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: ld.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 filename
- 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
- you 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

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 ≠ secure ≠ 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

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 file name (or no file 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 0_CREAT and 0_EXCL
 - CreateFile with appropriate flags
- ensure proper permissions
 - set a restrictive ACL when calling CreateFile
 - already taken care of with mkstemp

Part 4: DRM and Code Obfuscation

What is DRM?

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

Naive DRM

- 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

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