

CS 458 / 658
Computer Security and Privacy

Module 2
Program Security

Winter 2012

Secure programs

- Why is it so hard to write secure programs?
- A simple answer [CHE02]:
 - Axiom (Murphy):
Programs have bugs
 - Corollary:
Security-relevant programs have security bugs

Module outline

- ① Flaws, faults, and failures
- ② Unintentional security flaws
- ③ Malicious code: Malware
- ④ Other malicious code
- ⑤ Nonmalicious flaws
- ⑥ Controls against security flaws in programs

Module outline

- 1 Flaws, faults, and failures
- 2 Unintentional security flaws
- 3 Malicious code: Malware
- 4 Other malicious code
- 5 Nonmalicious flaws
- 6 Controls against security flaws in programs

Flaws, faults, and failures

- A **flaw** is a problem with a program
- A **security flaw** is a problem that affects security in some way
 - Confidentiality, integrity, availability
- Flaws come in two types: **faults** and **failures**
- A fault is a mistake “behind the scenes”
 - An error in the code, data, specification, process, etc.
 - A fault is a **potential problem**

Flaws, faults, and failures

- A failure is when something actually goes wrong
 - You log in to the library's web site, and it shows you someone else's account
 - "Goes wrong" means a deviation from the desired behaviour, not necessarily from the specified behaviour!
 - The specification itself may be wrong
- A fault is the programmer/specifier/inside view
- A failure is the user/outside view

Finding and fixing faults

- How do you find a fault?
 - If a user experiences a failure, you can try to work backwards to uncover the underlying fault
 - What about faults that haven't (yet) led to failures?
 - Intentionally try to **cause** failures, then proceed as above
 - Remember to think like an attacker!
- Once you find some faults, fix them
 - Usually by making small edits (**patches**) to the program
 - This is called “penetrate and patch”
 - Microsoft's “Patch Tuesday” is a well-known example

Problems with patching

- Patching sometimes makes things worse!
- Why?
 - Pressure to patch a fault is often high, causing a narrow focus on the observed failure, instead of a broad look at what may be a more serious underlying problem
 - The fault may have caused other, unnoticed failures, and a partial fix may cause inconsistencies or other problems
 - The patch for this fault may introduce new faults, here or elsewhere!
- Alternatives to patching?

Unexpected behaviour

- When a program's behaviour is specified, the spec usually lists the things the program must do
 - The ls command must list the names of the files in the directory whose name is given on the command line, if the user has permissions to read that directory
- Most implementors wouldn't care if it did additional things as well
 - Sorting the list of filenames alphabetically before outputting them is fine

Unexpected behaviour

- But from a security / privacy point of view, extra behaviours could be bad!
 - After displaying the filenames, post the list to a public web site
 - After displaying the filenames, delete the files
- When implementing a security or privacy relevant program, you should consider “and nothing else” to be implicitly added to the spec
 - “should do” vs. “shouldn’t do”
 - How would you test for “shouldn’t do”?

Module outline

- ① Flaws, faults, and failures
- ② Unintentional security flaws
- ③ Malicious code: Malware
- ④ Other malicious code
- ⑤ Nonmalicious flaws
- ⑥ Controls against security flaws in programs

Types of security flaws

- One way to divide up security flaws is by genesis (where they came from)
- Some flaws are **intentional**
 - **Malicious** flaws are intentionally inserted to attack systems, either in general, or certain systems in particular
 - If it's meant to attack some particular system, we call it a targeted malicious flaw
 - **Nonmalicious** (but intentional) flaws are often features that are meant to be in the system, and are correctly implemented, but nonetheless can cause a failure when used by an attacker
- Most security flaws are caused by **unintentional** program errors

Buffer overflows

- The single most commonly exploited type of security flaw
- Simple example:

```
#define LINELEN 1024
```

```
char buffer[LINELEN];
```

```
gets(buffer);
```

or

```
strcpy(buffer, argv[1]);
```

What's the problem?

- The gets and strcpy functions don't check that the string they're copying into the buffer **will fit in the buffer!**
- So?
- Some languages would give you some kind of exception here, and crash the program
 - Is this an OK solution?
- Not C (the most commonly used language for systems programming). C doesn't even notice something bad happened, and continues on its merry way

Smashing The Stack For Fun And Profit

- This is a classic (read: somewhat dated) exposition of how buffer overflow attacks work.
- Upshot: if the attacker can write data past the end of an array on the stack, she can usually overwrite things like the saved return address. When the function returns, it will jump to any address of her choosing.
- Targets: programs on a local machine that run with setuid (superuser) privileges, or network daemons on a remote machine

