Monitoring program execution on ARM processors thanks to hardware components Pascal Cotret, February 28 @ Evry Fa) Think aa CB and 3 p's [0110 0011] 00 32 Q.,

e Mix

EBD9

Round Key

EI

Other Columns:

· Q2

٥,

1as



I am Pascal Cotret

- Embedded software security engineer
- Research in my spare-time



HardBlare (2015/2018) Funded by Labex CominLabs



- 3 labs (INRIA CIDRE, Lab-STICC, SCEE/IETR)
- 2 PhD students.
- 1 postdoc (from February 2018).

=> Heterogeneous information flow control

- DIFT: a short introduction

- Related works in hardware-assisted DIFT

- What can we do with ARM processors?

- Results

- Conclusion & perspectives

Dynamic Information Flow Tracking

Dynamic Information Flow Tracking (DIFT) is a promising technique for detecting software attacks.

Motivation: DIFT for security purposes => Integrity and Confidentiality

DIFT principle:

- We attach tags to containers and specify an information flow policy, i.e. relations between tags.
- At runtime, we propagate tags to reflect information flows that occurs.
- Allows to detect any security policy violation at run-time.









DIFT – Three main steps

- Tag initialization: data are tagged with theirs "security level" password="abcd" Tag(password)=secret
- Tag propagation: any new data derived from the tagged data is also tagged
 log=err+password Tag(log)=Tag(err)+Tag(password)
- Tag check: raise an exception if an information flow doesn't respect a security policy

```
write(log,network) Policy: (Tag(log)==public)
```

Different levels for DIFT

- Fine-grained (processor level)
- vi = addresses and registers; P = instructions
- Medium-grained (language level)
 vi = variables; P = functions
- Coarse-grained (operating system level)
 vi = files; P = executables

int idx = tainted_input; //stdin (> BUFFER SIZE)
buffer[idx] = x; // buffer overflow

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{set}\ \mathsf{r1} \leftarrow \& \mathsf{tainted_input}\\ \mathsf{load}\ \mathsf{r2} \leftarrow \mathsf{M[r1]}\\ \mathsf{add}\ \mathsf{r4} \leftarrow \mathsf{r2} + \mathsf{r3}\\ \mathsf{store}\ \mathsf{M[r4]} \leftarrow \mathsf{r5} \end{array}$$



int idx = tainted_input; //stdin (> BUFFER SIZE)
buffer[idx] = x; // buffer overflow

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{set} \mathsf{r1} \leftarrow \& \mathsf{tainted_input} \\ \mathsf{load} \mathsf{r2} \leftarrow \mathsf{M[r1]} \\ \mathsf{add} \mathsf{r4} \leftarrow \mathsf{r2} + \mathsf{r3} \\ \mathsf{store} \mathsf{M[r4]} \leftarrow \mathsf{r5} \end{array}$$

| Т | Data | Т | Data |
|---|----------------|---|------------------|
| | r1:&input | | Return Address |
| | r2:idx=input | | |
| | r3:&buffer | | int huffor[Ciro] |
| | r4:&buffer+idx | | int buller[Size] |
| | r5:x | | |

int idx = tainted_input; //stdin (> BUFFER SIZE)
buffer[idx] = x; // buffer overflow

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{set}\ \mathsf{r1} \leftarrow \& \mathsf{tainted_input}\\ \hline\\ \mathsf{load}\ \mathsf{r2} \leftarrow \mathsf{M[r1]}\\ \mathsf{add}\ \mathsf{r4} \leftarrow \mathsf{r2} + \mathsf{r3}\\ \\ \mathsf{store}\ \mathsf{M[r4]} \leftarrow \mathsf{r5} \end{array}$$

| Т | Data | | Т | Data |
|---|----------------|---|---|------------------|
| | r1:&input | | | Return Address |
| | r2:idx=input | | | |
| | r3:&buffer | - | | int huffor[Ciro] |
| | r4:&buffer+idx | - | | int buller[Size] |
| | r5:x | | | |

int idx = tainted_input; //stdin (> BUFFER SIZE)
buffer[idx] = x; // buffer overflow

