just two implementations of the same idea.



Still not sure what's considered different? See the appendix.

Part D (10 pt)

This time, instead of fixing the message files, we will patch the program itself! We will do this by patching the program so that it always follows the valid code branch (regardless of whether the message is valid or not²).

Inside q1/q1d.py, implement the patch_program_data(program) method, so that it receives the bytes of the msgcheck program and returns a patched version of the program.

```
/home/user/3/q1$ ./msgcheck 02.msg
invalid message
/home/user/3/q1$ echo $?

1
/home/user/3/q1$ python3 q1d.py msgcheck
done
/home/user/3/q1$ chmod +x msgcheck.patched
/home/user/3/q1$ ./msgcheck.patched 02.msg
valid message
/home/user/3/q1$ echo $?
0
```

Document your solution (briefly!) inside q1/q1d.txt.

Part E (10 pt)

Find another way to patch the program, this time so that it returns **0** for all messages (whether valid or not), but without changing anything else (i.e. the output to the screen).

Inside q1/q1e.py, implement the patch_program_data(program) method, so that it receives the bytes of the msgcheck program and returns a patched version of the program.

Document your solution (briefly!) inside q1/q1e.txt.

```
/home/user/3/q1$ ./msgcheck 02.msg
invalid message
/home/user/3/q1$ echo $?
1
```

² You only need to patch the program path that handles the message content, you don't need to make it work for files that don't exist or couldn't be opened.



```
/home/user/3/q1$ python3 q1e.py msgcheck
done
/home/user/3/q1$ chmod +x msgcheck.patched
/home/user/3/q1$ ./msgcheck.patched 02.msg
invalid message
/home/user/3/q1$ echo $?
0
```

Question 2 (40 pt)

In this exercise you will patch a binary to implement more interesting logic than just changing a return value or print. The program we'll patch is q2/readfile - a program that reads files line by line. For example, for the file q2/1.txt the output will look as follows:

```
/home/user/3/q2$ ./readfile 1.txt
Line 1
Line 2
#!echo Victory
Line 3
/home/user/3/q2$
```

Our goal is to patch the program so that every line beginning with a #! will be executed (but not printed). For example, for q2/1.txt the result of patching would be:

Inside q2/q2.py, implement the patch_program(path) method, so that it receives a path to the readfile program and write the patched program to the path together with a .patched suffix.

Since this question is potentially challenging, try following the steps detailed below:

1. Reverse engineer the **readfile** program and find **dead zones** into which you can patch your code (we added these zones deliberately in this program, so



they're going to be hard to miss:))

- 2. Out of the two dead zones, one is quite big (has plenty of space for your code) and one is very small (doesn't have enough space for our code, but we can use it to redirect to our code in the other dead zone). Identify which is which.
- 3. Use IDA to figure out the offset in the code (binary) of each patch, and also the virtual address of each patch.
- 4. Inside q2/patch1.asm write x86 assembly for what we'll patch into the small deadzone code to perform the redirection from the small deadzone to the big deadzone.
- 5. Inside q2/patch2.asm write x86 assembly for what we'll patch into the big deadzone:
 - a. The code will check if the string starts with #! or not.
 - b. For lines not starting with #!, it will jump back to the original code, right **before** the call to printf.
 - c. For lines starting with #!, it will first call system (a standard library function to execute a string as a shell command³) and then jump back to the original code, right after the call to printf.
- 6. To assemble the code from the .asm files, you can use the code we provided you inside infosec.core.assemble:
 - a. First do from infosec.core import assemble
 - b. Then call assemble assemble file (to get the binary machine code for the assembly in the file) or assemble assemble data (to get the machine code for instructions directly specified in a string)
 - c. For more documentation on the assemble module, run

```
ipython3 -c 'from infosec.core import assemble; help(assemble)'
```

Document your solution (briefly!) inside q2/q2.txt.

Final notes:

- This exercise is more challenging than the previous ones. It does not mean it's impossible, but please please don't leave it for the last minute.
- Document your solutions.
- Don't use any additional third party libraries that aren't already installed on your machine (i.e. don't install anything).

³ How wonderful that it was "miraculously" included in the readfile program:)



• If your answer takes an entire page, you probably misunderstood the question.

Appendix - Minimal changes and differences between 1B and 1C

When we ask to make a minimal change in a file, it means not to change most of its content (i.e. aside from a few bytes, all bytes should remain unaffected).

- 1. It's OK to edit a "valid" message file to fix it. It's unnecessary, but you won't lose points for that.
- 2. You may add a few bytes, remove a few bytes, or change existing bytes. All of these are OK, as long as most of the bytes are unmodified.

When we ask for different solutions in part 1B and 1C, we mean solutions based on different ideas, and not just two implementations of the same fix.

- 1. If your first solution adds/edits a byte that has a role X, and your second solution adds/edits a byte that has a different role, that is OK
 - a. For example, a null terminator has a different role than a length field
- 2. If your first solutions adds a byte to fix <some problem> and then the second solution adds two bytes to fix the <same problem>, that's not considered different solutions
- 3. If your first solution modifies bytes in position X, and then the second solution modifies bytes in position X+1, unless these bytes have different roles, these are not different solutions