Kinds of buffer overflows

- In addition to the classic attack which overflows a buffer on the stack to jump to shellcode, there are many variants:
 - Attacks which work when a **single byte** can be written past the end of the buffer (often caused by a common off-by-one error)
 - Overflows of buffers on the heap instead of the stack
 - Jump to other parts of the program, or parts of standard libraries, instead of shellcode

Defences against buffer overflows

- How might one protect against buffer overflows?
- Use a language with bounds checking
 - And catch those exceptions!
- Non-executable stack
 - “W $\oplus$ X” (memory page is either writable or executable)
- Stack (and sometimes code) at random addresses for each process
 - Linux 2.6 does this
- “Canaries” that detect if the stack has been overwritten before the return from each function
 - This is a compiler feature

Integer overflows

- Machine integers can represent only a limited set of numbers, might not correspond to programmer's mental model
- Program assumes that integer is always positive, overflow will make (signed) integer wrap and become negative, which will violate assumption
 - Program casts large unsigned integer to signed integer
 - Result of a mathematical operation causes overflow
- Attacker can pass values to program that will trigger overflow

Format string vulnerabilities

- Class of vulnerabilities discovered only in 2000
- Unfiltered user input is used as format string in `printf()`, `fprintf()`, `sprintf()`,...
- `printf(buffer)` instead of `printf("%s", buffer)`
 - The first one will parse `buffer` for `%`'s and use whatever is currently on the stack to process found format parameters
- `printf("%s%s%s%s")` likely crashes your program
- `printf("%x%x%x%x")` dumps parts of the stack
- `%n` will write to an address found on the stack
- See reading provided with Assignment 1 for more

Incomplete mediation

- Inputs to programs are often specified by untrusted users
 - Web-based applications are a common example
 - “Untrusted” to do what?
- Users sometimes mistype data in web forms
 - Phone number: 51998884567
 - Email: iang#cs.uwaterloo.ca
- The web application needs to ensure that what the user has entered constitutes a **meaningful** request
- This is called **mediation**


Incomplete mediation

- Incomplete mediation occurs when the application accepts incorrect data from the user
- Sometimes this is hard to avoid
 - Phone number: 519-886-4567
 - This is a reasonable entry, that happens to be wrong
- We focus on catching entries that are clearly wrong
 - Not well formed
 - DOB: 1980-04-31
 - Unreasonable values
 - DOB: 1876-10-12
 - Inconsistent with other entries

Why do we care?

- What's the security issue here?
- What happens if someone fills in:
 - DOB: 98764874236492483649247836489236492
 - Buffer overflow?
 - DOB: ' ; DROP DATABASE clients; --
 - SQL injection?
- We need to make sure that any user-supplied input falls within well-specified values, known to be safe

SQL injection



<http://xkcd.com/327/>

Client-side mediation

- You've probably visited web sites with forms that do **client-side** mediation
 - When you click "submit", Javascript code will first run validation checks on the data you entered
 - If you enter invalid data, a popup will prevent you from submitting it
- Related issue: client-side state
 - Many web sites rely on the client to keep state for them
 - They will put hidden fields in the form which are passed back to the server when the user submits the form

Client-side mediation

- Problem: what if the user
 - Turns off Javascript?
 - Edits the form before submitting it? (Greasemonkey)
 - Writes a script that interacts with the web server instead of using a web browser at all?
 - Connects to the server “manually”?
(telnet server.com 80)
- Note that the user can send arbitrary (unmediated) values to the server this way
- The user can also modify any client-side state

Example

- At a bookstore website, the user orders a copy of the course text. The server replies with a form asking the address to ship to. This form has hidden fields storing the user's order
 - `<input type="hidden" name="isbn" value="0-13-239077-9">`
`<input type="hidden" name="quantity" value="1">`
`<input type="hidden" name="unitprice" value="111.00">`
- What happens if the user changes the “unitprice” value to “50.00” before submitting the form?

Defences against incomplete mediation

- Client-side mediation is an OK method to use in order to have a friendlier user interface, but is useless for security purposes.
- You have to do **server-side mediation**, whether or not you also do client-side.
- For values entered by the user:
 - Always do very careful checks on the values of all fields
 - These values can potentially contain completely arbitrary 8-bit data (including accented chars, control chars, etc.) and be of any length
- For state stored by the client:
 - Make sure client has not modified the data in any way

TOCTTOU errors

- TOCTTOU (“TOCK-too”) errors
 - Time-Of-Check To Time-Of-Use
 - Also known as “race condition” errors
- These errors occur when the following happens:
 - User requests the system to perform an action
 - The system verifies the user is allowed to perform the action
 - The system performs the action

Example

- A particular Unix terminal program is setuid (runs with superuser privileges) so that it can allocate terminals to users (a privileged operation)
- It supports a command to write the contents of the terminal to a log file
- It first checks if the user has permissions to write to the requested file; if so, it opens the file for writing
- The attacker makes a symbolic link:
`logfile -> file_she_owns`
- Between the “check” and the “open”, she changes it:
`logfile -> /etc/passwd`

The problem

- The state of the system changed between the check for permission and the execution of the operation
- The file whose permissions were checked for writeability by the user (`file_she_owns`) wasn't the same file that was later written to (`/etc/passwd`)
 - Even though they had the same name (`logfile`) at different points in time
- Q: Can the attacker really “win this race”?
- A: Yes.

