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Review — What’s on the stack?

bool num_of_users = 0;

bool login () {
    ......
    if (password_expired())
        reset_password();
    ......
}

void reset_password() {
    ......
    char usr[20], char pwd[100];
    gets(&usr); gets(&pwd);
    update_hash_file(usr,
        compute_hash(pwd, salt));
}

Each frame has:
- local data for the function
- a pointer to the previous stack frame (sfp)
- the value of previous PC (ret address)

Stack grows this way

Frame for login
int foo (void (*funcp)()) {
    char* ptr = point_to_an_array;
    char buf[128];
    gets (buf);
    strncpy(ptr, buf, 8);
    (*funcp)();
}

int bar (int val1) {
    int val2;
    foo (a_function_pointer);
}

Stack Corruption: General View

How about dictate the string and stack grow in the same direction?
Attack #1: Return Address

Change the return address to point to the attack code. After the function returns, control is transferred to the attack code.

… or return-to-libc: use existing instructions in the code segment such as system(), exec(), etc. as the attack code.
Basic Stack Code Injection

• Executable attack code is stored on stack, inside the buffer containing attacker’s string
  - Stack memory is supposed to contain only data, but…

• For the basic stack-smashing attack, overflow portion of the buffer must contain correct address of attack code in the RET position
  - The value in the RET position must point to the beginning of the “attack assembly code” in the buffer
    Otherwise application will crash with segmentation violation
  - Attacker must correctly guess the position of his stack buffer when the function is called
**Attack #2: Pointer Variables**

Change a function pointer to point to the attack code. Any memory, on or off the stack, can be modified by a statement that stores a compromised value into the compromised pointer.

```c
strcpy(buf, str);
*ptr = buf[0];
```
Off-By-One Overflow

• Home-brewed range-checking string copy

```c
void notSoSafeCopy(char *input) {
    char buffer[512]; int i;
    for (i=0; i<512; i++)
        buffer[i] = input[i];
}
void main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    if (argc==2)
        notSoSafeCopy(argv[1]);
}
```

1-byte overflow: can’t change RET, but can change saved pointer to previous stack frame

On little-endian architecture, make it point into buffer
Caller’s RET will be read from the buffer!
Attack #3: Frame Pointer

Change the caller’s saved frame pointer to point to attacker-controlled memory. Caller’s return address will be read from this memory.
Buffer Overflow: Causes and Cures

- Typical memory exploit involves **code injection**
  - Put malicious code at a predictable location in memory, usually masquerading as data
  - Trick vulnerable program into passing control to it
    Overwrite saved EIP, function callback pointer, etc.

- **Idea:** prevent execution of untrusted code
  - Make stack and other data areas non-executable
    Note: messes up useful functionality (e.g., Flash, JavaScript)
  - Digitally sign all code
  - Ensure that all control transfers are into a trusted, approved code image
Mark all writeable memory locations as non-executable
- Example: Microsoft’s Data Execution Prevention (DEP)
  - This blocks (almost) all code injection exploits

Hardware support
- AMD “NX” bit, Intel “XD” bit (in post-2004 CPUs)
  - Makes memory page non-executable

Widely deployed
- Windows (since XP SP2), Linux (via PaX patches), OS X (since 10.5)
What Does \(W \oplus X\) Not Prevent?

- Can still corrupt stack ...
  - ... or function pointers or critical data on the heap
- As long as “saved EIP” points into existing code, \(W \oplus X\) protection will not block control transfer
- This is the basis of \textit{return-to-libc} exploits
  - Overwrite saved EIP with address of any library routine, arrange stack to look like arguments
- Does not look like a huge threat
  - Attacker cannot execute arbitrary code, especially if \texttt{system()} is not available
Return-to-LIBC on Steroids

- Overwritten saved EIP need not point to the beginning of a library routine
- Any existing instruction in the code image is fine
  - Will execute the sequence starting from this instruction
- What if instruction sequence contains RET?
  - Execution will be transferred… to where?
  - Read the word pointed to by stack pointer (ESP)
    - Guess what? Its value is under attacker’s control! (why?)
  - Use it as the new value for EIP
    - Now control is transferred to an address of attacker’s choice!
  - Increment ESP to point to the next word on the stack
Chaining RETs for Fun and Profit

[Shacham et al.]

◆ Can chain together sequences ending in RET
  - Krahmer, “x86-64 buffer overflow exploits and the borrowed code chunks exploitation technique” (2005)

◆ What is this good for?

