# <span id="page-0-0"></span>**Exploiting Software Vulnerabilities** Software Vulnerabilities Control-Flow Hijacking

« **All wrongs reversed** – under CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0 license



Dept. of Computer Science and Systems Engineering University of Zaragoza, Spain

Course 2023/2024

### **Master's Degree in Informatics Engineering**

University of Zaragoza Room A.02, Ada Byron building



# **Outline**

### 1 [A Little Recap](#page-2-0)

- 2 [Buffer Overflows](#page-21-0)
- 3 [Defenses against Control-Flow Hijacking Attacks](#page-43-0)
	- [Stack Data Protection](#page-45-0)
	- [Non-Executable Stack](#page-50-0)
	- [Write XOR eXecute \(W](#page-53-0)<sup>A</sup>X) Pages
	- [Address Space Layout](#page-58-0)
	- [Other Techniques of Defense](#page-66-0)



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 2 / 52

## <span id="page-2-0"></span>**Outline**

### 1 [A Little Recap](#page-2-0)

- **[Buffer Overflows](#page-21-0)**
- 3 [Defenses against Control-Flow Hijacking Attacks](#page-43-0)



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 3 / 52

### Recap on. . . **Definitions**

#### **System/defender perspective**

- **Attack surface**
	- Exposure of a system to attacks
- **Vulnerability**
	- Software flaw that can be exploited by an attacker

### **Attacker perspective**

- **Attack vector**
	- How the attack was carried out
- **Exploit**
	- Succeed by taking advantage of a vulnerability



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 4 / 52

## Recap on. . .

Vulnerabilities

**Types of software vulnerabilities**

**Overflow**

. . .

- **Buffer overflow**
- **Heap overflow** H.
- **NULL pointer dereference**
- **Dynamic memory handling**
	- Use-after-free
	- Double free
	- Allocator abuse
- **Number handling**
- **Format strings**
- **Uninitialized memory**
- Race conditions

### **Vulnerability databases**

- $\blacksquare$  National Vulnerability Database (NVD), maintained by NIST (<https://nvd.nist.gov/>)
- MITRE CVE (<https://cve.mitre.org/>)
- Bugtraq (<http://www.securityfocus.com/archive/1>)



Today we talk about. . .

**Control-Flow Hijacking**

- Attacker's goal: **to seize the target system** 
	- Run arbitrary code to hijack the control flow of a vulnerable application



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 6 / 52

#### **Block of instructions that performs a specific task**

#### **Three components:**

- Input (values passed from the caller)
- Body (code to perform the task)
- Return value (to the caller)

#### **Calling a function involves a branch in the control flow** (i.e., jumping to another location)

The return address is usually stored in the caller's stack frame  $\blacksquare$ 



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 7 / 52

int  $x = compute(arg0, arg1, ...)$ 

What happens in the backstage before a function runs?

#### **Parameters are configured to be passed to the function**

- Either through the stack or logical registers
- **The address of the next instruction after the call is also saved**  $\blacksquare$



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 8 / 52

#### int  $x = compute(arg0, arg1, ...)$

What happens in the backstage before a function runs?

#### **Parameters are configured to be passed to the function**

■ Either through the stack or logical registers

#### **The address of the next instruction after the call is also saved**

What happens in the backstage after a function runs?

#### **Return value is set**

- Normally, the logical register eax contains the return value of a function
- Allocated variables (within the function) are removed from the stack
- $\blacksquare$  Registers used in the function are restored to their previous values
- The control is transferred to the saved return address



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 8 / 52

#### **Standard prologue**

- Occurs at the beginning of a function
- Allocates space for local variables (on stack)
- Saves registers to be reused in the body of the function

#### **Standard epilogue**

- Occurs at the end of a function
- Normally, undoes what was done in the prologue
- Cleans up the stack
- Restores register values



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 9 / 52

#### mov edi, edi

#### **Common prologue on Windows**

- 2-byte length instruction
- Equivalent for a nop instruction, since it does nothing
- Used to hot-patch a running executable, without stopping and restarting it
	- Can be overwritten with a relative jump of 2 bytes!