Defences against TOCTTOU errors

- When performing a privileged action on behalf of another party, make sure all information relevant to the access control decision is **constant** between the time of the check and the time of the action (“the race”)
 - Keep a private copy of the request itself so that the request can't be altered during the race
 - Where possible, act on the object itself, and not on some level of indirection
 - e.g. Make access control decisions based on filehandles, not filenames
 - If that's not possible, use locks to ensure the object is not changed during the race

Module outline

- 1 Flaws, faults, and failures
- 2 Unintentional security flaws
- 3 Malicious code: Malware**
- 4 Other malicious code
- 5 Nonmalicious flaws
- 6 Controls against security flaws in programs

Malware

- Various forms of software written with malicious intent
- A common characteristic of all types of malware is that it needs to be executed in order to cause harm
- How might malware get executed?
 - User action
 - Downloading and running malicious software
 - Viewing a web page containing malicious ActiveX control
 - Opening an executable email attachment
 - Inserting a CD
 - Exploiting an existing flaw in a system
 - Buffer overflows in network daemons
 - Buffer overflows in email clients or web browsers

Viruses

- A **virus** is a particular kind of malware that infects other files
 - Traditionally, a virus could infect only executable programs
 - Nowadays, many data document formats can contain executable code (such as macros)
 - Many different types of files can be infected with viruses now
- Typically, when the file is executed (or sometimes just opened), the virus activates, and tries to infect other files with copies of itself
- In this way, the virus can spread between files, or between computers

Infection

- What does it mean to “infect” a file?
- The virus wants to modify an existing (non-malicious) program or document (the **host**) in such a way that executing or opening it will transfer control to the virus
 - The virus can do its “dirty work” and then transfer control back to the host
- For executable programs:
 - Typically, the virus will modify other programs and copy itself to the beginning of the targets’ program code
- For documents with macros:
 - The virus will edit other documents to add itself as a macro which starts automatically when the file is opened

Infection

- In addition to infecting other files, a virus will often try to infect the computer itself
 - This way, every time the computer is booted, the virus is automatically activated
- It might put itself in the boot sector of the hard disk
- It might add itself to the list of programs the OS runs at boot time
- It might infect one or more of the programs the OS runs at boot time
- It might try many of these strategies
 - But it's still trying to evade detection!

Spreading

- How do viruses spread between computers?
- Usually, when the user sends infected files (hopefully not knowing they're infected!) to his friends
 - Or puts them on a p2p network
- A virus usually requires some kind of user action in order to spread to another machine
 - If it can spread on its own (via email, for example), it's more likely to be a worm than a virus

Payload

- In addition to trying to spread, what else might a virus try to do?
- Some viruses try to evade detection by disabling any active virus scanning software
- Most viruses have some sort of **payload**
- At some point, the payload of an infected machine will activate, and something (usually bad) will happen
 - Erase (or encrypt) your hard drive
 - Subtly corrupt some of your spreadsheets
 - Install a keystroke logger to capture your online banking password
 - Start attacking a particular target website

Spotting viruses

- When should we look for viruses?
 - As files are added to our computer
 - Via portable media
 - Via a network
 - From time to time, scan the entire state of the computer
 - To catch anything we might have missed on its way in
 - But of course, any damage the virus might have done may not be reversible
- How do we look for viruses?
 - Signature-based protection
 - Behaviour-based protection

Signature-based protection

- Keep a list of all known viruses
- For each virus in the list, store some characteristic feature (the **signature**)
 - Most signature-based systems use features of the virus code itself
 - The infection code
 - The payload code
 - Can also try to identify other patterns characteristic of a particular virus
 - Where on the system it tries to hide itself
 - How it propagates from one place to another

Polymorphism

- To try to evade signature-based virus scanners, some viruses are **polymorphic**
 - This means that instead of making perfect copies of itself every time it infects a new file or host, it makes a **modified** copy instead
 - This is often done by having most of the virus code encrypted
 - The virus starts with a decryption routine which decrypts the rest of the virus, which is then executed
 - When the virus spreads, it encrypts the new copy with a newly chosen random key
- How would you scan for polymorphic viruses?

