SERVER-SIDE ANALYSIS

Ben Livshits, Microsoft Research
Overview of Today’s Lecture

- Static analysis for bug finding
- Scripting languages analyzed (UsenixSec ‘05 paper)

- Runtime analysis
  - Fuzzing
  - Pen testing
  - Tainting
  - Symbolic execution
Compilers Under the Hood

```c
int main()
{
    printf("hello,world!\n");
    return (0);
}
```

Compilation started at Mon May 30 15:36:27

```
gcc -o hello 123.c
```

```
123.c: In function `main':
123.c:3:3: warning: incompatible implicit declaration of built-in function `printf'
```

Compilation finished at Mon May 30 15:36:29
Stages of Compilation

Source code

Lexing

Parsing

IR

Analysis

Code generation

Executable code
Stages of Compilation

- Source code
- Lexing
- Parsing
- IR
- Analysis
- Code generation
- Executable code
Stages of Compilation

- Source code
- Lexing
- Parsing
- IR
- Analysis
- Code generation
- Executable code
Stages of Compilation

1. Source code
2. Lexing
3. Parsing
4. IR
5. Analysis
6. Code generation
7. Executable code

[Diagram showing a tree structure related to compiler stages]
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Static Analysis

- Pros?
- Cons?
Static Analysis Tool for Bug Finding: Plan

1. Read the program

2. Transform into an Intermediate Representation (IR)

3. Do analysis on the IR

4. Output results
Dimensions of Analysis

- Intraprocedural vs. interprocedural
- Flow sensitive vs. flow-insensitive
- Context sensitive vs. context-insensitive
Cost vs. Effectiveness

- interprocedural
- flow-sensitive
- context-sensitive
- hard to implement

- intraprocedural
- flow-insensitive
- context-insensitive
- not too hard to build

or grep++ like LCLink
A static analyzer for finding dynamic programming errors
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SUMMARY
There are important classes of programming errors that are hard to diagnose, both manually and automatically, because they involve a program’s dynamic behavior. This article describes a compile-time analyzer that detects these dynamic errors in large, real-world programs. The analyzer traces execution paths through the source code, modeling memory and reporting inconsistencies. In addition to avoiding false paths through the program, this approach provides valuable contextual information to the programmer who needs to understand and repair the defects. Automatically-created models, abstracting the behavior of individual functions, allow inter-procedural defects to be detected efficiently. A product built on these techniques has been used effectively on several large commercial programs. Copyright © 2000 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
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INTRODUCTION
There are important classes of programming errors that are hard to diagnose, both manually and automatically, because they involve a program’s dynamic behavior. They include invalid pointer references, faulty storage allocation, the use of uninitialized memory, and improper operations on resources such as files (trying to close a file that is already closed, for example).

Finding and fixing such errors is difficult and expensive. They are usually found late in the development process. Extensive testing is often needed to find them, because they are commonly caused by complex interactions between components. Our measurements indicate that in commercial C and C++ code, on the order of 90% of these errors are caused by the interaction of multiple functions. In addition, problems may be revealed only in error conditions or other unusual situations, which are difficult to provoke by standard testing methods.

Traditional checking provided by the error-checking portion of compilers identifies errors relating to the static expression of a program, such as syntax errors, type violations, and mismatches between

*Correspondence to: William R. Bush, 1739 Lexington Avenue, San Mateo, CA 94402-4024, U.S.A.

Copyright © 2000 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
Paper Contributions

- Interprocedural static analysis algorithm
  - Address dynamic language features
  - Hash table use
  - Regular expression matching

- Features
  - Symbolic execution inside basic blocks
  - Basic block summaries
Paper Contributions

- **Focus**
  - SQL injection vulnerabilities. Why? Good idea?
  - XSS – claim to handle with minor modifications

- **Experiments**
  - 6 PHP apps
  - Finds 105 previously unknown vulnerabilities
> **PHP Language Features**

- **Natural SQL integration**
  
  ```php
  $rows = mysql_query(
    "UPDATE users SET pass=‘$pass’ WHERE userid=‘$userid’";
  )
  ```

- **Dynamic types and implicit casts**
  
  ```php
  If ($userid < 0) exit;
  $query = “SELECT * from users
    WHERE userid=‘$userid’”;
  ```

- **Global environment**
  
  ```php
  $_GET[‘name’] or $name
  $ used with register_globals = on? Attacker may provide arbitrary value for $superuser by inserting something like $superuser=1 into HTTP request
  ```
Analysis Steps (Section 3)

1. PHP Source
   └── Standard PHP Parser
2. Abstract Syntax Trees
   └── ∀ Function
3. Control Flow Graph
   └── Intrablock Analysis
4. Block Summary
   └── Intraprocedural Analysis
5. Function Summary
   └── Interprocedural Analysis
6. Result
Basic blocks: Simulation

- Build up a model mapping labels -> values
- Special treatment of strings. Why?
- Special treatment of (some) booleans. Why?
Various Data Types: Representation