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{set}\ \mathsf{r1} \leftarrow \& \mathsf{tainted_input}\\ \mathsf{load}\ \mathsf{r2} \leftarrow \mathsf{M[r1]}\\ \mathsf{add}\ \mathsf{r4} \leftarrow \mathsf{r2} + \mathsf{r3}\\ \mathsf{store}\ \mathsf{M[r4]} \leftarrow \mathsf{r5} \end{array}$$



int idx = tainted_input; //stdin (> BUFFER SIZE)
buffer[idx] = x; // buffer overflow

set r1
$$\leftarrow$$
 &tainted_input
load r2 \leftarrow M[r1]
add r4 \leftarrow r2 + r3
store M[r4] \leftarrow r5



Different levels:

- Application level
 - Java / Android, Javascript, C
- OS level
 - Laminar, HiStar
 - kBlare (1)
- Low level
 - Raksha (Kannan et al.)
 - Flexitaint (Ventakaramani et al.)
 - Flexcore (Deng et al.)
 - PAU (Heo et al.)

(1) Jacob Zimmermann, Ludovic Mé, and Christophe Bidan. Introducing Reference Flow Control for Detecting Intrusion Symptoms at the OS Level. In : RAID 2002.



Target architecture

SoC = System-on-Chip

- 1+ processor(s)
- Configurable electronic chip (aka FPGA)





In-core DIFT

Offloading DIFT

DIFT Coprocessor



Off-core DIFT

(2) Hari Kannan, Michael Dalton, and Christos ozyrakis. Decoupling dynamic information flow tracking with a dedicated coprocessor. In : Dependable Systems & Networks, 2009. IEEE. 2009, pp. 105-114.

| | Advantages | Disadvantages | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Software | Flexible security policies Multiple attacks detected | Overhead (from 300% to 3700%) | |
| In-core DIFT | Low overhead (<10%) | Invasive modifications Few security policies | |
| Dedicated CPU for DIFT | Low overhead (<10%) Few modifications to CPU | Wasting resources Energy consumption (x2) | |
| Dedicated DIFT coprocessor | Flexible security policies Low overhead (<10%) CPU not modified | CPU/coprocessor communication | |

ARMHEx approach:

- Reduce overhead of software instrumentation as it represents the major portion of overall DIFT execution time overhead
- Lack of security of DIFT coprocessor
- No existing work targets ARM-based SoCs (related work implementations on softcores)
- Additional challenges
 - Limited visibility
 - Frequency gap between CPU and DIFT coprocessor
 - Communication interface...

Target architecture

SoC = System-on-Chip

- 1+ processor(s)
- Configurable electronic chip (aka FPGA)



CoreSight components

A set of IP blocks providing HW-assisted system tracing



Overall architecture



CoreSight components

A set of IP blocks providing HW-assisted system tracing



CoreSight components

A set of IP blocks providing HW-assisted system tracing

C11.11.31 DBGOSLAR, OS Lock Access Register

The DBGOSLAR bit assignments are:



OS Lock Access, bits[31:0]

Writing the key value 0xC5ACCE55 to this field locks the debug registers. In v7 Debug, the write also resets the internal counter for the OS Save or OS Restore operation.

Writing any other value to this register unlocks the debug registers if they are locked.

See *The OS Save and Restore mechanism* on page C7-2154 for a description of using the OS Save and Restore mechanism registers, including the behavior when the OS Lock is set.

In v7 Debug, it is IMPLEMENTATION DEFINED whether Software debug events are not permitted when the OS Lock is set. See *About invasive debug authentication* on page C2-2030.

In v7.1 Debug, Software debug events are not permitted when the OS Lock is set.

Source : ARM CoreSight TRM

CoreSight PTM

Features:

- Trace filter (all code or regions of code)
- Branch Broadcast
- Context ID comparator
- Cycle accurate tracing
- Timestamping



Example trace

Source code

int i;
for(i=0;i<10;i++)</pre>

Assembly 8638 for_loop: ... b 8654 : ...

