

Hybrid Techniques for Preventing Memory Corruption Attacks in C

Prachi Gauriar prachi_gauriar@ncsu.edu



Background Survey CRED Cyclone CCured Lightweight 2-version Software Development Lightweight analysis for signature generation Heavyweight analysis for fast debugging

Background

Memory corruption attack Exploit a memory access error to attack a system Memory access errors **Referent and accessed memory object differ** Spatial - pointer is outside bounds of its referent **Buffer overflow, format string, deref NULL Temporal - referent no longer exists Dereference freed variables**, dangling pointers

Background

C is susceptible because it is not type-safe Type-safety (strong typing) Can't operate on a value like it has a different type **Requires that memory is acc**essed safely C's safety shortcomings Pointer arithmetic, unsafe casts No garbage collection or explicit memory rules **Bad variable argument implementation**

Approaches

Static Analysis Analyze source code to find errors Usually sound, all analysis is done offline Lots of false positives, only sound relative to model **Dynamic Checking** Modify runtime to prevent errors Usually no restrictions on code, no false positives Targets specific error types, adds overhead

Approaches

Static/Dynamic Hybrid Approaches Goal: best of both worlds No false positives and catch most/all errors Minimize runtime overhead **Basic pattern** Output Analyze source code to find unsafe portions Add runtime checks to regions where analysis is insufficient





Adds bounds checking to string buffers **Does not modify the pointer representation** Meshes better with uninstrumented code **Records the base address, size** of all memory objects Static, heap, and stack Stores them in the object table At dereference, looks up pointer in object table Perform bounds checks

Pointer arithmetic presents special problems In-bounds pointer arithmetic Output Address computed from an in-bounds pointer must refer to the same object as that pointer Check if pointer is in-bounds If so, find its referent Final result of arithmetic must fall within the referent's bounds

Out-of-bounds (OOB) pointer arithmetic

- Address computed from an OOB pointer must refer to the same object as that pointer's referent
- For each OOB pointer
 - CRED creates an OOB object in the heap
 - OOB pointer points to that OOB object
 - OOB object contains the original OOB pointer's address and referent

After each address computation, check if result is OOB
If so, create OOB object and store it in the OOB table
If a pointer is used in pointer arithmetic

In bounds? If not, perform OOB table lookup
Use the OOB object's address and referent to perform a bounds check

When an object is deallocated, remove it from the OOB

Only checks strings String buffers are most often overflowed Unsound Can't detect non-string attacks Does not analyze type casts Performance Overhead < 26% in apps w/o heavy string use</p> Overhead of 60-130% otherwise



"Safe" dialect of C

Attempts to solve safety shortcomings, keep flexibility
Restricts pointer arithmetic, disallows unsafe casts
Inserts NULL checks before pointer dereferences
Requires pointers to be initialized before use
Augments varargs implementation
Adds garbage collection and region analysis to prevent spatial memory errors



Several pointer kinds **Possibly-NULL** (*-pointers) **Never-NULL** (@-pointers) Fat pointers (?-pointers) Possibly-NULL are like C pointers NULL checks inserted before every dereference **Never-NULL are optimizations of possibly-NULL** NULL checks inserted only when pointer changes



Pointer arithmetic is only allowed on fat pointers
 Store the base address and size of the referent
 size field is programmer accessible, like *length* in Java
 NULL- and bounds-checked when dereferenced
 Arrays, strings automatically converted to ?-pointers

```
int strlen(const char *s) {
    int i = 0;
    if (!s) return 0;
    /* UNSAFE if S isn't
    NULL terminated */
    while (*s) i++;
    return i;
} int strlen(const char ?s) {
        int i, n;
        if (!s) return 0;
        n = s.size;
        for (i=0; i<n; i++, s++)
        if (!*s) return i;
        return n;
}</pre>
```



Safe C-like alternative to Java Can't mix with C code Tool support is lacking No lex, yacc, etc Analysis can reject safe code Performance Overhead With garbage collection: 0-185% Without garbage collection: < 36%

CCured

Program transformation tool Adds type-safety to C Solves many of the same problems as Cyclone Like Cyclone, introduces new pointer kinds Three main kinds: SAFE, SEQ, WILD Minor kinds: RTTI, FSEQ, others Unlike Cyclone, infers pointer kinds based on use Kind of pointer reflects how safely it is used

<u>CCured</u>

SAFE - not used in pointer arithmetic Just require NULL-check before dereference SEQ - used in pointer arithmetic, but no unsafe casts **Require bounds-check and NULL-check** WILD - used in pointer arithmetic, unsafe casts Bounds-, NULL-checks, and dynamic type checking At compile time, CCured suggests ways to make inferred WILD pointers into SAFE or SEQ pointers

<u>CCured</u>

Real strength lies in its inference algorithm < 1% WILD, < 10% SEQ</p> Some changes to code are required SEQ and WILD pointers are fat External function wrappers to convert from fat to normal pointers Some vararg functions like scanf require changes sizeof should use a variable, not a type

<u>CCured</u>

Performance

- Runtime overhead: 3-891%
 - Removing bc, 3-87%, average: 30.8%
 - bc without garbage collection: less than 50%
- Sophisticated, sound analysis
- Supports lots of programming paradigms in C
- Works with non-instrumented code via wrappers
- Drop-in replacement for gcc



Current Research

Motivation

Despite CCured's quality, has unacceptable overhead Security is only worth it if the cost is less than the price of being attacked Highly trafficked commercial servers, online stores We want to leverage its analysis, but forgo overhead Simplest way to do this is to maintain two very similar versions of our software CCured version for debugging and diagnosis **Release version**

Methodology

Highly pragmatic Development version D uses CCured Used during coding, test, and bug diagnosis phases Release version is conventional C code Possibly use address space randomization or IDS Vast majority of source is shared **D** contains code in addition to or in place of R's Satisfy CCured's compilation requirements

Methodology

When a security bug is found in the release version
Glean information from logs, core dumps, etc
Attempt to replay attack on version D
Currently exploring two analysis options
Lightweight - generate vulnerability signature
Heavyweight
Identify buffer, location of bug

Try to illuminate the cause via debugging tool

Lightweight

Detect an attack and automate replay Replace handlers for SIGSEGV, SIGBUS, SIGILL Augmented version of CCured can tell us Which buffer was involved Input size **Distribution of characters in the input** Based on this, we can create a vulnerability signature Use this signature into an input filter

Heavyweight

CCured aborts with arcane message upon error Must use debugging aids to find location of error For complex bugs, knowing where isn't always helpful We augment CCured with a tool that identifies the buffer that was accessed incorrectly We then replay the attack to allow the user to watch for important memory related events Allocation/reallocation, free, pointer arithmetic Filter events by how directly they affect the buffer

• **Example**

http.c:112: recv expected at least 1024 bytes of readable data, but buffer has only 224.

Problematic buffer: pPostData (0x8157f10) Perform further analysis? y Degree of contribution? 1

```
Problematic buffer: pPostData (0x8157f10)
Allocated at http.c:100 using calloc
   Element count: 224 (conn[sid].dat->in_ContentLength+1024)
      conn[sid].dat->in_ContentLength: -800
...
```

Element size: 1 (sizeof(char)) Assigned to pPostData at http.c:109

. . .



Questions?