**Further reading**: Why do Windows functions all begin with a pointless MOV EDI, EDI instruction?. R. Chen, 2011.

<https://devblogs.microsoft.com/oldnewthing/?p=9583>

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 10 / 52

**Universidad** Zaragoza

#### **Calling conventions**

- Describes **how data is passed in/out of functions**
- $\blacksquare$  Implementation may vary by compiler



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 11 / 52

Standard calling conventions

### **Calling conventions**

- Describes **how data is passed in/out of functions**
- **Implementation may vary by compiler**  $\blacksquare$

### cdecl **convention** (most common)

- Arguments are pushed onto the stack from right to left
- Return value is placed in eax
- The caller must clean the stack (removing passed parameters)



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 11 / 52

### stdcall **convention**

- Similar to cdec1, but callee clears the stack
- Convention used in Windows APIs



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 12 / 52

#### stdcall **convention**

- Similar to cdec1, but callee clears the stack
- Convention used in Windows APIs

### fastcall **convention**

- Arguments are passed by registers, put on the stack when a large number of arguments are required
	- For instance, the GCC and Microsoft compilers use the ecx and edx registers
- The callee clears the stack
- Return value is placed in eax

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 12 / 52

Universidad Zaragoza

#### thiscall **convention**

- Used in  $C_{++}$  in object methods (member functions)
- Includes a reference to the this pointer
- Depends on the compiler:  $\blacksquare$ 
	- In Microsoft compilers, ecx holds the this pointer and the callee clears the stack
	- In GNU compilers, the this pointer is pushed last and the caller clears the stack



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 13 / 52

```
#include <iostream >
using namespace std;
class Student {
    public:
        int id; //data member (also instance variable)
        string name; //data member (also instance variable)
    void imprime(){
        cout \lt\lt this \gt id \lt\lt endl;
        cout << this -> name << endl;
    }
};
cdecl int echo(int x){
    return x + 8:
}
int main() {
    Student s1: //creating an object of Student
    s1.id = 201:
    s1.name = "Sonoo Jaiswal";
    s1.imprime();
    printf("echo: %d\nu", echo(4));return 0;
}
```
[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 14 / 52

 $\overline{111}$  Universidad **III** Zaragoza







[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 16 / 52

#### **Pushing data on the stack:** mov **vs.** push

- $\blacksquare$  push always subtracts 4 from the esp register
- mov puts a value on the stack, but does not subtract from esp
- Optimization issue: small performance gain at runtime
	- When used with the stdcall convention, the caller must make special settings



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 17 / 52

#### **Pushing data on the stack:** mov **vs.** push

- **push always subtracts 4 from the esp register**
- mov puts a value on the stack, but does not subtract from esp
- Optimization issue: small performance gain at runtime
	- When used with the stdcall convention, the caller must make special settings

### **Inline functions**

- Eliminate costly control transfers
- Useful for small functions, as their body is inlined with the caller's body
- No extra overhead for entry/exit
- Occurs often with string-related functions

Universidad

# <span id="page-21-0"></span>**Outline**

### 1 [A Little Recap](#page-2-0)

### 2 [Buffer Overflows](#page-21-0)

3 [Defenses against Control-Flow Hijacking Attacks](#page-43-0)



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 18 / 52

#### **Most common vulnerability in C/C++ programs**



**Credits**: taken at 27/10/2022, [https://nvd.nist.gov/]( https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/statistics?form_type=Advanced&results_type=statistics&search_type=all&cwe_id=CWE-119&isCpeNameSearch=false)

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 19 / 52



Universidad

Zaragoza

### A bit of history – the first BOF exploited

- (BSD-derived) UNIX fingerd daemon
	- Utility that allows users to obtain information about other users
	- Usually used to identify the full name or login name of a user, whether a user is currently logged in or not, and other user information