Behaviour-based protection

- Signature-based protection systems have a major limitation
 - You can only scan for viruses that are in the list!
 - But there are several brand-new viruses identified *every day*
 - One anti-virus program recognizes over *15 million* virus signatures
 - What can we do?
- Behaviour-based systems look for suspicious patterns of behaviour, rather than for specific code fragments
 - Some systems run suspicious code in a sandbox first

False negatives and positives

- Any kind of test or scanner can have two types of errors:
 - False negatives: fail to identify a threat that is present
 - False positives: claim a threat is present when it is not
- Which is worse?
- How do you think signature-based and behaviour-based systems compare?

Trojan horses



Trojan horses


- **Trojan horses** are programs which claim to do something innocuous (and usually do), but which also hide malicious behaviour

You're surfing the Web and you see a button on the Web site saying, "Click here to see the dancing pigs." And you click on the Web site and then this window comes up saying, "Warning: this is an untrusted Java applet. It might damage your system. Do you want to continue? Yes/No." Well, the average computer user is going to pick dancing pigs over security any day. And we can't expect them not to. — Bruce Schneier

Dancing pig



Scareware



http://static.arstechnica.com/malware_warning_2010.png

Trojan horses

- Trojan horses:
 - Gain control by getting the user to run code of the attacker's choice, usually by also providing some code the user **wants** to run
 - "PUP" (potentially unwanted programs) are an example
 - For scareware, the user might even pay the attacker to run the code
 - The payload can be anything; sometimes the payload of a Trojan horse is itself a virus, for example
 - Trojan horses usually do not themselves spread between computers; they rely on multiple users executing the "trojaned" software
 - Better: users share the trojaned software on p2p networks

Logic bombs

- A **logic bomb** is malicious code hiding in the software **already on your computer**, waiting for a certain trigger to “go off” (execute its payload)
- Logic bombs are usually written by “insiders”, and are meant to be triggered sometime in the future
 - After the insider leaves the company
- The payload of a logic bomb is usually pretty dire
 - Erase your data
 - Corrupt your data
 - Encrypt your data, and ask you to send money to some offshore bank account in order to get the decryption key!

Logic bombs

- What is the trigger?
- Usually something the insider can affect once he is no longer an insider
 - Trigger when this particular account gets three deposits of equal value in one day
 - Trigger when a special sequence of numbers is entered on the keypad of an ATM
 - Just trigger at a certain time in the future (called a “time bomb”)

Spotting Trojan horses and logic bombs

- Spotting Trojan horses and logic bombs is extremely tricky. Why?
- The user is **intentionally** running the code!
 - Trojan horses: the user clicked “yes, I want to see the dancing pigs”
 - Logic bombs: the code is just (a hidden) part of the software already installed on the computer
- Don't run code from untrusted sources?
- Better: prevent the payload from doing bad things
 - More on this later

Worms

- A **worm** is a self-contained piece of code that can replicate with little or no user involvement
- Worms often use security flaws in widely deployed software as a path to infection
- Typically:
 - A worm exploits a security flaw in some software on your computer, infecting it
 - The worm immediately starts searching for other computers (on your local network, or on the Internet generally) to infect
 - There may or may not be a payload that activates at a certain time, or by another trigger

The Morris worm

- The first Internet worm, launched by a graduate student at Cornell in 1988
- Once infected, a machine would try to infect other machines in three ways:
 - Exploit a buffer overflow in the “finger” daemon
 - Use a back door left in the “sendmail” mail daemon
 - Try a “dictionary attack” against local users’ passwords. If successful, log in as them, and spread to other machines they can access without requiring a password
- All three of these attacks were well known!
- Thousands of systems were offline for several days

The Code Red worm

- Launched in 2001
- Exploited a buffer overflow in Microsoft's IIS web server (for which a patch had been available for a month)
- An infected machine would:
 - Deface its home page
 - Launch attacks on other web servers (IIS or not)
 - Launch a denial-of-service attack on a handful of web sites, including www.whitehouse.gov
 - Installed a back door and a Trojan horse to try to prevent disinfection
- Infected 250,000 systems in nine hours

The Slammer worm

- Launched in 2003
- First example of a “Warhol worm”
 - A worm which can infect nearly all vulnerable machines in just 15 minutes
- Exploited a buffer overflow in Microsoft’s SQL Server (also having a patch available)
- A vulnerable machine could be infected with a single UDP packet!
 - This enabled the worm to spread extremely quickly
 - Exponential growth, doubling every **8.5 seconds**
 - 90% of vulnerable hosts infected in 10 minutes

Module outline

- 1 Flaws, faults, and failures
- 2 Unintentional security flaws
- 3 Malicious code: Malware
- 4 Other malicious code**
- 5 Nonmalicious flaws
- 6 Controls against security flaws in programs

Web bugs

- A **web bug** is an object (usually a 1x1 pixel image) embedded in a web page, which is fetched from a different server from the one that served the web page itself.
- Information about you can be sent to third parties (often advertisers) without your knowledge or consent
 - IP address
 - Contents of cookies (to link cookies across web sites)
 - Any personal info the site has about you

Web bug example

- On the quicken.com home page:
 - `<IMG WIDTH="1" HEIGHT="1" src="http://app.insightgrit.com/1/nat?id=79152388778&ref=http://www.eff.org/Privacy/Marketing/web_bug.html&z=668951&purl=http://quicken.intuit.com/">`
- What information can you see being sent to insightgrit.com?

