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Mission-critical Software Environments

- **Myth:** In mission-critical environments, all software is custom, rigorously tested, and formally verified.

- **Reality:** Most mission-critical environments use commodity software and components extensively.
  - Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS)
    - widely available to attackers
  - mostly closed-source
    - independent security audit not feasible
  - supports mainstream OSes (Windows) and architectures (Intel)
  - some effort at secure development, but no formal guarantees
Critical Infrastructure: Critically Insecure

- 2010: Stuxnet infiltrates and destroys Iranian nuclear centrifuges
  - **Software exploited:** Siemens Windows apps and PLCs
  - Sets Iranian nuclear program back 3-5 years

- 2012: Shamoon virus destroys 30K power control workstations owned by Saudi Aramco
  - **Software exploited:** unpatched Windows NT
  - “All told, the Shamoon virus was probably the most destructive attack that the private sector has seen to date.” —Leon Panetta

- 2014: NOAA satellite system compromised
  - **Software (potentially) exploited:** Windows Mobile
  - “GOES and ESPC did not consistently ensure that Microsoft Windows AutoRun feature was disabled.” —Office of Inspector General [OIG-14-025-A]
Top Linux Vulnerabilities of 2014

- **Heartbleed**
  - OpenSSL vulnerability disclosed April 2014
  - allowed anyone to anonymously grab arbitrary data (e.g., master keys) from internet-facing services
  - affected ~66% of all web servers, email servers, chat servers, VPNs, clients, etc.
  - all versions vulnerable since 2011!

- **Shellshock**
  - Bash shell vulnerability disclosed September 2014
  - allowed complete compromise - remote code execution
  - all versions vulnerable since 1989(!!)
Are In-house Projects “More Secure”? 

- **Idea:** Build all your own custom software in-house from scratch (or contract trusted third-party to build from scratch).
  - expensive, time-consuming
  - error-prone (not built by specialists)
    - 63% of in-house IT projects fail to meet their own specs [Standish Group, 2011 CHAOS Report]
  - poor compatibility, hard to maintain
  - very questionable security assurance
    - vulnerable to insider threats, less tested, shaky design, etc.
    - assurance usually based on myth of “security by obscurity”

- Many COTS advantages
  - constantly updated for new threats
  - tested on a mass scale
  - crafted & maintained by specialists
  - cheaper, mass-produced
Why is Software so Insecure?

- Huge and constantly evolving
  - Windows XP has 40 million lines of code
  - Microsoft Office had 30 million lines in 2006
  - Debian 5.0 has a staggering 324 million lines!
    - contrast: Space shuttle has only 2.5 million moving parts!

- Often written in unsafe languages
  - C, C++, VC++, Visual Basic, scripting languages, ...

- Increasingly sophisticated attacks
  - buffer-overrun
  - direct code-injection
  - return-to-libc
  - return-oriented programming (RoP)
  - implementation disclosure-assisted code-reuse attacks
Code-injection Example

```c
void main(int argc, char *argv[0]) {
    char buf[64];
    strcpy(buf, argv[1]);
    ...
    return;
}
```

```
lea eax,[ebp-48h]
push eax
call <system>
.data "erase"
.data ";*
.data "aaaaa..."
.data "aaaa"
<addr of buf>
```

```
8D 45 B8
dec 50
50
FF 15 BC 82 2F 01
lea 65 72 61 73 65 20
2A 2E 2A 20
61 (x24)
61 61 61 61
30 FB 1F 00
```

```
buf (64 bytes)
saved EBP (4 bytes)
saved EIP (4 bytes)
argv (4 bytes)
argc (4 bytes)
bottom of stack (higher addresses)
```
Code-injection Example

```c
void main(int argc, char *argv[])
{
    char buf[64];
    strcpy(buf, argv[1]);
    ...
    return;
}
```

```
8D 45 B8
50
FF 15 BC 82 2F 01
65 72 61 73 65 20
2A 2E 2A 20
61 (x24)
61 61 61 61
30 FB 1F 00
```

```
lea eax,[ebp-48h]
push eax
call <system>
.data "erase"
.data "*.*"
.data "aaaaa..."
.data "aaaa"
<addr of buf>
```

```
lea eax,[ebp-48h]
push eax
call <system>
erase *.* aaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
```

```
bottom of stack (higher addresses)
```

```
argv (4 bytes)
argc (4 bytes)
<addr of buf>
```

```
aaa
```
Code-injection Example

```c
void main(int argc, char *argv[])
{
    char buf[64];
    strcpy(buf, argv[1]);
    ...
    return;
}
```

```assembly
lea eax,[ebp-48h]
push eax
call <system>
.data "erase"
.data "*.*"
.data "aaaaaaa..."
.data "aaaa"
<addr of buf>
```

