Module Integrity, Temporary Files

Petr Ročkai

Overview

- Part 1: Dynamic Linking
- Part 2: Signatures and Trust
- Part 3: Temporary Files
- Part 4: DRM and Code Obfuscation
- Part 5: Homomorphic Cryptosystems

Part 1: Dynamic Linking

Static Linking

- library code is built into the executable
- distributed as . a (UNIX) or . Lib (Windows)
- library is not needed to run the program
- easy distribution no external dependencies

Resource Use

- disk space is taken up by many copies of the same code
- so is RAM when programs are loaded (executed)

Static Linking: Vulnerability Management

- each application ships with its own copy of the code
- what if a problem is found in the library?
- each application needs to be updated separately

Detour: How a Linker Works

- programs need addresses of things
	- − global variables
	- − procedures
- the compiler often does not know the address
- object files (.o) contain relocations
- the linker replaces symbols (names) with addresses

Detour: Copy on Write

- multiple running programs share text
- this is because fork() does not copy everything
- saves a lot of RAM when many copies of a program run
- implemented using a memory management unit
- works on a page-by-page (4K on x86) basis

Dynamic Linking

- allows a single library to be shared by many programs
- stored in . so (UNIX) or . dll files (Windows)
- UNIX: 1d. so implements runtime linking
- part of the linking process done at execution time

Dynamic Linker

- loads all the pieces into memory
- performs relocation in memory
- hands off execution to the program
- this is actually naive and inefficient
- in practice
	- − position-independent code
	- − lazy binding

Position-Independent Code

- normal code must be loaded at a fixed address
	- − e.g. absolute jump and call instructions
	- − direct references to global data
- runtime linker can rewrite those addresses
	- − takes too much time
	- − we lose sharing
- compilers can emit position-independent code
	- − use relative addresses when possible
	- − use address tables for indirection (GOT, PLT)

Lazy Binding

- do not relocate at load time
- replace inter-library calls with stubs
- the stub asks the linker to relocate
- the linker rewrites the stub with a jump
- unused parts of the code are never relocated

Library Preloading

- the runtime linker can load additional libraries
	- − via LD_PRELOAD on UNIX
	- − AppInit_DLLs on Windows
	- − DYLD_INSERT_LIBRARIES on OS X
- those extra libraries can override functionality
	- − useful for hooking into library calls
	- − but also compromises the integrity of the application

Plugins

- often implemented using shared libraries
- not linked into the application
- explicitly loaded at runtime
	- − using dlopen (UNIX) or LoadLibrary (Windows)
	- − based on the ϐilename
- used via function pointers obtained by name

− dlsym or GetProcAddress

Search Path Attacks

- the system needs to find shared libraries to load
- it is usually possible to extend or override this path − LD_LIBRARY_PATH on UNIX, PATH on Windows − current directory is also searched on Windows
- only a problem in special circumstances
	- − the library is missing in system locations
	- − loading based on the SearchPath API on Windows

Library Injection

- arrange for your library to be loaded
	- − either via preloading
	- − or use the same name as a system library
	- − and place it where it's found
- hard to do unless the library is missing on the system
- may be easier with plugins

Interposing Calls

- assume your library has been loaded
- the code in the library runs with privileges of the process
- your implementation of the API can do anything
	- − log and exfiltrate arguments and return values
	- − modify either of those things
	- − completely hijack the application
- vou can also dlopen the correct library
	- − and forward calls to the original

Implications

- always make sure you are loading the correct library
- libraries have to be trusted by the application
- malicious library can do anything the process can do
	- − e.g. by using global constructors or DllMain
	- − those get to run before the main app even starts
- it can also turn the app into a trojan and steal secrets

Use Secure Paths

- the default paths are quite secure
- do not try to outsmart the system
	- − e.g. by looking up the library yourself
	- − especially bad is using SearchPath on Windows
	- − do not use LoadLibrary to check Windows version
- you can explicitly remove the working directory
	- − only an issue on Windows use SetDllDirectory("")

Side-by-Side with Checksums (Windows)

- the application ships its own copies of DLLs
- designed to avoid "DLL hell"
- lists DLL checksums avoids injection
- problem: partially defeats code sharing
- problem: vulnerability management again

Part 2: Signatures and Trust

Module Integrity, Temporary Files 20/53 December 3, 2018

Signatures: Why?

