

Software security, secure programming (and computer forensics)

Lecture 4: Protecting your code against software vulnerabilities ? (overview)

Master on Cybersecurity – Master MoSiG (HECS & AISSE)

Academic Year 2016 - 2017

Preamble

Bad news

Many programming languages are **unsecure** ...

- ▶ codes are likely to contain vulnerabilities
- ▶ some of them can be exploited by an attacker ...

Good news

There exists some **protections** to make attacker's life harder !

→ 3 categories of protections:

- ▶ from the programmer itself
- ▶ from the compiler / interpreter
- ▶ from the execution platform

Outline

Programmer's level protections

Compilers level protections

Platform level protections

Code hardening

Most language level vulnerabilities are known !

→ there exist **code patterns** to mitigate their effects ...

Examples

- ▶ The CERT coding standarts

<https://www.securecoding.cert.org/>

- ▶ covers several languages: C, C++, Java, etc.
- ▶ rules + examples of non-compliant code + examples of solutions
- ▶ undefined behaviors
- ▶ etc.

- ▶ Microsoft banned function calls

- ▶ ANSSI recommendations

- ▶ JavaSec
- ▶ LaFoSec (Ocaml, F#, Scala)

- ▶ Use of **secure libraries**

- ▶ `Strsafe.h` (Microsoft)
guarantee null-termination and bound to dest size
- ▶ `libsafe.h` (GNU/Linux)
no overflow beyond current stack frame
- ▶ etc.

Example 1

INT30-C. Ensure that unsigned integer operations do not wrap

Example of non compliant code

```
void func(unsigned int ui_a, unsigned int ui_b) {
    unsigned int usum = ui_a + ui_b;
    /* ... */
}
```

Example of compliant code

```
void func(unsigned int ui_a, unsigned int ui_b) {
    unsigned int usum = ui_a + ui_b;
    if (usum < ui_a) {
        /* Handle error */
    }
    /* ... */
}
```

Example 2

ARR30-C. Do not form or use out-of-bounds pointers or array subscripts

Example of non compliant code

```
char *init_block(size_t block_size, size_t offset,
                 char *data, size_t data_size) {
    char *buffer = malloc(block_size);
    if (data_size > block_size || block_size - data_size < offset) {
        /* Data won't fit in buffer, handle error */
    }
    memcpy(buffer + offset, data, data_size);
    return buffer;
}
```

Example of compliant code

```
char *init_block(size_t block_size, size_t offset,
                 char *data, size_t data_size) {
    char *buffer = malloc(block_size);
    if (NULL == buffer) { /* Handle error */ }
    if (data_size > block_size || block_size - data_size < offset) {
        /* Data won't fit in buffer, handle error */
    }
    memcpy(buffer + offset, data, data_size);
    return buffer;
}
```

Code validation

Several tools can also help to detect code vulnerabilities . . .

Dynamic code analysis

Instruments the code to detect runtime errors (beyond language semantics . . .)

- ▶ invalid memory access (buffer overflow, use-after-free)
- ▶ uninitialized variables
- ▶ etc.

⇒ No false positive, but runtime overhead (~ testing)

Tools: Purify, Valgrind, AddressSanitizer, etc.

Static code analysis

Infer some (over)-approximation of the program behaviour

- ▶ uninitialized variables
- ▶ value analysis (e.g., array access out of bounds)
- ▶ pointer aliasing
- ▶ etc.

⇒ No false negative, but sometimes “inconclusive” . . .

Tools: Frama-C, Polyspace, CodeSonar, Fortify, etc.

Outline

Programmer's level protections

Compilers level protections

Platform level protections

Compilers may help for code protection

Most compilers offer **compilation options** to help mitigating the effect of vulnerable code ...

→ automatically generate extra code to enforce security

Examples

- ▶ stack protection
 - ▶ stack layout
 - ▶ canaries
 - ▶ shadow stack for return addresses
 - ▶ control-flow integrity
 - ▶ ...
- ▶ pointer protection
 - ▶ pointer encryption (PointGuard)
 - ▶ smart pointers (C++)
 - ▶ ...
- ▶ no “undefined behavior”
e.g., enforce *wrap around* for unsigned int in C
(`-fno-strict-overflow`, `-fwrapv`)
- ▶ etc.

Outline

Programmer's level protections

Compilers level protections

Platform level protections

Some more generic protections from the execution platform

General purposes operating systems (Linux, Windows, etc.)

- ▶ Memory layout randomization (ASLR)
attacker needs to know precise memory addresses
 - ▶ make this address random (and changing at each execution)
 - ▶ no (easy) way to guess the current layout on a remote machine ...
- ▶ Non executable memory zone (NX, W \ominus X, DEP)
basic attacks \Rightarrow execute code from the data zone
distinguish between:
 - ▶ memory for the code (eXecutable, not Writeable)
 - ▶ memory for the data (Writable, not eXecutable)Example: make the execution stack non executable ...

Rk: exists other dedicated protections for more specific platforms:
JavaCard, Android, embedded systems, TPMs, etc.

Conclusion

- ▶ \exists numerous protections to avoid / mitigate vulnerability exploitations
- ▶ several protection levels
code, verification tools, compilers, platforms
- ▶ they allow to “compensate” most known programming languages weaknesses (e.g., C/C++)
- ▶ they still require programmers skills and concerns
- ▶ even if they make attackers life harder . . .
- ▶ . . . they can still be bypassed !

→ an endless game between “attackers” and “defenders” !