

CSci 4271W  
Development of Secure Software Systems  
Day 10: OS-level Injection Threats

Stephen McCamant  
University of Minnesota, Computer Science & Engineering

## Outline

- Injection vulnerabilities: format strings (cont'd)
- Shell code injection and related threats
- Print server threat modeling
- Good technical writing (pt. 1)

## Injection vulnerabilities

- Common dangerous pattern: interpreter code with attacker control
- Interpreted language example: `eval`
- OS example: shell script injection
- Web examples: JavaScript (XSS), SQL injection
- C library example: `printf` format string

## Format string attack: overwrite

- `%n` specifier: store number of chars written so far to pointer arg
  - Benign but uncommon use: account for length in other formatting
- Advance format arg pointer to other attacker-controlled data
- Control number of chars written with padding
- Net result is a "write-what-where" primitive

## Practical format string challenges

- Attacker usually must control format as well as one or more arguments
- Writing a big value requires impractical output size
  - Workaround 1: overwrite two bytes with `%hn`
  - Workaround 2: use overlapping unaligned write to control byte by byte

## Format string defenses

- Compilers will warn for `printf` that looks like it should just be `puts`
- Several platforms have decided to just remove `%n`
  - Android Bionic, Visual Studio
- Linux `glibc` by default will block `%n` if the format string is writeable
- Major remaining use is information disclosure

## Demo: first steps of BCLPR format attack

- In demo: quick audit, supplying format

## Outline

- Injection vulnerabilities: format strings (cont'd)
- Shell code injection and related threats
- Print server threat modeling
- Good technical writing (pt. 1)

## Two kinds of privilege escalation

- Local exploit: give higher privilege to a regular user
  - E.g., caused by bug in `setuid` program or OS kernel
- Remote exploit: give access to an external user who doesn't even have an account
  - E.g., caused by bug in network-facing server or client

## Shell code injection

- The command shell is convenient to use, especially in scripts
  - In C: `system`, `popen`
- But it is bad to expose the shell's power to an attacker
- Key pitfall: assembling shell commands as strings
- Note: different from binary "shellcode"

## Shell code injection example

- Benign: `system("cp $arg1 $arg2"), arg1 = "file1.txt"`
- Attack: `arg1 = "a b; echo Gotcha"`
- Command: `"cp a b; echo Gotcha file2.txt"`
- Not a complete solution: prohibit ``;`

## The structure problem

- What went wrong here?
- Basic mistake: assuming string concatenation will respect language grammar
  - E.g., that attacker supplied "filename" will be interpreted that way

## Best fix: avoiding the shell

- Avoid letting untrusted data get near a shell
- For instance, call external programs with lower-level interfaces
  - E.g., `fork` and `exec` instead of `system`
- May constitute a security/flexibility trade-off

## Less reliable: text processing

- Allow-list: known-good characters are allowed, others prohibited
  - E.g., username consists only of letters
  - Safest, but potential functionality cost
- Deny-list: known-bad characters are prohibited, others allowed
  - Easy to miss some bad scenarios
- "Sanitization": transform bad characters into good
  - Same problem as deny-list, plus extra complexity

## Terminology note

- Historically the most common terms for allow-list and deny-list have been "whitelist" and "blacklist" respectively
- These terms have been criticized for a problematic "white=good", "black=bad" association
- The push to avoid the terms got significant additional attention last summer, but is still somewhat political and in flux

## Different shells and multiple interpretation

- Complex Unix systems include shells at multiple levels, making these issues more complex
  - Frequent example: `scp` runs a shell on the server, so filenames with whitespace need double escaping
- Other shell-like programs also have caveats with levels of interpretation
  - Tcl before version 9 interpreted leading zeros as octal

## Related local dangers

- File names might contain any character except / or the null character
- The PATH environment variable is user-controllable, so cp may not be the program you expect
- Environment variables controlling the dynamic loader cause other code to be loaded

## IFS and why it was a problem

- In Unix, splitting a command line into words is the shell's job
  - String → argv array
  - `grep a b c` vs. `grep 'a b' c`
- Choice of separator characters (default space, tab, newline) is configurable
- Exploit `system("/bin/uname")`
- In modern shells, improved by not taking from environment

## Outline

Injection vulnerabilities: format strings (cont'd)

Shell code injection and related threats

Print server threat modeling

Good technical writing (pt. 1)

## Data flows and trust boundaries

- Interactive in drawing program

## Outline

Injection vulnerabilities: format strings (cont'd)

Shell code injection and related threats

Print server threat modeling

Good technical writing (pt. 1)

## Writing in CS versus other writing

- Key goal is accurately conveying precise technical information
- More important: careful use of terminology, structured organization
- Less important: writer's personality, persuasion, appeals to emotion

## Still important: concise expression

- Don't use long words or complicated expressions when simpler ones would convey the same meaning. Examples:
  - necessitate
  - utilize
  - due to the fact that
- Beneficial for both clarity and style

## Know your audience: terminology

- When technical terminology makes your point clearly, use it
- But provide definitions if a concept might be new to many readers
  - Be careful to provide the right information in the definition
  - Define at the first instead of a later use
- On other hand, avoid introducing too many new terms
  - Keep the same term when referring to the same concept

## Precise explanations

- Don't say "we" do something when it's the computer that does it
  - And avoid passive constructions
- Don't anthropomorphize (computers don't "know")
- Use singular by default so plural provides a distinction:
  - The students take tests
  - + Each student takes a test
  - + Each student takes multiple tests

## Provide structure

- Use plenty of sections and sub-sections
- It's OK to have some redundancy in previewing structure
- Limit each paragraph to one concept, and not too long
  - Start with a clear topic sentence
- Split long, complex sentences into separate ones

## Know your audience: Project 1

- For projects in this course, assume your audience is another student who already understands general course concepts
  - Up to the current point in the course
  - I.e., don't need to define "buffer overflow" from scratch
- But you need to explain specifics of a vulnerable program
  - Make clear what part of the program you're referring to
  - Explain all the specific details of a vulnerability

## Inclusive language

- Avoid words and grammar that implies relevant people are male
- My opinion: avoid using he/him pronouns for unknown people
- Some possible alternatives
  - "he/she"
  - Alternating genders
  - Rewrite to plural and use "they" (may be less clear)
  - Singular "they" (least traditional, but spreading)