- executable code is very powerful
- often downloaded from the internet
	- − a man in the middle is a possibility
	- − they could tamper with the application code
	- − instant arbitrary code execution / compromise
- it is very important to establish authenticity

Signatures: Hash Functions

- standard cryptographic hash functions (SHA-1 &c.)
- easy to compute for the package you have
- possibly hard to obtain the expected value
	- − maybe fetch using HTTPS
	- − but web servers are easy to compromise
	- − better if you can get it from multiple sources
- usually needs manual verification
	- − users are often lazy and generally unreliable
	- − almost as bad as no signature at all

Signatures: Keyed Hashes

- Message Authentication Code (HMAC &c.)
- needs a shared secret
- not suitable for standard distribution models
- could be used in per-customer distribution
- also possibly for subsequent updates

Signatures: Asymmetric Crypto

- this is the standard approach
- problem: PKI / trust management
- reduces one problem to another problem
	- − software distribution to key distribution
	- − but keys are smaller
	- − and once obtained, can be used for many packages
- initial keys can be distributed as hardcopies
	- − e.g. on read-only installation media
	- − or pre-installed on the computer with the OS

Code Signing: Commercial Examples

- Secure Boot
- Java certificates (includes Android)
- Microsoft Authenticode
- Adobe Air certificates
- Microsoft Office and VBA certs
- Apple Developer Program

Example: MS Authenticode

- based on RSA 2048 and SHA-1
- covers Active-X, plugins, executables
- software vendors need to obtain an X.509 certificate
	- − also known as Code Signing Digital ID
	- − many different CAs issue those
- the signature is embedded in the application
- when downloaded, the system checks the signature
	- − any mismatches are reported but may be overridden
	- − kernel code (drivers) are refused

Microsoft WHQL

- Windows Hardware Quality Labs
- stricter requirements than generic Authenticode
- testing logs must be submitted to MS
- however: no code review is done by MS
	- − WHQL does not imply the drivers are secure
	- − it does imply a certain level of quality
- allows distribution through Windows Update

Code Signing: Open Source

- OpenBSD binary distribution & packages
- FreeBSD and NetBSD likewise
- binary Linux distributions
	- − Fedora, Debian, Ubuntu, RHEL, CentOS
	- − almost every package manager
- source code is also often signed

Trust

- signed \neq secure \neq trustworthy
- you need to trust the vendor
	- − possibly backed by a legal contract
	- − but usually not for off-the-shelf software
- even honest vendors make mistakes
	- − vulnerabilities are widespread
- reviewing source code is the only reliable option

Open Source

- collaborative trust
	- − many people look at different bits
	- − if you find something bad, you speak up
	- − assume it is OK if everyone is silent
	- − seems to be working well in practice
- how to ensure everyone is looking at the same source?
	- − source in git or similar
	- − signed source distribution tarballs
- rate of change: can the readers keep up?

Reproducible Builds

- how to check the binary came from given source?
- rebuilding may change the checksum of the result
- essential for collaborative trust for binary distributions
- https://reproducible-builds.org
- alternative: build everything yourself

Security

- assume we trust the vendor
- when are signatures verified?
	- − do we need to decompress the package first?
	- − maybe even unpack the content
- trust OK only after the signature is verified
	- − the header may be malicious if signature is bad

Part 3: Temporary Files

Module Integrity, Temporary Files 33/53 December 3, 2018

Why Temporary Files?