#### **Morris worm** (November 2 1988!)

- Affected Sun 3 systems and VAX computers running 4 BSD UNIX variants
- Exploited a buffer overflow in fingerd to create a remote shell
	- 8) The infection attempts proceeded by one of three routes: reb. flegend, or sendmall
		- 8a) The attack via rsh was done by attempting to spawn a remote shell by invocation of (in order of trial) /usr/ach/rsh, /usr/bin/rsh, and /bin/rsh. If successful, the host was infected as in steps 1 and 2a, above.
		- 8b) The attack via the *flueer* daemon was somewhat more subtle. A connection was established to the remote finger server daemon and then a specially constructed string of 536 bytes was passed to the daemon, overflowing its input buffer and overwriting parts of the stack. For standard 4 BSD versions running on VAX computers, the overflow resulted in the return stack frame for the main routine being changed so that the return address pointed into the buffer on the stack. The instructions that were written into the stack at that location were:
			- pushl \$68732f  $1.7683.01$ pushl \$6e69622f '/bin' mov1  $\sin x = 10$ pushl - so pushl  $$0$ pushl  $x10$ pushl \$3  $m \sim 1$ sp, ap chmk  $53h$

That is, the code executed when the main routine attempted to return was

execve("/bin/sh", 0, 0)

On VAXen, this resulted in the worm connected to a remote shell via the TCP connection. The worm then proceeded to infect the host as in steps 1 and 2a, above. On Suns, this simply resulted in a core file since the code was not in place to corrupt a Sun version of fingerd in a similar fashion.

8c) The worm then tried to infect the remote host by establishing a connection to the SMTP port and mailing an infection, as in step 2b, above.

**Further reading**: The internet worm program: an analysis. E.H. Spafford. 1989. SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev. 19, 1, 17–57. [doi:](http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/66093.66095)dad

[10.1145/66093.66095](http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/66093.66095)

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 20 / 52

**III** Zaragoza

What we need to know

- **How the stack works**
- **Calling conventions**
- **How system calls are made**

#### **Anything else?. . .**

- **Target system CPU**
	- Little-endian vs. big-endian

#### **Target system operating system**

UNIX vs. Windows: stack frame changes!



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 21 / 52

### Linux x86 process memory layout



Check output of: cat /proc/<PROCESS PID>/maps



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 22 / 52

### Buffer overflows Stack frame



- Stack Pointer (%esp): top of the stack
- **Base Pointer (**%ebp**)**: base of the current frame
- **Function arguments belong to the previous stack frame**
	- **Each function defines its own stack frame**

**Note:** Stack grows to lower memory addresses

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 23 / 52



Stack concepts summary

- The stack stores abstract data
- **Last-In-First-Out (LIFO) policy**
- **Assembly instructions of interest**:
	- push: **inserts** an item on top of the stack, **and decreases** %esp by 4 bytes (dword size) pop: **eliminates** the item at the top of the stack, and **increments** %esp by 4 bytes

Stack concepts summary

■ The stack stores abstract data

**Last-In-First-Out (LIFO) policy**

#### **Assembly instructions of interest**:

- push: **inserts** an item on top of the stack, **and decreases** %esp by 4 bytes (dword size)
- pop: **eliminates** the item at the top of the stack, and **increments** %esp by 4 bytes П
- call: **inserts** as the address of the next instruction which immediately follows the call on top of the stack, **and decreases** %esp **by 4 bytes**
- **Return of functions.** %esp is incremented after execution. They accept an optional immediate value, which increments more %esp

retn: near return, **retrieves the top of the stack and sets it as %eip**  $\blacksquare$  retf: far return, **retrieves two dwords from the top of the stack and sets them** 

**as %eip and** cs **(code segment), respectively**. Note that although cs is word size, it takes two dwords off from stack!

> $\overline{111}$  Universidad **III** Zaragoza

Stack concepts summary **On 32-bit architectures**

- **Function arguments**
- **Return address**
- **Local variables**

### **On 64-bit architectures**

- Also stores function arguments, **but differs from 32-bit architectures**:
	- UNIX uses System V Application Binary Interface (ABI): first 6 integer (or pointer) arguments to a function are passed in registers (%rdi, %rsi, %rdx, %rcx, %r8, and %r9); from the 7th argument onwards, the stack is used
	- **Microsoft ABI**: only 4 registers are used (%rcx, %rdx, %r8, and %r9); from the 5th argument onwards, the stack is used

### **Return address**

### **Local variables**

**Further reading**: <http://eli.thegreenplace.net/2011/09/06/stack-frame-layout-on-x86-64>



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 25 / 52

```
void readName(){
  char username[256];
  printf("Type user name: ");
  scanf("%s", username);
}
                                %eip: push ebp
```
readName:



 $\mathbf{I}$ 

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 26 / 52

 $\overline{111}$  Universidad **III** Zaragoza

```
void readName(){
  char username[256];
  printf("Type user name: ");
  scanf("%s", username);
}
                                 %eip: mov ebp, esp
```
readName:





Universidad **ALL** Zaragoza

```
void readName(){
  char username[256];
  printf("Type user name: ");
  scanf("%s", username);
}
                                 %eip: sub esp, 264
```
readName: push ebp mov ebp, esp sub esp, 264 sub esp, 12 push OFFSET FLAT:.LCO printf add esp, 16 subesp, 8<br>Jea eax F eax,  $[ebp - 264]$ push eax push OFFSET FLAT:.LC1<br>call isoc99 scanf call \_\_isoc99\_scanf<br>add esp 16  $e$ sp, 16 leave ret . . . . . . | − %ebp=%esp<sup>→</sup> %ebp @rtn address . . . . . . | +

 $\overline{111}$  Universidad **III** Zaragoza

 $\uparrow$ 



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 26 / 52





What if *username* is more than 264 bytes long?



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 27 / 52



What if *username* is more than 264 bytes long?

- **The adjacent memory to username is overwritten**, since scanf does not check for any buffer limits (it is an insecure function)
- **Arbitrary code execution**, since %eip will pop the top value of the stack when the function returns! **Universidad**

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 27 / 52

Zaragoza

### Basic stack exploit



**stack**

#### 1 **Insert your shellcode on the stack**

■ Shellcode: originally, the minimal code to launch a shell (i.e., exec("/bin/sh")). Today, any code injected regardless of its purpose

#### 2 **Manipulate** @rtn address **to return to your shellcode**

■ Look for assembly instructions that allow redirection of execution to %esp ■ When the vulnerable function ends, the shellcode runs!

**Further reading:** Smashing The Stack For Fun And Profit. Aleph One, Phrack 49 (1996), http://phrack.org/issues/49/14?html?

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 28 / 52

 $\overline{nn}$  Universidad

Insecure libc functions – (non-exhaustive list)

- strcpy  $\rightarrow$  strncpy  $\rightarrow$  strlcpy/strcpy\_s (Windows CRT)
- strcat  $\rightarrow$  strncat  $\rightarrow$  strlcat/strcat\_s (Windows CRT)
- strtok
- sprintf  $\rightarrow$  snprintf
- vsprintf  $\rightarrow$  vsnprintf
- gets  $\rightarrow$  fgets/gets\_s
- scanf/sscanf  $\rightarrow$  sscanf\_s (Windows CRT)
- snscan $f \rightarrow \_$ snscan $f\_s$  (Windows CRT)
- $\blacksquare$  strlen  $\rightarrow$  strnlen\_s (Windows CRT)

#### Some safe versions are misleading

 $\blacksquare$  strncpy, strncat can leave strings unfinished – be careful!

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 29 / 52

Corrupting method pointers – Heap overflow





[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 30 / 52

Corrupting method pointers – Heap overflow



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 30 / 52

Zaragoza

How to hunt overflows. . .

### **Find the overflow**

- Configure the operating system correctly (core dump?)
- Issue malformed inputs **with specific endings** 
	- Automated tools (fuzzers)

#### **If the application crashes, check the CPU registers for the endings**

How to hunt overflows. . .

#### **Find the overflow**

- Configure the operating system correctly (core dump?)
- Issue malformed inputs **with specific endings** 
	- Automated tools (fuzzers)
- **If the application crashes, check the CPU registers for the endings**

### **Build the exploit**

- **Analyze overflow conditions**
- Check if the overflow can lead to arbitrary code execution
	- Not easy, given the latest built-in defenses at the OS level



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 31 / 52

# <span id="page-43-0"></span>**Outline**

#### [A Little Recap](#page-2-0)

#### **[Buffer Overflows](#page-21-0)**

#### 3 [Defenses against Control-Flow Hijacking Attacks](#page-43-0)

- [Stack Data Protection](#page-45-0)
- [Non-Executable Stack](#page-50-0)
- [Write XOR eXecute \(W](#page-53-0)∧X) Pages
- [Address Space Layout](#page-58-0)
- [Other Techniques of Defense](#page-66-0)



