- Before starting the exam, you can fill out your name and other information of this page, but don't open the exam until you are directed to start. Don't put any of your answers on this page.
- This exam contains 6 pages (including this cover page) and 4 questions. Once we tell you to start, please check that no pages are missing.
- You may use any textbooks, notes, or printouts you wish during the exam, but you may not use any electronic devices: no calculators, smart phones, laptops, etc.
- You may ask clarifying questions of the instructor or TAs, but no communication with other students is allowed during the exam.
- Please read all questions carefully before answering them. Remember that we can only grade what you write on the exam, so it's in your interest to show your work and explain your thinking.
- By signing below you certify that you agree to follow the rules of the exam, and that the answers on this exam are your own work only.

The exam will end promptly at 12:30pm. Good luck!



Your UMN email/X.500: \_\_\_\_\_\_Qumn.edu

Number of rows ahead of you: \_\_\_\_\_ Number of seats to your left, to an aisle: \_\_\_\_\_

Sign and date: \_\_\_\_\_

Question	Points	Score
1	30	
2	16	
3	26	
4	28	
Total:	100	

- 1. (30 points) Matching definitions and concepts. Fill in each blank with the letter of the corresponding answer. Each answer is used exactly once.
  - (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Intel's name for a bit implementing  $W \oplus X$
  - (b) \_\_\_\_\_ Roughly a synonym of  $W \oplus X$
  - (c) \_\_\_\_\_ Choosing a random base address for memory regions
  - (d) \_\_\_\_\_ A technical change to decrease the possibility of attack
  - (e) \_\_\_\_\_ A safe place to store return addresses
  - (f) \_\_\_\_\_ Falsifying your identity in communication
  - (g) \_\_\_\_\_ A C library routine that executes a shell command
  - (h) \_\_\_\_\_ An amount of randomness measured in bits
  - (i) \_\_\_\_\_ Represented with a dashed rectangle
  - (j) \_\_\_\_\_ A code reuse attack using complete functions
  - (k) \_\_\_\_\_ Modifying information that should be protected
  - (l) \_\_\_\_\_ Property of information protected from disclosure
  - (m) \_\_\_\_\_ A Unix system call to switch to a new program
  - (n) \_\_\_\_\_ A Windows system call to change memory permissions
  - (o) \_\_\_\_\_ A value that can't be copied because it signifies the end

A. ASLR B. confidentiality C. DEP D. entropy E. execve F. mitigation G. return-to-libc H. shadow stack I. spoofing J. system K. tampering L. terminator canary M. trust boundary N. VirtualProtect O. XD 2. (16 points) Stack buffer overflow, in source code.

The two C functions src1 and src2 both implement similar functionality, but the different order in which they do certain operations has a significant effect. Assume that the argument s to both functions is non-null, but could point to any characters. One of the functions is safe, in the sense that it will never invoke undefined behavior. But the other function is unsafe: for some inputs, it will invoke undefined behavior. Depending on how it is compiled, this means it could crash or allow an attack.

The functions use subroutines named strlen\_nl and strcpy\_nl, which are similar to the standard library functions with similar names, but use a newline character ('\n', hex 0x0a) as a terminator instead of a null character.

```
char *strcpy_nl(char *dst, const char *src){
size_t strlen_nl(const char *s) {
                                            char *p = dst; const char *q = src;
   size_t count = 0;
                                            while (*q != '\n') { *p++ = *q++; }
   while (*s != '\n') {count++; s++;}
                                            *p++ = '\n';
   return count;
                                            return dst;
}
                                        }
int src1(char *s) {
                                        int src2(char *s) {
                                            char buf[16];
    char buf[16];
    size_t len;
                                            size_t len;
    len = strlen_nl(s);
                                            len = strlen_nl(s);
    if (len >= 16) {
                                            strcpy_nl(buf, s);
        puts("Input too long!");
                                            if (len >= 16) {
        exit(1);
                                                puts("Input too long!");
    }
                                                exit(1);
                                            }
    strcpy_nl(buf, s);
    return buf[0];
                                            return buf[0];
                                        }
}
```

- (a) The buffer buf can hold 16 characters. Why is it nonetheless a good idea that the code that checks for the input string being too long uses the condition  $len \geq 16$  (equivalent to len > 15), rather than len > 16?

(b) Between src1 and src2, which one is safe and which one is unsafe? Briefly explain why.

3. (26 points) Stack buffer overflow, in machine code.

Below are four function definitions in Linux/x86-64 assembly code, compiled from src1 and src2 from the previous question. Two of the compilations come from each of the two source functions, but with different compiler options; the labels A through D were assigned randomly. The code that handles the error case is always the same, so we've separated it out with the label error\_handler. Only one of these four versions is vulnerable to a stack buffer overflow attack overwriting its return address.