- data too large to fit in memory
- transferring data to other programs
- named pipes and UNIX domain sockets
- usually not persistent

Creation in C / C++

- FILE *tmpfile()
	- − created in the default system location
	- − deleted on close / program exit
	- − unique ϐile name (or no ϐile name at all)
	- − opened for reading and writing
- tmpnam() and tempnam()
	- − do not use those functions
	- − only for compatibility with very old programs

Creation in C / C++: Windows

- tmpnam $s()$ from secure C library
	- − not actually secure
	- − never use this function with fopen
- tmpfile s()
	- − like tmpfile but different calling convention
	- − neither is very useful on Windows (needs admin)

Creation in C / C++: Windows

- use CREATE NEW in CreateFile()
- also specify FILE_FLAG_DELETE_ON_CLOSE
- possibly also FILE_ATTRIBUTE_TEMPORARY
- you can get the filename by using tmpnam s
- try with a new name if CreateFile fails

Creation in C / C++: POSIX

- always use mkdtemp and mkstemp
- both are secure against race attacks
- mkostemp on newer systems
	- − allows 0 SYNC and 0 CLOEXEC to be specified
- unlink() the file to get erase-on-exit

Creation in Java

- File tmp = File.createTempFile
- do not leave garbage around: tmp.deleteOnExit()
- about as secure as mkstemp() in C
- needs at least Java 7

Temporary File Checklist (1)

- do not use them if not necessary
- never store secrets in temporary files
- do not use standard C functions
	- − tmpnam, mktemp, tempname are bad
	- − tmpfile is sometimes OK on UNIX

Temporary File Checklist (2)

- use platform APIs to prevent races
	- − mkstemp, mkdtemp
	- − open with O_CREAT and O_EXCL
	- − CreateFile with appropriate ϐlags
- ensure proper permissions
	- − set a restrictive ACL when calling CreateFile
	- − already taken care of with mkstemp

Part 4: DRM and Code Obfuscation

Module Integrity, Temporary Files 42/53 December 3, 2018

What is DRM?

- Digital Rights Management
- essentially just copy protection
- as old as commercial software
- usually not very successful

Naive DRM

- \bullet embed a secret key in the official viewer
- encrypt all content with the secret key
- distribute the encrypted content
- only the official viewer can play it
- but the key is easy to recover

DRM is Hard

- the attacker has complete control over execution
- can use debuggers, analysers, fuzzers, etc.
- embedded keys are easy to spot (high entropy)
- obfuscation can help, but only a little
- once the key is compromised, so is all the content

White-Box Cryptography

- all of the black-box assumptions − mainly chosen plaintext attacks
- the attacker can also look at execution
	- − even perturb data while the algorithm runs
	- − can see the entire memory
	- − including any key material
- hard but (maybe) not impossible

History of White-Box AES

- 2002: White-Box Crypto and an AES Implementation − initial proposal by Chow et al.
	- − based on encrypted networks, broken in 2004
- 2006: White Box Cryptography: A New Attempt
	- − Bringer et al., added perturbations
	- − broken in 2010
- 2009: A Secure Implementation of White-Box AES − different approach by Xiao et al., broken in 2012
- 2011: Protecting White-Box AES with Dual Ciphers − broken in 2013 by CRoCS

Summary

- unless you do DRM, do not put secrets in binaries
- offload sensitive computations − smart cards, hardware security modules
- white-box cryptography is hard
	- − we don't even know if it's actually possible
	- − long history of failed attempts

Part 5: Homomorphic Cryptosystems

Module Integrity, Temporary Files 49/53 And the second process of the December 3, 2018

Why Homomorphic Crypto?

- inverse problem to DRM
- private data in the public cloud
	- − reminder: cloud = someone else's computer
	- − "someone else" has full control over execution
- how to do useful things without decrypting?

Homomorphism?

- $f(e(x), e(y)) = e(f(x, y))$
	- − *e* is the encryption function
	- $− f$ is some useful operation
- example: f is multiplication, e is RSA
	- $-x^k \cdot y^k \mod m = (x \cdot y)^k \mod m$
	- − does not work for addition
- RSA is only partially homomorphic

Fully Homomorphic Encryption

- allows arbitrary computation
- needs unlimited addition and multiplication − the rest can be built from those
	-
- first plausible system: Gentry's Cryptosystem
	- − proposed in 2009
	- − extremely slow: 30 minutes per 1 bit operation

Second Generation Systems

- based on the Learning with errors problem
	- − need to reconstruct a linear function
	- − from a finite number of noisy samples
- AES-128 circuit as a benchmark
	- − about 36 hours per block initially
	- − down to 4 minutes by 2014
- amenable to SIMD-like evaluation
	- − brings down AES-128 to 2s per block
	- − by processing 120 blocks at once