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 32 / 52

## Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks Approaches

#### 1 **Fix bugs**:

- Audit software to find bugs (there are automated tools soundness?)
- Re-code software in a type-safe language

#### 2 **Allow overflow, but prevent injected code from running**

#### 3 **Insert runtime code to detect overflows**

**Process stops when overflow is detected** 

**Further readings**: SoK: Eternal War in Memory. L. Szekeres, M. Payer, T. Wei and D. Song. 2013 IEEE Symposium on Security and

Privacy, Berkeley, CA, 2013, pp. 48–62. [doi: 10.1109/SP.2013.13](http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/SP.2013.13)

Memory Errors: The Past, the Present, and the Future. V. van der Veen, N. dutt-Sharma, L. Cavallaro, H. Bos (2012). In Research in Attacks, Intrusions, and Defenses. RAID 2012. LNCS, vol 7462. Springer. [doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-33338-5\\_5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-33338-5_5)

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 33 / 52

 $\overline{111}$  Universidad **III** Zaragoza

## <span id="page-45-0"></span>Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks Stack data protection

#### **Stack cookies**

- Detect stack-based overflows by:  $\blacksquare$ 
	- 1 **In the function prologue, push a magic number**
	- 2 **In the function epilogue, check this value**

## Defeating Control-Flow Hijacking Attacks Stack cookies

■ Initial ideas come from StackGuard (Crispin Cowan, 1997)

**Enhanced by Hiroaki Etoh with** ProPolice (2000)

■ Later renamed to **SSP (Stack-Smashing Protector)**, included in mainstream GCC version 4.1

#### **Types of canaries**:

- **Null canary** (all zeros; 0x00000000)
- **Terminator canary** (0x000aff0d)
	- 0x00 stops strcpy() (and related functions)
	- 0x0a and 0x0d stop gets() (and related functions)
	- 0xff (EOF) stops other functions
- **Random canary**



## Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks Stack cookies

#### **How to protect information stored after the vulnerable buffer?**

- **Add a canary after each buffer and check each time** before accessing any other data stored after it
	- Good idea, may be a compiler modification
	- However, not practical: performance impact
- **Reorder local variables on the stack** to move the sensitive data out of the way of the buffer overflow
	- Side effect of compiler optimizations
	- Implemented as an intentional protection in ProPolice: ideal stack layout
		- **Places local buffers at the end of the stack frame**
		- Relocates other local variables before them
	- Also introduced by Microsoft Visual Studio (/GS feature)



## Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks Stack cookies

#### **Ideal stack layout does not always exist...**

- Multiple local buffers are placed one after another
- Structure members cannot be rearranged (interoperability issues)
- Particular structures (like arrays of pointers) can be overflowed or be treated as sensitive information, depends on the semantics
- Functions with a variable number of arguments remain unprotected
- **Dynamically created buffers on the stack (e.g., alloca()) are placed at the** top of the stack frame

 $\overline{111}$  Universidad Zaragoza

# Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks Stack cookies

readName:



- On Windows, SEH-based exploits
- On UNIX-like systems, we need a memory leak (or bruteforce)

[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 38 / 52

 $\overline{111}$ 

Universidad **III** Zaragoza

### <span id="page-50-0"></span>**BOF exploitation steps**

- **1** Place code in the stack (in the same vulnerable buffer)
- **2** Overwrite a return address
- 3 Jump to it



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 39 / 52

#### **BOF exploitation steps**

- **1** Place code in the stack (in the same vulnerable buffer)
- 2 Overwrite a return address
- 3 Jump to it

#### **Non-executable stack**

- First implemented for DEC on Alpha in Feb 1999
- **Enabled by default on most desktop platforms**, such as Linux, macOS, and Windows

#### **Main weaknesses**:

- **Still allows the return address to be abused**, overwriting it with an arbitrary location
- **Does not prevent the execution of code** already present in the process memory or code injected in other data areas

**Universidad** Zaragoza

## Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks Non-executable stack

#### **Bypassing techniques**

```
■ return-into-libc (ret2libc for short)
```
- Use libc function addresses as return addresses
- The attacker does not require any shellcode to take control of a target, they simply redirect the execution of the control flow as they wish
- We will talk about this more in deep in the last part of the course!