“Malicious code” ?

- Why do we consider web bugs “malicious code” ?
- This is an issue of privacy more than of security
- The web bug instructs your browser to behave in a way contrary to the principle of informational self-determination
 - Much in the same way that a buffer overflow attack would instruct your browser to behave in a way contrary to the security policy

Leakage of your identity

- With the help of cookies, an advertiser can learn what websites a person is interested in
- But the advertiser cannot learn person's identity
- ... unless the advertiser can place ads on a social networking site

- Content of HTTP request for Facebook ad:

GET [pathname of ad]

Host: ad.doubleclick.net

Referer: http://www.facebook.com/
profile.php?id=123456789&ref=name

Cookie: id=2015bdfb9ec...

Back doors

- A **back door** (also called a **trapdoor**) is a set of instructions designed to bypass the normal authentication mechanism and allow access to the system to anyone who knows the back door exists
 - Sometimes these are useful for debugging the system, but **don't forget to take them out before you ship!**
- Fanciful examples:
 - "Reflections on Trusting Trust" (mandatory reading)
 - "The Net"
 - "WarGames"

Examples of back doors

- Real examples:
 - Debugging back door left in sendmail
 - Back door planted by Code Red worm
 - Port knocking
 - The system listens for connection attempts to a certain pattern of (closed) ports. All those connection attempts will fail, but if the right pattern is there, the system will open, for example, a port with a root shell attached to it.
 - Attempted hack to Linux kernel source code
 - ```
if ((options == (__WCLONE|__WALL)) &&
 (current->uid = 0))
 retval = -EINVAL;
```

# Sources of back doors

- Forget to remove them
- Intentionally leave them in for testing purposes
- Intentionally leave them in for maintenance purposes
  - Field service technicians
- Intentionally leave them in for malicious purposes
  - Note that malicious users can use back doors left in for non-malicious purposes, too!

# Salami attacks

- A **salami attack** is an attack that is made up of many smaller, often considered inconsequential, attacks
- Classic example: send the fractions of cents of round-off error from many accounts to a single account owned by the attacker
- More commonly:
  - Credit card thieves make very small charges to very many cards
  - Clerks slightly overcharge customers for merchandise
  - Gas pumps misreport the amount of gas dispensed

# Privilege escalation

- Most systems have the concept of differing levels of privilege for different users
  - Web sites: everyone can read, only a few can edit
  - Unix: you can write to files in your home directory, but not in `/usr/bin`
  - Mailing list software: only the list owner can perform certain tasks
- A **privilege escalation** is an attack which raises the privilege level of the attacker (beyond that to which he would ordinarily be entitled)

# Sources of privilege escalation

- A privilege escalation flaw often occurs when a part of the system that **legitimately** runs with higher privilege can be tricked into executing commands (with that higher privilege) on behalf of the attacker
  - Buffer overflows in setuid programs or network daemons
  - Component substitution (see attack on search path in textbook)
- Also: the attacker might trick the system into thinking he is in fact a legitimate higher-privileged user
  - Problems with authentication systems
    - “-froot” attack

# Rootkits

- A **rootkit** is a tool often used by “script kiddies”
- It has two main parts:
  - A method for gaining unauthorized root / administrator privileges on a machine (either starting with a local unprivileged account, or possibly remotely)
    - This method usually exploits some known flaw in the system that the owner has failed to correct
    - It often leaves behind a back door so that the attacker can get back in later, even if the flaw is corrected
  - A way to hide its own existence
    - “Stealth” capabilities
    - Sometimes just this stealth part is called the rootkit

# Stealth capabilities

- How do rootkits hide their existence?
  - Clean up any log messages that might have been created by the exploit
  - Modify commands like `ls` and `ps` so that they don't report files and processes belonging to the rootkit
  - Alternately, modify the **kernel** so that no user program will ever learn about those files and processes!

## Example: Sony XCP

- Mark Russinovich was developing a rootkit scanner for Windows
- When he was testing it, he discovered his machine already had a rootkit on it!
- The source of the rootkit turned out to be Sony audio CDs equipped with XCP “copy protection”
- When you insert such an audio CD into your computer, it contains an `autorun.exe` file which automatically executes
- `autorun.exe` installs the rootkit

## Example: Sony XCP

- The “primary” purpose of the rootkit was to modify the CD driver in Windows so that any process that tried to read from an XCP-protected CD would get garbled output
- The “secondary” purpose was to make itself hard to find and uninstall
  - Hid all files and processes whose names started with \$sys\$
- After people complained, Sony eventually released an uninstaller
  - But running the uninstaller left a back door on your system!