- 8D 45 B8 lea eax,[ebp-48h]
- 50 push eax
- FF 15 BC 82 2F 01 call <system>
- 65 72 61 73 65 20 .data “erase”
- 2A 2E 2A 20 .data “*.*”
- 61 (x24) .data “aaaaaaa...”
- 61 61 61 61 .data “aaaa”
- 30 FB 1F 00 <addr of buf>

- top of stack (lower addresses)
  - lea eax,[ebp-48h]
  - push eax
  - call <system>
  - erase *.* aaaaaaaa aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

- bottom of stack (higher addresses)
  - argv (4 bytes)
  - argc (4 bytes)
  - aaaa
  - <addr of buf>
void main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    char buf[64];
    strcpy(buf, argv[1]);
    ...
    return;
}
Code-injection Example

```c
void main(int argc, char *argv[])
{
    char buf[64];
    strcpy(buf,argv[1]);
    ...
    return;
}
```

8D 45 B8               lea eax,[ebp-48h]
50                      push eax
FF 15 BC 82 2F 01       call <system>
65 72 61 73 65 20       .data “erase”
2A 2E 2A 20             .data “*.*”
61 (x24)                .data “aaaaa...”
61 61 61 61             .data “aaaa”
30 FB 1F 00             <addr of buf>

lea eax,[ebp-48h]      push eax
call <system>          erase *.* aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
```

`argv` (4 bytes)

`<addr of buf>`

bottom of stack (higher addresses)

`<addr of “erase *.* ...”>`

`top of stack (lower addresses)`
Code-injection Example

```c
void main(int argc, char *argv[])
{
    char buf[64];
    strcpy(buf, argv[1]);
    ...
    return;
}
```

8D 45 B8  lea eax,[ebp-48h]
50         push eax
FF 15 BC 82 2F 01 call <system>
65 72 61 73 65 20 .data "erase"
2A 2E 2A 20  .data "*.*"
61 (x24)    .data "aaaa...
61 61 61 61 .data "aaaa"
30 FB 1F 00 <addr of buf>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lea eax,[ebp-48h]</th>
<th>top of stack (lower addresses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>push eax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>call &lt;system&gt;</td>
<td>erase <em>.</em> aaaaaaaaaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>argv (4 bytes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;addr of buf&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;addr of &quot;erase <em>.</em> ...&quot;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bottom of stack (higher addresses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pernicious Vulnerabilities

[SourceFire Vulnerability Research 2013]

TOP HIGH SEVERITY VULNERABILITIES

- Buffer Errors: 24%
- SQL Injection: 21%
- Code Injection: 10%
- Access Control: 10%
- Not enough info: 8%
- Resource Management: 4%
- Input Validation: 7%
- Path Traversal: 3%
- Everything Else: 13%
Defense: DEP + ASLR

- Data Execution Prevention (DEP)
  - set stack memory non-executable (hardware-enforced)

- Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR)
  - randomize locations of libraries on-load

- Counter-attack
  - don’t insert any code onto the stack
  - jump directly to existing code fragments
  - called a “code-reuse” attack
void main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    char buf[64];
    strcpy(buf, argv[1]);
    ...
    return;
}
ROP Example