#### **Improved techniques**:

- ret2plt
- ret2syscall
- $\blacksquare$  ret2strcpy, ret2gets (or read(), recv(), recvfrom() variants)
- ret2data
- ret2text, ret2code, ret2dl-resolve
- Chained ret2code (or chained ret2libc)



 $\overline{nn}$  Universidad **III** Zaragoza

### <span id="page-53-0"></span>**W**∧**X (memory) pages**

**Logical extension of non-executable stacks**

**Non-executable writable pages and non-writable executable pages**



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 41 / 52

### **W**∧**X (memory) pages**

- Logical extension of non-executable stacks
- **Non-executable writable pages and non-writable executable pages**
- Term coined by Theo de Raadt (founder and main architect of OpenBSD)
- First implementation of W∧X : 1972! (Multics on the GE-645 mainframe)

Universidad

## Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks Write XOR eXecute (W∧X) pages

#### **The PaX project** (Oct 2000)

- Linux kernel patch for Intel x86 hardware
- Today, it is available for almost all hardware platforms
- It was never included in mainstream Linux distribution, although today most distributions have some kind of W∧X

#### **On-chip support for non-executable pages** came a bit later

- NX: Non-eXecutable feature (AMD Athlon 64; Sept 2003)
- ED: Execute-Disable feature (Intel P4 Prescott; Feb 2004)
- XN: eXecute-Never feature (ARM v6)

#### **Software that took advantage of hardware support emerged** a few months later

- Linux kernel patches (via PaX project)
- Microsoft Windows XP Service Pack 2 (Data Execution Prevention; DEP opt-in by default)

 $\overline{111}$  Universidad **III** Zaragoza

### Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks **Can we still execute arbitrary injected code when W**∧**X is on?**

- Do we really need to inject new code? Otherwise, ret2code
- Is there a page with W+X permissions? If so, ret2str $\mathsf{cpy}$  or ret2gets
- $\blacksquare$  Can we chain the existing code, using  $\text{ret2code}$ , to write an executable file to disk and then run it?



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 43 / 52

### Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks **Can we still execute arbitrary injected code when W**∧**X is on?**

- Do we really need to inject new code? Otherwise, ret2code
- Is there a page with W+X permissions? If so, ret2str $\mathsf{cpy}$  or ret2gets
- $\blacksquare$  Can we chain the existing code, using  $\text{ret2code}$ , to write an executable file to disk and then run it?
- If is there a way to turn the protection off?
	- SetProcessDEPPolicy / ZwSetInformationProcess on Windows platforms
- Can we change the permissions of a specific memory region from W $\triangle X$  to  $W+X<sub>2</sub>$ 
	- VirtualProtect on Windows platforms
	- mprotect on GNU/Linux platforms
		- **note**: PaX **does not** allow a page to be W+X, nor X after W ■ In kernel, it requires the memory address to be aligned to 4KiB
- $\blacksquare$  Can we create a new memory region with W+X permissions?
	- VirtualAlloc() on Windows platforms
	- mmap() on Unix-like platforms
		- As before, not allowed if PaX is installed
	- You will first need to copy the injected code and then jump there (chained ret2code: mmap-strcpy-code)



#### <span id="page-58-0"></span>■ ret2libc allows us to bypass non-executable stacks

Addresses of functions are known and are part of the attacker's input



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 44 / 52

#### ■ ret2libc **allows us to bypass non-executable stacks**

Addresses of functions are known and are part of the attacker's input

### **ASCII Armored Address Space** (AAAS)

- **Linux kernel patch that loaded all shared libraries into memory addresses starting with a null byte**
- Similar idea to terminator canaries
- Protects against strcpy-like exploitation, but not gets
- Still vulnerable to other ret2- attacks



**Universidad** 

### **Address Space Layout Randomization** (ASLR)

- **Randomizes the address of everything** (libraries, image, stack, and heap)
- Prevents the attacker from knowing where to jump or where to point pointers
- First implemented in PaX for Linux in 2001:
	- "unless every address is randomized and unpredictable, there's always going to be room for some kind of attack"
- Introduced in Windows Vista (2007)
- **NOTE**: if the attacker can inject code and there is enough room for nops, **an approximate address can be enough** to achieve reliable code execution
	- This technique is known as NOP-sled or NOP slide

If is there anything left in a predictable address?