# Keystroke logging

- Almost all of the information flow from you (the user) to your computer (or beyond, to the Internet) is via the keyboard
  - A little bit from the mouse, a bit from devices like USB keys
- An attacker might install a **keyboard logger** on your computer to keep a record of:
  - All email / IM you send
  - All passwords you type
- This data can then be accessed locally, or it might be sent to a remote machine over the Internet

# Who installs keyboard loggers?

- Some keyboard loggers are installed by malware
  - Capture passwords, especially banking passwords
  - Send the information to the remote attacker
- Others are installed by one family member to spy on another
  - Spying on children
  - Spying on spouses
  - Spying on boy/girlfriends

# Kinds of keyboard loggers

- Application-specific loggers:
  - Record only those keystrokes associated with a particular application, such as an IM client
- System keyboard loggers:
  - Record all keystrokes that are pressed (maybe only for one particular target user)
- Hardware keyboard loggers:
  - A small piece of hardware that sits between the keyboard and the computer
    - Works with any OS
    - Completely undetectable in software

# Interface illusions

- You use user interfaces to control your computer all the time
- For example, you drag on a scroll bar to see offscreen portions of a document
- But what if that scrollbar isn't really a scrollbar?
- What if dragging on that “scrollbar” really dragged a program (from a malicious website) into your “Startup” folder (in addition to scrolling the document)?
  - This really happened

# Interface Illusion by Conficker worm



# Interface illusions

- We expect our computer to behave in certain ways when we interact with “standard” user interface elements.
- But often, malicious code can make “nonstandard” user interface elements in order to trick us!
- We think we’re doing one thing, but we’re really doing another
- How might you defend against this?

# Phishing

- **Phishing** is an example of an interface illusion
- It looks like you're visiting Paypal's website, but you're really not.
  - If you type in your password, you've just given it to an attacker
- Advanced phishers can make websites that look every bit like the real thing
  - Even if you carefully check the address bar, or even the SSL certificate!

# Man-in-the-middle attacks

- Keyboard logging, interface illusions, and phishing are examples of **man-in-the-middle attacks**
- The website/program/system you're communicating with isn't the one you **think** you're communicating with
- A man-in-the-middle intercepts the communication from the user, and then passes it on to the intended other party
  - That way, the user thinks nothing's wrong, because his password works, he sees his account balances, etc.

# Man-in-the-middle attacks

- But not only is the man-in-the-middle able to see (and record) everything you're doing, and can capture passwords, but once you've authenticated to your bank (for example), the man-in-the-middle can **hijack** your session to insert malicious commands
  - Make a \$700 payment to attacker@evil.com
- You won't even see it happen on your screen, and if the man-in-the-middle is clever enough, he can edit the results (bank balances, etc.) being displayed to you so that there's no visible record (to you) that the transaction occurred
  - Stealthy, like a rootkit

# Module outline

- 1 Flaws, faults, and failures
- 2 Unintentional security flaws
- 3 Malicious code: Malware
- 4 Other malicious code
- 5 Nonmalicious flaws**
- 6 Controls against security flaws in programs

# Covert channels

- Suppose Alice has access to very sensitive information, and Eve is an attacker who wants it
  - Medical information
  - Banking information
  - Alice's own password
- Eve can even arrange for malicious code to be running on Alice's machine
  - Trojan horse, logic bomb, etc.

# Covert channels

- Normally, Eve would just have the Trojan horse send the sensitive data to her over the Internet
- But Alice is too clever for that!
  - She closely watches all Internet traffic from her computer
  - Better, she doesn't connect her computer to the Internet at all!
- How does Eve get Alice's data?

# Covert channels

- If there's no information at all that goes from Alice to somewhere Eve can get it, there's really nothing Eve can do.
  - But this is rare
- Suppose Alice publishes a weekly report summarizing some (nonsensitive) statistics
- Eve can “hide” the sensitive data in that report!
  - Modifications to spacing, wording, or the statistics itself
  - This is called a **covert channel**
  - See the text for an example

# Side channels

- What if Eve can't get Trojaned software on Alice's computer in the first place?
- It turns out there are some very powerful attacks called **side channel** attacks
  - Eve watches how Alice's computer behaves when processing the sensitive data
  - Eve usually has to be somewhere in the physical vicinity of Alice's computer to pull this off
    - But not always!

