



Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

6.858 Fall 2015

Quiz I

You have 80 minutes to answer the questions in this quiz. In order to receive credit you must answer the question as precisely as possible.

Some questions are harder than others, and some questions earn more points than others. You may want to skim them all through first, and attack them in the order that allows you to make the most progress.

If you find a question ambiguous, be sure to write down any assumptions you make. Be neat and legible. If we can't understand your answer, we can't give you credit!

Write your name and submission website email address on this cover sheet.

**This is an open book, open notes, open laptop exam.
NO INTERNET ACCESS OR OTHER COMMUNICATION.**

Please do not write in the boxes below.

I (xx/14)	II (xx/8)	III (xx/10)	IV (xx/8)	V (xx/12)	VI (xx/6)	VII (xx/6)	VIII (xx/12)	IX (xx/4)	X (xx/4)	Total (xx/84)

Name:

Submission website email address:

I Lab 1: buffer overflow

Consider the following code similar to `http_serve()` from Lab 1, where an adversary can supply arbitrary input in the string `name`. Throughout this part, assume a 32-bit x86 system like the Lab VM, and assume no compiler optimization or ASLR (Address Space Layout Randomization).

```
void http_serve(int fd, const char *name) {
    void (*handler)(int, const char *) = http_serve_none;
    char pn[1024];
    struct stat st;

    getcwd(pn, sizeof(pn));
    strcat(pn, name);
    if (stat(pn, &st) == 0 && S_ISREG(st.st_mode))
        handler = http_serve_file;
    handler(fd, pn);
}
```

1. [6 points]: The figure on the page after the next page shows the stack layout and register values right after `http_serve()` invokes `handler`, but before any instruction in `handler` is executed. Fill in the first column (Q1) next to the figure with letters “a” to “f” from the following options. Each letter indicates the stack content at the corresponding slot. **Note that not every option will be used, and some options may be used more than once.**

- (a) address of `pn`
- (b) `fd`
- (c) `name`
- (d) `handler`
- (e) return address for `http_serve`
- (f) return address for `handler`

2. [4 points]: Ben Bitdiddle notices that there is a vulnerability in the above code that enables a return-to-libc attack. In particular, the attacker can overflow buffer `pn[]`, and trick the server into calling the library function `unlink("grades.txt")` when `http_serve` returns. Please show how to mount this attack by smashing the relevant stack slots. Mark your solution on the second column in the figure (Q2), using the following notation:

- Write “**unlink**” if the slot should be replaced with `unlink()`’s address.
- Write “**argument**” if the slot should be replaced with the address of the string `"grades.txt"`.
- Write “**preserve**” if when overwritten, the slot must keep its original value.
- Write “**n/a**” if the slot cannot be overwritten.
- Write “**any**” if the slot will be overwritten, but it does not matter what goes in it.

3. [4 points]: Louis Reasoner argues that Ben’s exploit will not work if the server uses a stack canary. A stack canary is a value that the compiler pushes on stack at function entry, and pops and checks before return. He figures out a way to delete `grades.txt` even in the presence of a stack canary. Louis’ attack overflows `pn[]`, but in a different way than Ben’s attack. Please briefly describe how should Louis overwrite the stack in this attack.

* Options for Q1:

- (a) address of pn (b) fd (c) name (d) handler
 (e) return address for http_serve (f) return address for handler

* Options for Q2:

- unlink argument preserve n/a any

0xffffffff		Q1	Q2
		
	+-----+		
		1) _____	1) _____
	+-----+		
		2) _____	2) _____
	+-----+		
		3) _____	3) _____
	+-----+		
%ebp --->	saved %ebp		4) _____
	+-----+		
	handler		5) _____
	+-----+		
	~ pn[] ~		
	+-----+		
	st		
	+-----+		
		4) _____	6) _____
	+-----+		
		5) _____	7) _____
	+-----+		
%esp --->		6) _____	8) _____
	+-----+		
		
0x00000000			

II User authentication

The paper *The Quest to replace passwords* compares many user authentication mechanisms, ranking them on Usability, Deployability, and Security.

4. [4 points]: Consider a smartphone-based two-factor scheme that uses text messages as the second factor (e.g., Google's two factor login or MIT's Duo). Compare regular passwords to smartphone-based two-factor authentication in terms of usability, deployability, and security. (Briefly explain your answer.)

5. [4 points]: Describe an attack that smartphone-based two factor authentication is vulnerable to, but RSA SecurID is less vulnerable to.

III OKWS

The Bank of Barton provides a web site for their customers to transfer money to each other. The web site runs on a single server and uses OKWS (see *Building Secure High-Performance Web Services with OKWS*, by Maxwell Krohn).