```
void main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    char buf[64];
    strcpy(buf, argv[1]);
    ...
    return;
}
```

data "erase "
data ".*.* 
.data "aaaa..."
data <addr1>
data <addr2>
data <addr3>

top of stack (lower addresses)
eroase *..*
aaaaaaa...

aaaa
<addr1>
aaaa
<addr2>
<addr2>
<addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...
< ... 1024 bytes ... >
system: ...

addr2: add eax, 512
ret
...
addr1: mov eax, [init_display]
call eax
call eax
pop ebx
ret
...
addr3: call eax
ret

top of stack (lower addresses)
erase *.*

aaaaaaa...

<addr1>

aaaa

<addr2>

<addr2>

<addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...
< ... 1024 bytes ... >

system: ...

addr2: add eax, 512
ret
...

addr1: mov eax, [init_display]
call eax
pop ebx
ret
...

addr3: call eax
ret

top of stack (lower addresses)
 erase *.*
 aaaaaaaa...

aaa

<addr1>

aaaa

<addr2>

<addr2>

<addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...
< ... 1024 bytes ... >
system: ...

addr1: mov eax, [init_display]
call eax
pop ebx
ret

addr2: add eax, 512
ret

addr3: call eax
ret

top of stack (lower addresses)

erase *.*
aaaaaaaa...

eax = init_display

aaaa
<addr1+5>
aaaa
<addr2>
<addr2>
<addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...
   < ... 1024 bytes ... >

system: ...

daddr2: add eax, 512
   ret
   ...

daddr1: mov eax, [init_display]
call eax
call eax
   pop ebx
   ret
   ...

daddr3: call eax
   ret

eax = init_display

top of stack (lower addresses)

   erase *.*
   aaaaaaaaa...

   aaaa
   <addr1+5>
   aaaa
   <addr2>
   <addr2>
   <addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...
< ... 1024 bytes ... >
system: ...

addr1: mov eax, [init_display]
call eax
pop ebx
ret

addr2: add eax, 512
ret

addr3: call eax
ret

top of stack (lower addresses)
erase *.*

aaaaaaa...

<addr1+5>

aaaa

<addr2>

<addr2>

<addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...
< ... 1024 bytes ... >

system: ...

addr2: add eax, 512
ret
... 

addr1: mov eax, [init_display]
call eax
pop ebx
ret
...

addr3: call eax
ret

eax = init_display

top of stack (lower addresses)

erase *.*

aaaaaaa...

aaaa
<addr1+5>
aaaa
<addr2>
<addr2>
<addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...
< ... 1024 bytes ... >
system: ...

addr2:  
add eax, 512
ret
...

addr1:  
mov eax, [init_display]
call eax
call eax
pop ebx
ret
...

addr3:  
call eax
ret

eax = init_display+512

top of stack (lower addresses)

erase *.*
aaaaaaaa...

aaaa
<addr1+5>
aaaa
<addr2>
<addr2>
<addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...

< ... 1024 bytes ... >

system: ...

addr2: add eax, 512
       ret

addr1: mov eax, [init_display]
       call eax
       pop ebx
       ret

addr3: call eax
       ret

eax = init_display+512

top of stack (lower addresses)

  erase *.*
  aaaaaaa...

  aaaa
  <addr1+5>
  aaaa
  <addr2>
  <addr2>
  <addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...
< ... 1024 bytes ... >
system: ...

addr2:   add eax, 512
  ret
  ...
addr1:   mov eax, [init_display]
call eax
call eax
pop ebx
ret
  ...
addr3:   call eax
  ret

eax = init_display+1024 = system !!!

top of stack (lower addresses)
erase *.*
 aaaaaaaa...

aaaa
<addr1+5>
aaaa
<addr2>
<addr2>
<addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...
< ... 1024 bytes ... >
system: ...

addr2:
  ...
  add eax, 512
  ret
  ...
addr1:
  mov eax, [init_display]
  call eax
  pop ebx
  ret
  ...
addr3:
  call eax
  ret

eax = init_display+1024 = system !!!

top of stack (lower addresses)
erase *.*

aaaaaaa...

aaaa

<addr1+5>

aaaa

<addr2>

<addr2>

<addr3>
ROP Example

init_display: ...
< ... 1024 bytes ... >
system: ...

addr2: add eax, 512
ret ...
addr1: mov eax, [init_display]
call eax
pop ebx
ret ...
addr3: call eax
ret
eax = init_display + 1024 = system !!!
top of stack (lower addresses)
erase *.*
aaaaaaa...

eax = init_display+1024 = system !!!
Battling Code-reuse Attacks

- Microsoft’s 2012 BlueHat Competition
  - Focused on RoP Mitigation
  - $260,000 total for top three solutions
    - Successful attack against 2nd place solution was published two weeks later

- Google Pwnium Competition
  - Hacker Pinkie Pie paid $60K for Chrome RoP exploit
  - Google fixes the exploit
  - Five months later, Pinkie Pie finds a new RoP exploit in the fixed Chrome, gets paid another $60K
  - Google fixes the 2nd exploit
  - Five months later, Pinkie Pie finds a yet another (partial) exploit, gets paid another $40K
Code-reuse Conflict Timeline
Secure commodity software AFTER it is compiled and distributed, by automatically modifying it at the binary level.
Advantages