- In most cases, yes:
	- Images are usually compiled to run in a fixed known memory address
	- No relocatable shared dynamic libraries
	- Improvement: **PIE (Position Independent Execution) code, on Linux platforms** (2005)
- ret2code approaches
- Can we quess the randomly generated addresses?
	- $\blacksquare$  It depends. Low entropy on 32-bits
	- On 32-bit Windows, even lower entropy
- If is there a clever way to find these addresses?
	- $\blacksquare$  Is there a memory leak available?
	- **Brute-forcing is always an option**

 $\overline{111}$  Universidad **III** Zaragoza

Some final remarks

- On Windows, threads of the same application share the memory layout
- On Unix, fork processes replicates the parent memory layout

### **ASLR is a very strong protection against code execution exploits, but most operating systems do not offer a complete solution**



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 47 / 52

## Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks ASLR on Windows

#### **Stack location:**

- The time stamp counter (TSC) of the current processor is shifted and masked to a 5-bit value  $(2^5 \text{ options})$
- Added to another 9-bit TSC-derived value to make up the base address of the stack

#### **Heap location:**

- TSC shifted and masked to a 5-bit value ( $2<sup>5</sup>$  options), multiplied by 64KiB
- The possible heap address ranges from 0x00000000 to 0x001f0000



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 48 / 52

## Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks ASLR on Windows

#### **Executable images location:**

- Load displacement by calculating a  $\delta$  value each time an app runs
- 8-bit pseudo-random number  $\rightarrow$  only one of 256 possible locations
	- TSC shifts four places, and then divides modulo 254 and adds 1
	- $\blacksquare$  The result is then multiplied by the allocation granularity of 64 KiB

#### **This** δ **value is added to the preferred load address of the image file**



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 49 / 52

Defeating control-flow hijacking attacks Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR) in Windows

### **Shared libraries location:**

- **Load offset is calculated with a system-wide per-boot value called the image bias**
	- Stored in a global memory state structure (MI\_SYSTEM\_INFORMATION), in field MiState.Sections.ImageBias)
- **Calculated only once per startup**
- Shared memory region between 0x50000000 and 0x78000000
- First DLL is always ntdll. We can calculate its image base address as:
	- 0x78000000 (ImageBias + NtDllSizein64KBChunks)\*0x10000 (32-bit)
	- 0x7FFFFFFF0000 (ImageBias64High + NtDllSizein64KBChunks)\*0x10000 (64-bit)

# <span id="page-66-0"></span>Other techniques of defense

### **Probabilistic methods**

- **Instruction Set Randomization**  $\blacksquare$
- **Data Space Randomization**: randomizes the representation of data stored in memory (not location). Encrypts all variables, not just pointers, and using different keys



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 51 / 52

# Other techniques of defense

### **Probabilistic methods**

- **Instruction Set Randomization**
- **Data Space Randomization**: randomizes the representation of data stored in memory (not location). Encrypts all variables, not just pointers, and using different keys

### **Generic methods**

- **Data Integrity:** spatial memory integrity (protect against invalid memory writes)
- **Data Flow Integrity**: checks read instructions to detect data corruption before use



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 51 / 52

# Other techniques of defense

### **Probabilistic methods**

- **Instruction Set Randomization**
- **Data Space Randomization**: randomizes the representation of data stored in memory (not location). Encrypts all variables, not just pointers, and using different keys

#### **Generic methods**

- **Data Integrity:** spatial memory integrity (protect against invalid memory writes)
- **Data Flow Integrity**: checks read instructions to detect data corruption before use

### **Other defenses against hijacking the flow of control**

- Code Pointer Integrity
- **Control Flow Integrity** (CFI)



[Software Vulnerabilities](#page-0-0) [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 © R.J. Rodríguez] **2023/2024** 51 / 52

# **Exploiting Software Vulnerabilities** Software Vulnerabilities Control-Flow Hijacking

« **All wrongs reversed** – under CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0 license



Dept. of Computer Science and Systems Engineering University of Zaragoza, Spain

Course 2023/2024

### **Master's Degree in Informatics Engineering**

University of Zaragoza Room A.02, Ada Byron building