		B:	push	%rbp
A: push sub mov call cmpq ja mov mov call movsbl add pop ret	<pre>%rbx \$0x10,%rsp %rdi,%rbx strlen_nl \$0xf,%rax error_handler %rsp,%rdi %rbx,%rsi strcpy_nl (%rsp),%eax \$0x10,%rsp %rbx</pre>		push sub mov call mov mov call cmpq ja movsbl add pop pop ret	<pre>%rbx \$0x18,%rsp %rdi,%rbx strlen_nl %rax,%rbp %rsp,%rdi %rbx,%rsi strcpy_nl \$0xf,%rbp error_handler</pre>
movsbl mov pop ret	<pre>%rbp %rsp,%rbp \$0x30,%rsp %rdi,-0x28(%rbp) -0x28(%rbp),%rax %rax,%rdi strlen_nl %rax,-0x8(%rbp) \$0xf,-0x8(%rbp) error_handler -0x28(%rbp),%rdx -0x20(%rbp),%rax %rdx,%rsi %rax,%rdi strcpy_nl -0x20(%rbp),%eax %al,%eax %rbp,%rsp %rbp</pre>	D:		<pre>%rbp %rsp,%rbp \$0x30,%rsp %rdi,-0x28(%rbp) -0x28(%rbp),%rax %rax,%rdi strlen_nl %rax,-0x8(%rbp) -0x28(%rbp),%rdx -0x20(%rbp),%rax %rdx,%rsi %rax,%rdi strcpy_nl \$0xf,-0x8(%rbp) error_handler -0x20(%rbp),%eax %al,%eax %rbp,%rsp %rbp</pre>
message: .strin	g "Input too long!"			
error_hand mov call mov call				

Here is an example of an input, in the format of a C string, that would overwrite the return address of the function with the value 0x4012e2 if it is given as the argument to the vulnerable version:

## "AAAAAAABBBBBBBBxxxxxxx\x01\0\0\0\0\0\0\0yyyyyyy\xe2\x12\x40\0\0\0\0\0\n"

- (a) Write the letters of the two versions compiled from src1:
- (b) Write the letters of the two versions compiled from src2:
- (c) For each of the versions, which location(s) hold the value of the variable len? For each version, write one or more locations, where each location is either a register (e.g., %rcx), or a stack location indicated as an offset from the location a register points to (e.g., 42(%rcx) represents the location 42 bytes beyond where the register %rcx points).

A:	B:
C:	D:

- (d) Write the letter of the version that is vulnerable:
- (e) Briefly explain why this and only this version is vulnerable:

Here are some reminders about Linux/x86-64 assembly language. We use "AT&T" syntax, which means that the operand that is modified in an instruction always comes last, even though that means that subtraction (sub) and comparison are backwards from normal math. The cmp instruction compares two values, and the suffix q indicates that it operates on 64-bit values. The conditional jump instruction ja transfers control to operand label if the result of a previous comparison was greater-than ("above") according to unsigned arithmetic. The instruction lea computes an address or other numeric value using addressing-mode operations. The mov instruction copies data from its first operand to its second; the sbl and zbl variants expand from an 8-bit source to a 32-bit destination with sign extension or zero-extension respectively. push allocates 8 bytes by decreasing the stack pointer %rsp and copies a value the stack, while pop copies a value from the stack and increments the stack pointer by 8 bytes. The first two arguments to a function are passed in registers %rdi and %rsi, and a return value is in the register %rax. The function exit terminates the program.

- 4. (28 points) Multiple choice. Each question has only one correct answer: circle its letter.
  - (a) All of the following printf format specifiers might sometimes produce only a single byte of output, except:

A. %ld B. %c C. %s D. %d E. %100d

(b) If x is a 32-bit signed integer (like an int), all of the following operations could overflow, except:

A. x - 1 B. x / 2 C. x + 1 D. x \* 2 E. x + x + x

- (c) Suppose that an array field within a struct allocated with malloc can be overflowed via strcpy. All of the following might be overwritten except:
  - A. an integer field later in the structure
  - B. a return address
  - C. a pointer field in a different heap-allocated object
  - D. heap metadata for the allocation containing the overflow
  - E. metadata for another heap allocation
- (d) Addresses on x86-64 are stored in 64 bits, but current systems don't use all 64. In one common configuration, the top 17 bits of an address are required to all be the same, and if these bits are all 1, the address is reserved for the OS kernel. Also, pages are 4096 bytes long, and keeping memory regions page-aligned is important for performance. If these were the only relevant restrictions, the number of locations that could be chosen for one user-space memory region in ASLR is:

A.  $2^{12}$  B.  $2^{20}$  C.  $2^{34}$  D.  $2^{35}$  E.  $2^{36}$ 

(e) Arguably one of the most important features of pen-and-ink signatures in the physical world is that you can confront someone later with a document they have signed, and it is hard for them to deny having signed it. In our terminology, the property being provided here is:

A. integrity B. non-repudiation C. availability D. confidentiality E. invariance

- (f) Suppose your company is considering switching to two-factor authentication (similar to UMN's use of Duo) with a service provided by an outside company named AuthCorp, and your considering threats that might arise from AuthCorp. When logging in, your users will both provide a password checked on your company's service, and be authenticated via AuthCorp's app. Both the password and using the app are required, so even if AuthCorp is malicious, as long as they don't know users' other passwords, this threat class is mitigated: A. spoofing B. tampering C. repudiation D. information disclosure E. denial of service
- (g) On the other hand, because AuthCorp's service must be working correctly for users to log in, AuthCorp might still be a source of this threat class:

A. spoofing B. tampering C. repudiation D. denial of service E. escalation of privilege