- No need to get code-producer cooperation
- No need to customize the OS/VM
- No custom hardware needed (expensive & slow)
- Not limited to any particular source language or tool chain
- Can enforce consumer-specific policies
- Maintainable across version updates (just re-apply rewriter to newly released version)
- Rewriter remains untrusted, so can outsource that task to an untrusted third party!
  - Local, trusted verifier checks results
Challenges

- Software is in purely binary form
  - no source, no debug info, no disassembly

- Diverse origins
  - various source languages, compilers, tools, ...

- Code-producers are uncooperative
  - unwilling to recompile with special compiler
  - unwilling to add/remove features
  - no compliance with any coding standard

- Highly complex binary structure
  - target real-world APIs (e.g., hundreds of thousands of Windows system dll’s and drivers)
  - multi-threaded, multi-process
  - event-driven (callbacks), dynamically linked (runtime loading)
  - heavily optimized (binary code & data arbitrarily interleaved)
Three Major Advances

1) Heuristic-free & Machine Learning-based Binary Disassembly
   - automatically recovers high-level program structure from binary software product
   - Superset Disassembly (NDSS’18): recover a superset of the control-flow graph
   - Finding the Undecidable Path (PAKDD’14): Optimize CFG via machine learning

2) Native Code Instrumentation
   - method of automatically in-lining extra security checks into untrusted programs

3) Formal, Automated, Machine-validation
   - automatically PROVES (mathematically) that retrofitted software is immune to certain classes of attacks
Scope & Limitations

- **Policies we enforce:**
  - **Safety Policies** – “bad things” must not happen
    - access control policies
    - API trace policies (permissible API call sequences)

- **Policies Outside our Scope:**
  - **Liveness** – “good things” must eventually happen
    - Example: Availability
  - **Confidentiality** – secrets must not be disclosed (e.g., possibly disclosed by inaction)
First Step: Disassembly

- Disassemble this hex sequence
- Turns out x86 disassembly is an undecidable problem!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Disassembly</th>
<th>Valid Disassembly</th>
<th>Valid Disassembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FF E0 5B 5D C3 0F</td>
<td>FF E0 5B 5D C3 0F</td>
<td>FF E0 5B 5D C3 0F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 52 0F 84 EC 8B</td>
<td>88 52 0F 84 EC 8B</td>
<td>88 52 0F 84 EC 8B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jumps</td>
<td>jumps</td>
<td>jumps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF E0</td>
<td>FF E0</td>
<td>FF E0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jmp eax</td>
<td>jmp eax</td>
<td>jmp eax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pop ebx</td>
<td>pop ebx</td>
<td>pop ebx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>5D</td>
<td>5D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pop ebp</td>
<td>pop ebp</td>
<td>pop ebp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retn</td>
<td>retn</td>
<td>retn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0F 88 52</td>
<td>88 52 0F</td>
<td>0F 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jcc</td>
<td>mov</td>
<td>db (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0F 84 EC</td>
<td>84 EC</td>
<td>8B ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mov</td>
<td>mov</td>
<td>mov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B ...</td>
<td>8B ...</td>
<td>8B ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0F 88</td>
<td>0F 88</td>
<td>0F 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>db (2)</td>
<td>push edx</td>
<td>jcc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0F 84 EC</td>
<td>8B ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disassembly Intractability

- Even the best reverse-engineering tools cannot reliably disassemble even standard COTS products
- Example: IDA Professional Disassembler (Hex-rays)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Disassembly Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Foundation Class Lib (mfc42.dll)</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Player (mplayerc.exe)</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant Web Browser (RevelationClient.exe)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMWare (vmware.exe)</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innovation: Superset Disassembly

Byte Sequence: FF E0 5B 5D C3 0F 88 B0 50 FF FF 8B

- Disassembled
- Invalid