**Strings**  Most fundamental type

- Concatenation of string segments
- `contains(\sigma)`: String with substrings from a set \( \sigma \) of memory locations
# Basic Block Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error set</td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>Input variables which must be sanitized before entering this basic block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return value</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Representation for return value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untaint set</td>
<td>$U$</td>
<td>Sanitized locations for each successor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination predicate</td>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>Block contains exit() or calls another termination function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value flow</td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>Set of location pairs $(l_1, l_2)$ where $l_1$ is a substring of $l_2$ on exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>Defined memory locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Function Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error set</td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>Input variables which must be sanitized before entering this basic block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return value</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Representation for return value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitized values</td>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>Sanitized locations for each successor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Program exit   | $X$    | Memory location that can flow to database inputs for main function, this cannot include \$_GET[...] or \$_POST[...]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
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<td>Sanitized locations for each successor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program exit</td>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>Block contains exit() or calls another termination function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```php
function make_query($user, $pass) {
    global $table;
    return "SELECT * from $table " .
        "where user = $user and pass = $pass";
}
```

$R = \{\$table, \$arg#1, \$arg#2\}$

string-typed parameters or globals that might be returned, either fully or as part of a longer string
# Function Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error set</td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>Input variables which must be sanitized before entering this basic block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return value</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Representation for return value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitized values</td>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>Sanitized locations for each successor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program exit</td>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>Program exit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```latex
global $S = (\text{false } \Rightarrow \{\}, \text{true } \Rightarrow \{\text{arg#1}\})$
```

```plaintext
function is_valid($x$) {
    if (is numeric($x$)) return true;
    return false;
}
```
## Function Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error set</td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>Input variables which must be sanitized before entering this basic block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return value</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Representation for return value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitized values</td>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>Sanitized locations for each successor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program exit</td>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>Block contains exit() or calls another termination function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Boolean which indicates whether the current function terminates program execution on all paths
Since we require the summary information of a function before we can analyze its callers, the order in which functions are analyzed is important. Due to the dynamic nature of PHP (e.g., `include` statements), we analyze functions on demand—a function $f$ is analyzed and summarized when we first encounter a call to $f$. The summary is then memoized to avoid redundant analysis. Recursive function calls are rare in PHP programs. If we encounter a cycle during the analysis, our current implementation uses a dummy “no-op” summary as a model for the second invocation.
Why On Demand?

- PHP Fusion
- version 7-02-03
- about 52K lines of code
- But really only about 16,000 matter
We seed the checker with a small set of query functions (e.g. `mysql_query`) and sanitization operations (e.g. `is_numeric`).

The checker infers the rest automatically.
Errors
- Variables controlled by the attacker \$_GET[...] and \$_POST[...]

Warnings
- Other environment-define variables at the level of main
## Result Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Err Mgs</th>
<th>Bugs (FP)</th>
<th>Warn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e107</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 (0)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Pro</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (0)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myBloggie</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 (0)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCP Portal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 (0)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP Webthings</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 (0)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>99 (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of experiments. Err Mgs: number of reported errors. Bugs: number of confirmed bugs from error reports. FP: number of false positives. Warn: number of unique warning messages for variables of unresolved origin (uninspected).
Are the techniques in the paper sound, i.e. do they find all SQL injection bugs?
Runtime Analysis Overview

- Black-box analysis
- Fuzzing
- Penetration testing
- White-box analysis
- Tainting
- Symbolic execution
“Fuzz testing or fuzzing is a software testing technique that provides invalid, unexpected, or random data to the inputs of a program. If the program fails (for example, by crashing or failing built-in code assertions), the defects can be noted.”

Wikipedia
Why Fuzz in General?

- Another point of view of testing
- If its automated, why not?

- Some Fuzzing Successes:
  - Month of Browser Bugs in 2006, many found with input fuzzing:
    - IE: 25
    - Safari: 2
    - Firefox: 2
    - Opera: 1
    - Konquerer: 1
Need a Fuzzing Specification

Fuzz testing of web applications, Hammersland and Snekkenes
Penetration Testing Overview

White Hat Tester

Web Application
- HTML
- Servlets

Other Systems
- DB

Secret Data!

!@#$
Penetration Testing: Phases

White Hat Tester

- Target Selection
- Information Gathering
- Attack Generation
- Response Analysis
- Report

Web Application
- HTML
- Servlets

Attacks
Analysis Feedback
Responses
Tainting

- **Negative tainting**
  - Mark or taint untrusted input data at runtime
  - Stop execution when untrusted input reaches “sinks”

- **Positive tainting**
  - Taint trusted data such as constant strings only
  - Stop execution when data reaching “sinks” is not tainted

- Propagate the taint through at the application executes

```java
String s = 
    req.getParameter(“userName”);
String s2 = “hello” + s;
output.println(“<div>”);
output.println(s2);
output.println(“</div>”);
```
Questions About Tainting

- How do we identify all sources in negative tainting?
- How do we remote taint?
- What is the runtime overhead?
Symbolic Execution

- Treat input values \textit{symbolically}
- Propagate symbolic values through
- When encountering a conditional, consider both branches
- Use a \textit{theorem prover} to eliminate infeasible paths

```java
String s;
if (!P) {
    s = req.getParameter("userName");
} else {
    s = "";
}

String s2 = "hello" + s;
if (P) {
    output.println(<div>);
    output.println(s2);
    output.println(</div>);
} else {
    output.println("hello");
}
```
Summary

- Static analysis for bug finding

- Scripting languages analyzed (UsenixSec ‘05 paper)

- Runtime analysis
  - Black-box
    - Fuzzing
    - Pen testing
  - White-box
    - Tainting
    - Symbolic execution