

**1. What were the environment and attack set up? What is/are the ultimate goal(s) for this lab?**

In this lab, we took a program, `stack.c`, and introduced a buffer-overflow vulnerability. In this program a vulnerable `strcpy` command is executed. This `strcpy` reads in an arbitrary length character array from a file and stores it in a fixed length character buffer of size 24. As a result, any file with more than 23 characters will result in a buffer-overflow; 23 because Strings in C end in a terminating character which would take the 24th position.

With this knowledge, we developed an exploit (`exploit.c`) to allow us to execute arbitrary code on the machine. Using the `exploit.c` program, we crafted an exploit specifically designed to give us root access within a shell through the `call_shellcode.c` program that had already been loaded into memory.

By debugging using GDB and 'x/x128x buffer', we determined the address of `str_main` in `stack.c`. In our case, it was `0xbffff198` (in the picture below). We used that address to fill out the beginning of the file used to overflow the buffer (`bad_file`) for 64 bytes. In our case 64 bytes worked because the distance between the "buffer" and the return address of the `call_shellcode` in memory was less than 64 bytes (in the picture below). We then placed several NOP operation in the file, creating a NOP sled for our new return address to point. At the end of this NOP sled, we placed instructions to call the method used to open a shell. The rest of file used to overflow the buffer was filled with NOP with enough bytes to overflow, in our case 256 bytes.

Because the original program (`stack.c`) was constructed by root and then modified to be accessible by a regular user, the shell opened by our buffer-overflow attack was also given root access. As a result, a regular user could execute the `stack.c` program, have it read the `bad_file`, and escalate their privileges to obtain a root shell, as shown by the 'whoami' command (in the picture below).

**2. What were the steps that you take in order to launch the attack? (Note: Make sure you include the shell commands, GDB debugger commands and screenshots of your computer to demonstrate it.)**

- a. as root, compile the `stack.c` program with the stack check disabled
  - i. `gcc -fno-stack-protector -z execstack -g -o stack stack.c`
- b. as root, change the permission on the resulting stack file
  - i. `chmod 4755 stack`
- c. as a regular user, compile the exploit program
  - i. `gcc -o exploit exploit.c`
- d. as a regular user, run the exploit program
  - i. `./exploit`

COSC 647 - Fall 2015 - Harold McGinnis & Mary Snyder  
Lab 1 - Buffer-Overflow Vulnerability Lab

- e. as a regular user, debug the stack program, placing a breakpoint on the copy line, and determine the address of the overflow.
  - i. `gdb -q stack`
  - ii. `break 14`
  - iii. `run`
  - iv. `x/x128x buffer`
- f. as a regular user, modify the exploit.c program and recompile it
  - i. on line 32, change the `add[]` buffer to "98", "f1", "ff", "bf" (accounting for little endian)
  - ii. on line 34, cut off the loop at 64
  - iii. on line 39, cut off the buffer at 256
  - iv. `rm exploit`
  - v. `rm badfile`
  - vi. `gcc -o exploit exploit.c`
- g. as a regular user, run the program exploit
  - i. `./exploit`
- h. as a regular user, run the program stack
  - i. `./stack`
- i. this results in a shell being opened, with root privileges.
  - i. `whoami` (returns the 'root' user as shown below)

**3. What have you learned from this lab? Make at least 3 bullets.**

- Buffer-overflow attacks can be used to execute arbitrary code, including code that can be used for privilege escalation.
- Copying into a fixed length buffer is dangerous and such copies should be checked for size constraints.
- Segmentation faults indicate a vulnerability in the program, which, if properly exploited, can result in a buffer-overflow.
- Memory randomization makes buffer-overflow attacks more difficult as it becomes harder to craft a bad file like that of the lab. Since the memory location would be dynamic, it would be harder to create a return address pointing to the offensive NOP sled.

## Lab 1 - Buffer-Overflow Vulnerability Lab