Hex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Included Disassembly

- jmp eax
- pop
- L1: pop
- retn
- jcc
- L2: mov
- loopne
- jmp L1
- mov
- jmp L2
Problem: Pointers

- We just rearranged everything. Pointers will all point to the wrong places.
  - can’t reliably identify pointer data in a sea of unlabeled bytes

- Two kinds of relevant pointers:
  - pointers to static data bytes among the code bytes
  - pointers to code (e.g., method dispatch tables)
Preserving Static Data Pointers

- Put the de-shingled code in a NEW code segment.
  - Set it execute-only (non-writable)
- Leave the original .text section
  - Set it read/write-only (non-execute)
Almost half of all jump instructions in real x86 binaries compute their destinations at runtime.

Exercise: Why? Examples?

Must ensure these jumps target new code locations instead of old.

impossible to statically predict their destinations
Preserving Code Pointers

- Almost half of all jump instructions in real x86 binaries compute their destinations at runtime.
  - all method calls (read method dispatch table)
  - all function returns (read stack)
  - almost all API calls (read linker tables)
  - pointer encryption/decryption logic for security

- Must ensure these jumps target new code locations instead of old.
  - impossible to statically predict their destinations
Solution: Control-flow Patching

- Create a lookup table that maps old code addresses to new ones at runtime.
- Add instructions that consult the lookup table before any computed jump.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Rewritten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jump eax</td>
<td>jump table[eax]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With these three tricks we can successfully transform (most) real-world COTS binaries even without knowing how they work or what they do!

- de-shingling disassembly
- static data preservation
- control-flow patching

Limitations

- runtime code modification conservatively disallowed
- computing data pointers from code pointers breaks
- These are compatibility limitations not security limitations.

But it’s prohibitively inefficient (increases code size ~700%)

need to optimize the approach
1. If the optimization fails, we might get broken code but \textit{never} unsafe code.

2. The optimizations only need to work for non-malicious, non-vulnerable code fragments.
   - If the code fragment is malicious or vulnerable, we don’t want to preserve it!
Optimization #1: De-shingling

- Lots of extra overlapping information
  - Can we prune our disassembly tree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hex</th>
<th>Path 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>jmp eax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0</td>
<td>pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>L1: pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>retn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>jcc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>L2: mov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Insight: Distinguishing real code bytes from data bytes is a “noisy word segmentation problem”.

- Word segmentation: Given a stream of symbols, partition them into words that are contextually sensible. [Teahan, 2000]
- Noisy word segmentation: Some symbols are noise (data).

Machine Learning based disassembler
- based on $k$th-order Markov model
- Estimate the probability of the sequence $B$:

$$ p(B|M_\alpha) = - \log \prod_{i=1}^{\left| B \right|} p(b_i|b_{i-k}^{i-1}, M_\alpha) $$


Disassembler Stats

# of instructions identified by our disassembler but not by IDA Pro
# PPM Disassembly Stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPM Disassembler</th>
<th>False Negative</th>
<th>False Positive</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7zFM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notepad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DosBox</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WinRAR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>99.982%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mulberry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scummvm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emule</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>99.988%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfc42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>99.987%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mplayerc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>99.963%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revClient</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99.893%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vmware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>99.988%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optimization #2: Lookup Table Compression