The bank's original design has two OKWS service processes. The login service handles customer login: it checks the customer's password and issues a session cookie. The banking service handles balance requests and transfers. Both service processes talk to a database proxy via RPC. Each service has its own authentication token which it sends with every RPC so the proxy knows which service is talking to it.

The database proxy accepts the following RPCs:

```
CheckPassword(token, username, password) -> ok, session-cookie  
CheckCookie(token, session-cookie) -> ok, username  
GetBalance(token, username) -> amount  
SetBalance(token, username, amount)
```

The proxy uses the token to ensure that only the login service can use the CheckPassword RPC, and that only the banking service can call GetBalance and SetBalance. The proxy doesn't enforce any other restrictions.

- 6. [4 points]:** Does the separation between login and banking services significantly improve security over a scheme in which they are in the same process? If yes, describe an attack that it prevents; if no, explain why not.

The bank is considering changing their design so that each bank branch has a separate OKWS service process, and a separate authentication token. Each customer is associated with a single branch, and the web site handles all of a customer's balance/transfer requests in that branch's service. The web site needs to support bank transfers between customers at different branches.

7. [6 points]: It turns out that the new design won't help security unless the bank also changes the proxy RPC interface and/or the restrictions the proxy enforces. Describe a new proxy RPC interface and/or set of restrictions that would cause the service-per-branch design to significantly improve security, and outline an attack which your change prevents.

IV Lab 2: privilege separation

Ben Bitdiddle has been working on a secure email server but is having trouble configuring the proper permissions, uids, gids, and supplementary groups. The mail server is designed as follows:

The system is managed by a daemon called `postld` which is analogous to `zookld`; it starts other daemons and restarts them if they die. Authentication is managed by the `auth` service as in the lab.

All incoming mail is received by the `smtpd` daemon, on port 25 over TCP. When a client connects to `smtpd`, it can optionally authenticate as a local user. This means that `smtpd` must be able to check user credentials with the `auth` server. When `smtpd` receives a mail message, it handles it in one of two ways depending on the destination address:

A local user: it forwards the message to the `mda` (mail delivery agent) service for local delivery.

A user on a remote system: it forwards the message to the `relayd` service for remote delivery *if and only if the client has authenticated as a local user* (to avoid relaying spam from untrusted users). This is why `smtpd` must be able to authenticate users.

The following processes are involved:

Process	User	Group	Description
<code>postld</code>	<code>root</code>	<code>root</code>	the launch daemon
<code>smtpd</code>	<code>smtpd</code>	<code>smtpd</code>	receives mail from (remote) clients over smtp and forwards them to the appropriate service if applicable.
<code>relayd</code>	<code>relayd</code>	<code>relayd</code>	receives mail from <code>smtpd</code> and relays it to other mail servers.
<code>mda</code>	<code>mda</code>	<code>mda</code>	receives mail from <code>smtpd</code> and delivers it to local users' inboxes.
<code>auth</code>	<code>auth</code>	<code>auth</code>	handles authentication.

The directory set up is as follows:

```
/
+-- jail/
  +-- authsvc/
    | +-- sock    auth server socket
  +-- relaydsvc/
    | +-- sock    relayd server socket
  +-- mda/
    | +-- sock    mda socket
  +-- creds/      credentials database directory (format unspecified).
  +-- queue/      the relayd's outbound mail queue (format unspecified).
  +-- mail/       user inboxes
    +-- user1/    user1's inbox
    +-- user2/    user2's inbox
```

8. [8 points]: Please fill in the permissions below such that services have the absolute least permissions necessary to function. There may be multiple correct solutions. Note: A user must have read/write permissions to a socket to connect to it.

Directory	user	group	permissions (mode)
+++ jail/	root	root	0755
+-- authsvc/	auth		
+-- sock	auth		
+-- relaydsvc/	relayd		
+-- sock	relayd		
+-- mda/	mda		
+-- sock	mda		
+-- creds/	auth		
+-- queue/	relayd		
+++ mail/	root	root	0755
+-- user1/	user1		
+-- user2/	user2		

V Capsicum

You have a job at a hedge fund evaluating portfolios: deciding which collections of stocks will likely yield the highest returns. On the Web you find a nifty open-source electronic portfolio optimization program called `epopt`. The program's documentation says that it reads a file containing the amounts of each stock in a portfolio, computes a better portfolio, and then overwrites the file with the new portfolio. The documentation says that the only input it needs is the portfolio file. `epopt` expects the file on the command line, like this:

```
epopt /usr/rtm/my-portfolio
```

The code for `epopt` is millions of lines, and you don't have time to inspect it all carefully. You are thinking of using Capsicum to improve the security of `epopt` (see the paper *Capsicum: practical capabilities for UNIX* by Watson *et al.*).