# Side channels

- Eve can learn information about what Alice's computer is doing (and what data it is processing) by looking at:
  - RF emissions
  - Power consumption
  - Audio emissions
  - Reflected light from a CRT
  - Reflection of screen in Alice's eyeball
  - Time it takes for Alice's computer to perform a computation
  - Shared CPU cache
- These are especially powerful attacks when "Alice's computer" is a smart card (like a SIM chip or satellite TV card) that stores some kind of secret but is physically in Eve's possession

# Module outline

- ① Flaws, faults, and failures
- ② Unintentional security flaws
- ③ Malicious code: Malware
- ④ Other malicious code
- ⑤ Nonmalicious flaws
- ⑥ Controls against security flaws in programs

# The picture so far

- We've looked at a large number of ways an attacker can compromise program security
  - Exploit unintentional flaws
  - Exploit intentional, but nonmalicious, behaviour of the system
  - Introduce malicious code, including malware
- The picture looks pretty bleak
- Our job is to control these threats
  - It's a tough job

# Software lifecycle

- Software goes through several stages in its lifecycle:
  - Specification
  - Design
  - Implementation
  - Change management
  - Code review
  - Testing
  - Documentation
  - Maintenance
- At which stage should security controls be considered?

# Security controls—Design

- How can we design programs so that they're less likely to have security flaws?
- Modularity
- Encapsulation
- Information hiding
- Mutual suspicion
- Confinement

# Modularity

- Break the problem into a number of small pieces (“modules”), each responsible for a single subtask
- The complexity of each piece will be smaller, so each piece will be far easier to check for flaws, test, maintain, reuse, etc.
- Modules should have low **coupling**
  - A coupling is any time one module interacts with another module
  - High coupling is a common cause of unexpected behaviours in a program

# Encapsulation

- Have the modules be mostly self-contained, sharing information only as necessary
- This helps reduce coupling
- The developer of one module should not need to know how a different module is implemented
  - She should only need to know about the published interfaces to the other module (the API)

# Information hiding

- The internals of one module should not be visible to other modules
- This is a stronger statement than encapsulation: the implementation and internal state of one module should be **hidden** from developers of other modules
- This prevents accidental reliance on behaviours not promised in the API
- It also hinders some kinds of malicious actions by the developers themselves!

# Mutual suspicion

- It's a good idea for modules to check that their inputs are sensible before acting on them
- Especially if those inputs are received from untrusted sources
  - Where have we seen this idea before?
- But also as a defence against flaws in, or malicious behaviour on the part of, other modules
  - Corrupt data in one module should be prevented from corrupting other modules

# Confinement

- Similarly, if Module A needs to call a potentially untrustworthy Module B, it can **confine** it (also known as **sandboxing**)
  - Module B is run in a limited environment that only has access to the resources it absolutely needs
- This is especially useful if Module B is code downloaded from the Internet
- Suppose all untrusted code were run in this way
  - What would be the effect?

# Security controls—Implementation

- When you're actually coding, what can you do to control security flaws?
- High on the list: Don't use C, but this might not be an option
- Other useful approaches: static code analysis, formal methods, and genetic diversity
- Finally: learn more!

# Static code analysis

- There are a number of software products available that will help you find security flaws in your code
  - These work for various languages, including C, C++, Java, Perl, PHP, Python
- They often look for things like buffer overflows, but some can also point out TOCTTOU and other flaws
- These tools are not perfect!
  - They're mostly meant to find suspicious things for you to look at more carefully
  - They also miss things, so they can't be your only line of defence

# Formal methods

- Instead of looking for suspicious code patterns, **formal methods** try to **prove** that the code does exactly what it's supposed to do
  - And you thought the proofs in your math classes were hard?
  - Unfortunately, we can show that this is impossible to do in general
    - But that doesn't mean we can't find large classes of useful programs where we can do these proofs in particular
- Usually, the programmer will have to “mark up” her code with assertions or other hints to the theorem proving program
  - This is time-consuming, but if you get a proof out, you can really believe it!

# Genetic diversity

- The reason worms and viruses are able to propagate so quickly is that there are many, many machines running **the same vulnerable code**
  - The malware exploits this code
- If there are lots of different HTTP servers, for example, there's unlikely to be a common flaw
- This is the same problem as in agriculture
  - If everyone grows the same crop, they can all be wiped out by a single virus

# Learn more about software security

- We barely scratched the surface in this course
- If you are thinking about becoming a software developer, get one of these books:
- “Building Secure Software - How to Avoid Security Problems the Right Way” by John Viega and Gary McGraw
- “Writing Secure Code (Second Edition)” by Michael Howard and David LeBlanc

# Security controls—Change management

- Large software projects can have dozens or hundreds of people working on the code
- Even if the code's secure today, it may not be tomorrow!
- If a security flaw does leak into the code, where did it come from?
  - Not so much to assign blame as to figure out how the problem happened, and how to prevent it from happening again