- Idea: Overwrite the old code bytes with the lookup table.
  - PPM disassembler identifies most code bytes
  - Also identifies subset that are possible computed jump destinations.
  - Overwrite those destinations with our lookup table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Rewritten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>call eax</td>
<td>cmp [eax], 0xF4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cmovz eax, [eax+1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>call eax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applications of our Rewriter

- Three Applications
  - Binary randomization for RoP Defense (STIR)
  - Opaque Control-Flow Integrity (O-CFI)
  - Machine-certified Software Fault Isolation (Reins)
RoP Defense Strategy

- RoP is one example of a broad class of attacks that require attackers to know or predict the location of binary features.

**Defense Goal**
Frustrate such attacks by randomizing the feature space.
Randomly reorder the program’s internal layout every time the program loads

- Attacker cannot reliably locate code addresses for code-reuse attacks
- Astronomically low chance of attack success
- Exact attack probability is \textit{mathematically computable} as an entropy calculation
Supports Windows PE and Linux ELF files

Tested on SPEC2000 benchmarks and the entire coreutils chain for Linux

1.5% program runtime efficiency overhead on average


- Won 2nd place in the NYU-Poly AT&T Best Applied Security Paper of the Year competition


- Conceals code reachability info to defeat even advanced attackers who can inspect portions of the randomized program memory image!
Windows STIR Runtime Overhead

![Bar chart showing Windows STIR runtime overhead for various benchmarks. The chart displays the overhead percentage for each benchmark, ranging from -10% to 20%. The benchmarks include gzip, vpr, mcf, parser, gap, bzip2, twolf, mesa, art, and equake. The overhead percentages are visually represented by bars in green, indicating the impact on runtime performance.]
Linux STIR Runtime Overhead
Custom Safety Policy Enforcement with Machine-provable Assurance

- untrusted binary code
- Binary Rewriter
- safety policy
- secure binary
- Verifier
  - deploy
  - reject
An API Policy

**function** conn = ws2_32::connect(
    SOCKET, struct sockaddr_in *, int) -> int;

**function** cfile = kernel32::CreateFileW(
    LPCWSTR, DWORD, DWORD, LPSECURITY_ATTRIBUTES,
    DWORD, DWORD, HANDLE) -> HANDLE WINAPI;

**event** e1 = conn(_, {sin_port=25}, _) -> 0;

**event** e2 = cfile("*.exe", _, _, _, _, _, _) -> _;

**policy** = e1* + e2*;

**Policy**: Applications may not both open email connections and create files whose names end in "\.exe".
Reference Monitor In-lining

- In-line security checks as rewriting progresses
  - checks uncircumventable due to control-flow and memory safety
  - ensures complete mediation
REINS - Rewriting and In-lining System

- Prototype targets full Windows XP/7/8 OS
  - significantly harder than Linux
- 2.4% average runtime overhead
- 15% average process size increase
- Tested on SPEC2000, malware, and large GUI binaries
  - Eureka email client and DOSBox, much larger than any previous implementation had accomplished
  - won Best Student Paper at ACSAC
Control-Flow Safety

- Used PittSField approach [McCamant & Morrisett, 2006]
  - Break binaries into chunks
    - chunk – fixed length (16 byte) basic blocks
  - Only one extra guard instruction necessary
  - Mask instruction only affects violating flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Rewritten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>call eax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
cmp [eax], 0xF4
cmovz eax, [eax+1]
and eax, 0x0FFFFFFF0
call eax
```
### Jump Table w/ Masking

**Original Instruction:**

| .text:0040CC9B | FF DO | call eax |

**Original Possible Target:**

| .text:00411A40 | 5B | pop ebp |

**Rewritten Instructions:**

| .tnew:0052A1C0 | 80 38 F4 | cmp byte ptr [eax], F4h |
| .tnew:0052A1C3 | 0F 44 40 01 | cmovz eax, [eax+1] |
| .tnew:0052A1C7 | FF D0 | and eax, 0x0FFFFFFF0 |
| .tnew:0052A1CE | | call eax |

**Rewritten Jump Table:**

| .told:00411A40 | F4 B9 4A 53 00 | F4 dw 0x534AB0 |

**Rewritten Target:**

| .tnew:00534AB0 | 5B | pop ebp |
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