866C: bcc 8654

Trace

00 00 00 00 00 80 08 38 86 00 00 21 2a 86 01 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00

Decoded trace

A-sync Address 00008638, (I-sync Context 00000000, IB 21) Address 00008654, Branch Address packet (x 10)

Static analysis – Tag dependencies



DIFT stack

Our case:

- We want to store tags and initialize tags from the operating system : modified kBlare (based on a Linux Kernel 4.9)
- We don't want to loose information (no over-approximation) :
 Dynamic approach: Instrumentation + PTM traces
- Extract some informations about the data flow (for tag propagation) :
 Static Analysis: Generating annotations.

Overall architecture

char buffer1[20], buffer2[20], buffer3[20]; FILE *fpassword, findex, funauthorized;

fpassword = open("passwd.txt"); findex = open("index.html"); funauthorized = open("unauthorized.html");

read(buffer1, fpassword) read(buffer2, findex) read(buffer3, funauthorized)

```
if(getuid()){
    send_to_socket(buffer2);
}
else{
    send_to_socket(buffer3);
}
```



- LLVM modification:

- Static Analysis
- Generating annotations
- Code instrumentation
- Modifying the ARM Backend (excl. conditional exec, ...)
- kBlare: loading annotations into the co-processor dedicated memory.
- **Dynamic linker:** resolving addresses of instrumentation IP address, merging annotations.
- **Yocto:** Generating the complete distribution and the SDK suitable for HardBlare.



Instrumentation

Recover memory addresses

Two possible strategies:

- Recover all memory addresses through instrumentation
- Recover only register-relative memory address through instrumentation

Instrumentation strategy 1

| Example Instructions | Tag dependencies | Memory address recovery | | |
|----------------------|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| sub r0, r1, r2 | $\underline{r0} = \underline{r1} + \underline{r2}$ | | | |
| mov r3, r0 | $\underline{\texttt{r3}} = \underline{\texttt{r0}}$ | | | |
| str r1, [PC, #4] | $\underline{\texttt{@Mem(PC+4)}} = \underline{\texttt{r1}}$ | instrumented | | |
| ldr r3, [SP, #-8] | $\underline{r3} = \underline{@Mem(SP-8)}$ | instrumented | | |
| str r1, [r3, r2] | $\underline{\texttt{@Mem(r3+r2)}} = \underline{\texttt{r1}}$ | instrumented | | |

Instrumentation strategy 2

| Example Instructions | Tag dependencies | Memory address recovery |
|----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| sub r0, r1, r2 | $\underline{r0} = \underline{r1} + \underline{r2}$ | |
| mov r3, r0 | $\underline{\texttt{r3}} = \underline{\texttt{r0}}$ | |
| str r1, [PC, #4] | $\underline{\texttt{@Mem(PC+4)}} = \underline{\texttt{r1}}$ | CoreSight PTM |
| ldr r3, [SP, #-8] | $\underline{r3} = \underline{@Mem(SP-8)}$ | Static analysis |
| str r1, [r3, r2] | $\underline{\texttt{@Mem(r3+r2)}} = \underline{\texttt{r1}}$ | instrumented |

CoreSight components – Performance overhead



Instrumentation time overhead



Comparison with existing works – Hardware view

| Approaches | Kannan | Deng | Heo | ARMHEX |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Hardcore portability | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Main CPU | Softcore | Softcore | Softcore | Hardcore |
| Communication overhead | N/A | N/A | 60% | 5.4% |
| Area overhead | 6.4% | 14.8% | 14.47% | 0.47% |
| Area (Gate Counts) | N/A | N/A | 256177 | 128496 |
| Power overhead | N/A | 6.3% | 24% | 16% |
| Max frequency | N/A | 256 MHz | N/A | 250 MHz |
| Isolation | No | No | No | Yes |

Conclusion

As well as some perspectives 😊

Conclusion - Perspectives

Take away:

- CoreSight PTM allows to obtain runtime information (Program Flow)
- Non-intrusive tracing => Negligible performance overhead

Perspectives:

- Mid-term: releasing a PoC of the whole system
- Combine Low-level and OS-level DIFT
- Extend DIFT on multicore CPU
- Take use of other debug components for security
- What about Intel, ST ?



You can find me at: pascal.cotret@gmail.com