For each of the following scenarios, indicate whether Capsicum can be used to protect against it. If yes, briefly outline how; if no, briefly explain why not.

9. [3 points]: Can Capsicum prevent `epopt` from sending a copy of the input portfolio file to your competitor over the Internet?

10. [3 points]: Can Capsicum prevent `epopt` from modifying your portfolio file to contain a lower-quality set of stocks?

11. [3 points]: Can Capsicum prevent `epopt` from writing a copy of your portfolio into the file `/tmp/.hidden`?

12. [3 points]: Can Capsicum prevent an exploit in which you download a portfolio file from somewhere on the web, and give it to `epopt` as input, but the file contains cleverly-crafted contents that trigger a buffer overflow bug in `epopt`?

VI Native Client

Native Client runs untrusted assembly code inside a sandbox using software fault isolation. The sandboxed module is located in the address range 0 to 256 Mbyte. Through a trampoline, the sandboxed module can call into a service runtime, which is located above the address 256 Mbyte. The service runtime is trusted and provides functions for I/O etc. Two of the service functions available to the sandboxed module are `mmap(dst, src, len)` and `munmap(addr, len)`. `mmap` allocates `len` bytes of memory and maps the memory into the virtual address range specified by `dst` and `len`, first initializing it by copying `len` bytes starting from `src`. `munmap` allows the module to remove the specified address range from the process' address space. Native client checks that the module doesn't `mmap` memory outside of its sandbox.

- 13. [6 points]:** How can an attacker use `mmap` and `munmap` to break out of a module's sandbox? (Outline an attack in enough detail so that we can decide if it works. Several attacks possible; you have to give only one.)

VII Intel SGX

Ben develops a password manager for a bank using SGX's secure attestation features. The bank distributes the password manager to its customers, and they install it on their SGX-enabled computers. When a customer logs into the bank, the bank verifies that Ben's code is running inside the enclave before sending any secret to the enclave.

14. [6 points]: The string library that runs inside the enclave and is used by code inside the enclave turns out to have a buffer overrun exploit. Ben's friend Sam says that SGX is so powerful that exploiting buffer overflows is not possible and that Ben doesn't have to worry about them. Explain why Sam is wrong. (Give a scenario in which an attacker can exploit a buffer overrun and explain why attestation doesn't prevent this attack.)

VIII Symbolic Execution

Recall from the EXE paper (*EXE: Automatically Generating Inputs of Death*) that, under certain circumstances, EXE forks execution in order to explore different paths (see the EXE paper's Section 2). For each of the two functions below, how many forks would each cause in total? The argument x is symbolic. Assume that the compiler does not optimize the code, and that EXE has enough time to follow all paths.

```
int
f1(int x)
{
    int z = 0;
    int i;
    for(i = 0; i < 10; i++){
        if(x == i){
            z += 1;
            break;
        }
    }
    return z;
}
```

Note the `break` inside the `if` statement, which causes the loop to terminate if the `if` condition is true.

15. [4 points]: How many forks for `f1()` above?

```
int
f2(int x[10])
{
    int z = 0;
    int i;
    for(i = 0; i < 10; i++){
        if(x[i] == 1){
            z += 1;
        }
    }
    return z;
}
```

Note that `x` is an array of symbolic integers, and that there is no `break` inside the `if` statement.

16. [4 points]: How many forks for `f2()` above?

Suppose you have a server with a secret (in `theSecret`) that it should only reveal under certain circumstances. Your server contains this code that calls `authCheck()` to decide if the client input implies that it's OK to reveal the secret, and (if yes) it calls `emit()` to send the secret to the client.

```
if(authCheck(input))
    emit(theSecret);
```

The `input` variable holds a complete HTTP request (URL, cookies, and other HTTP headers). You are worried that there might be logical bugs in `authCheck()` that cause it to return true in situations where `theSecret` should not be revealed.

17. [4 points]: Outline how you could use EXE to help you gain confidence that `authCheck()` works correctly.

IX Android security

Consider the Friend application described in the paper *Understanding Android Security*. The FriendTracker application defines the permissions `READ_FRIENDS` and `WRITE_FRIENDS`, which are used to limit access to the FriendProvider component in the FriendTracker application.

- 18. [4 points]:** Does the Android security system ensure that no other application than the FriendViewer application can read from the FriendProvider component? (Briefly explain your answer.)

X 6.858

We'd like to hear your opinions about 6.858. Any answer, except no answer, will receive full credit.

19. [2 points]: Are there things you'd like to see improved in the second half of the semester?

20. [2 points]: Is there one paper out of the ones we have covered so far in 6.858 that you think we should definitely remove next year? If not, feel free to say that.

End of Quiz