◆ Answer [Shacham et al.]: everything
  - Turing-complete language
  - Build “gadgets” for load-store, arithmetic, logic, control flow, system calls
  - Attack can perform arbitrary computation using no injected code at all – return-oriented programming
Other Issues with W⊕X / DEP

- Some applications require executable stack
  - Example: Flash ActionScript, Lisp, other interpreters
- Some applications are not linked with /NXcompat
  - DEP disabled (e.g., some Web browsers)
- JVM makes all its memory RWX – readable, writable, executable (why?)
  - Spray attack code over memory containing Java objects (how?), pass control to them
- “Return” into a memory mapping routine, make page containing attack code writeable
Run-Time Checking: StackGuard

- Embed “canaries” (stack cookies) in stack frames and verify their integrity prior to function return
  - Any overflow of local variables will damage the canary

- Candidate Canaries
  - Choose random canary value picked on program start
  - Terminators: “\0”, newline, linefeed, EOF
StackGuard Implementation

- StackGuard requires code recompilation
- Checking canary integrity prior to every function return causes a performance penalty
  - For example, 8% for Apache Web server
- StackGuard can be defeated
  - A single memory write where the attacker controls both the value and the destination is sufficient
Defeating StackGuard

• Suppose program contains `strcpy(dst,buf)` where attacker controls both dst and buf
  - Example: dst is a local pointer variable

![Diagram showing overwritten stack with canary and RET]

- Overwrite destination of `strcpy` with RET position
- strcpy will copy BadPointer here
- Return execution to this address
- Example: dst is a local pointer variable

BadPointer, attack code

&RET canary sfp RET

buf dst canary sfp RET

Return execution to this address
ProPolice / SSP

[IBM, used in gcc 3.4.1; also MS compilers]
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What Can Still Be Overwritten?

- Other string buffers in the vulnerable function
- Any data stored on the stack
  - Exception handling records
  - Pointers to virtual method tables
    - C++: call to a member function passes as an argument “this” pointer to an object on the stack
    - Stack overflow can overwrite this object’s vtable pointer and make it point into an attacker-controlled area
    - When a virtual function is called (how?), control is transferred to attack code (why?)
    - Do canaries help in this case? (Hint: when is the integrity of the canary checked?)
Litchfield’s Attack

- Microsoft Windows 2003 server implements several defenses against stack overflow
  - Random canary (with /GS option in the .NET compiler)
  - When canary is damaged, exception handler is called
  - Address of exception handler stored on stack above RET

- Attack: smash the canary AND overwrite the pointer to the exception handler with the address of the attack code
  - Attack code must be on heap and outside the module, or else Windows won’t execute the fake “handler”
  - Similar exploit used by CodeRed worm
PointGuard

• Attack: overflow a function pointer so that it points to attack code

• Idea: encrypt all pointers while in memory
  - Generate a random key when program is executed
  - Each pointer is XORed with this key when loaded from memory to registers or stored back into memory
    Pointers cannot be overflowed while in registers

• Attacker cannot predict the target program’s key
  - Even if pointer is overwritten, after XORing with key it will dereference to a “random” memory address
Normal Pointer Dereference

1. Fetch pointer value
2. Access data referenced by pointer

[1234] 0x1234

1. Fetch pointer value
2. Access attack code referenced by corrupted pointer

[0x1234] [0x1340]

Corrupted pointer

[Cowan]
PointGuard Dereference
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[Cowan]
PointGuard Issues

- Must be very fast
  - Pointer dereferences are very common

- Compiler issues
  - Must encrypt and decrypt only pointers
  - If compiler “spills” registers, unencrypted pointer values end up in memory and can be overwritten there

- Attacker should not be able to modify the key
  - Store the key in a memory page inaccessible to adversaries

- PG’d code doesn’t mix well with normal code
  - What if PG’d code needs to pass a pointer to OS kernel?
Libsafe

- Dynamically loaded library – no need to recompile!
- Intercepts calls to `strcpy(dest, src)` and other unsafe C library functions
  - Checks if there is sufficient space in current stack frame: `|framePointer – dest| > strlen(src)`
  - If yes, does `strcpy`; else terminates application
Limitations of Libsafe

- Protects frame pointer and return address from being overwritten by a stack overflow
- Does not prevent sensitive local variables below the buffer from being overwritten
- Does not prevent overflows on global and dynamically allocated buffers
Charge

- Write a C program with too functions
- Call strcpy to copy a string you supply to an internal buffer on the stack
- Try to subvert your own program with “bad” input
  - a “segmentation fault” counts as a “subversion”