# Source code and configuration control

- Track all changes to either the source code or the configuration information (what features to enable, what version to build, etc.) in some kind of management system
- There are dozens of these; you've probably used at least a simple one before
  - CVS, Subversion, git, darcs, Perforce, Mercurial, Bitkeeper, ...
- Remember that attempted backdoor in the Linux source we talked about last time?
  - Bitkeeper noticed a change to the source repository that didn't match any valid checkin

# Security controls—Code review

- Empirically, code review is the single most effective way to find faults once the code has been written
- The general idea is to have people other than the code author look at the code to try to find any flaws
- This is one of the benefits often touted for open-source software: anyone who wants to can look at the code
  - But this doesn't mean people actually do!
  - Even open-source security vulnerabilities can sit undiscovered for years, in some cases

# Kinds of code review

- There are a number of different ways code review can be done
- The most common way is for the reviewers to just be given the code
  - They look it over, and try to spot problems that the author missed
  - This is the open-source model

# Guided code reviews

- More useful is a guided walk-through
  - The author explains the code to the reviewers
  - Justifies why it was done this way instead of that way
  - This is especially useful for **changes** to code
    - Why each change was made
    - What effects it might have on other parts of the system
    - What testing needs to be done
- Important for safety-critical systems!

# “Easter egg” code reviews

- One problem with code reviews (especially unguided ones) is that the reviewers may start to believe there's nothing there to be found
  - After pages and pages of reading without finding flaws (or after some number have been found and corrected), you really just want to say it's fine
- A clever variant: the author **inserts intentional flaws** into the code
  - The reviewers now know there **are** flaws
  - The theory is that they'll look harder, and are more likely to find the **unintentional** flaws
  - It also makes it a bit of a game

# Security controls—Testing

- The goal of testing is to make sure the implementation meets the specification
- But remember that in security, the specification includes “and nothing else”
  - How do you test for that?!
- Two main strategies:
  - Try to make the program do unspecified things just by doing unusual (or attacker-like) things to it
  - Try to make the program do unspecified things by taking into account the design and the implementation

# Black-box testing

- A test where you just have access to a completed object is a **black-box** test
  - This object might be a single function, a module, a program, or a complete system, depending on at what stage the testing is being done
- What kinds of things can you do to such an object to try to get it to misbehave?
- `int sum(int inputs[], int length)`

# Fuzz testing

- One easy thing you can do in a black-box test is called **fuzz testing**
- Supply completely random data to the object
  - As input in an API
  - As a data file
  - As data received from the network
  - As UI events
- This causes programs to crash surprisingly often!
  - These crashes are violations of Availability, but are often indications of an even more serious vulnerability

# White-box testing

- If you're testing conformance to a specification by taking into account knowledge of the design and implementation, that's **white-box** testing
  - Also called **clear-box** testing
- Often tied in with code review, of course
- White-box testing is useful for **regression testing**
  - Make a comprehensive set of tests, and ensure the program passes them
  - When the next version of the program is being tested, run all these tests again

# Security controls—Documentation

- How can we control security vulnerabilities through the use of documentation?
- Write down the choices you made
  - And why you made them
- Just as importantly, write down things you tried that **didn't work!**
  - Let future developers learn from your mistakes
- Make checklists of things to be careful of
  - Especially subtle and non-obvious security-related interactions of different components

# Security controls—Maintenance

- By the time the program is out in the field, one hopes that there are no more security flaws
  - But there probably are
- We've talked about ways to control flaws when modifying programs
  - Change management, code review, testing, documentation
- Is there something we can use to try to limit the number of flaws that make it out to the shipped product in the first place?

# Standards, process, and audit

- Within an organization, have rules about how things are done at each stage of the software lifecycle
- These rules should incorporate the controls we've talked about earlier
- These are the organization's **standards**
- For example:
  - What design methodologies will you use?
  - What kind of implementation diversity?
  - Which change management system?
  - What kind of code review?
  - What kind of testing?

# Standards, process, and audit

- Make formal **processes** specifying how each of these standards should be implemented
  - For example, if you want to do a guided code review, who explains the code to whom? In what kind of forum? How much detail?
- Have **audits**, where somebody (usually external to the organization) comes in and verifies that you're following your processes properly
- This doesn't guarantee flaw-free code, of course!

# Recap

- Flaws, faults, and failures
- Unintentional security flaws
- Malicious code: Malware
- Other malicious code
- Nonmalicious flaws
- Controls against security flaws in programs

# Recap

- Various controls applicable to each of the stages in the software development lifecycle
- To get the best chance of controlling all of the flaws:
  - Standards describing the controls to be used
  - Processes implementing the standards
  - Audits ensuring adherence to the processes