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Introductions

- Collin Mulliner
- Jon Oberheide
Announcing Cats4Fun: $1000 USD to the cat charity of your choosing for the best cat picture brought to the #pwn2own booth at CanSecWest.

As @mdowd says, the cat pictures must not be withheld for 6 months and cannot be cats originating from (or sold to) oppressive governments.
Thanks, Mudge!
Thanks, Mudge!
Android
Android

Most popular smartphone platform about 1 billion devices today
This dude is in trouble
Lets patch him up!
WTF are we doing here people

● **Anti-malware**
  ○ 99.9%* of Android malware is bullshit toll fraud

● **MDM**
  ○ “Manage” your way out of an insecure platform
  ○ HEY I CAN SEE ALL MY VULNERABLE DEVICES, YAY!

● **Other features of mobile “security” products**
  ○ Find my phone (G does it), backup (G does it), …?

* I just made this up, kinda
How about…

● Maybe we try to fix the underlying issues?
  ○ “Enumerating badness” always doomed to fail
  ○ Naw, that’s crazy talk!

● Underlying issues (in our not-so-humble opinion)
  ○ Lack of platform integrity
  ○ Privilege escalation vulns, large attack surface
  ○ Huge windows of vuln due to slow/non-existing patching practices
Our research

● Investigated Android vulns and solutions
  ○ Vulns in native and managed code
  ○ More than privesc!
● Let’s show what can be done
  ○ Mostly PoC, but deployed to 100k’s of real-world devices
  ○ If we can do this on the cheap, maybe Big Corp can do it for reals
● “Defensive” talk, booooooo
A tale of three projects

- Vulns exist
  - X-Ray

- How to get rid of them
  - PatchDroid

- How to brick a lot of people’s phones ;-)
  - ReKey
Ideal mobile ecosystem...HA!

- In a perfect world...
- **AOSP**: Google ships a secure base platform.
- **OEM**: Samsung and third-party suppliers don’t introduce vulns in their handsets and customizations.
- **Carrier**: T-Mobile rolls out rapid OTA updates to keep users up to date and patched.
Real-world mobile ecosystem

- In the real world...

- **AOSP**: Android improving mitigations, but slowly.

- **OEM**: Customizations by device OEMs are a primary source of vulnerabilities.

- **Carrier**: Updates are not made available for months and sometimes even years.
Real-world mobile ecosystem

- In the real world...

- **AOSP**: Android improving mitigations, but slowly.

  All software has vulns, mobile or otherwise.

- **OEM**: Customizations by device OEMs are a primary source of vulnerabilities.

- **Carrier**: Updates are not made available for months and sometimes even years.

  Failing to deliver patches is the real issue.
Disclosure & patching process

- **Google**
- **OEM**
- **Carrier**
- **Third-party providers**
- **Researchers**
- **Public**
- **Attackers**

Timeframes:
- Days
- Weeks
- Months
Challenges in patching

● Why is mobile patching challenging?
  ● Complicated software supply chain
  ● Testing, testing, testing
  ● Risk of bricking devices
  ● Inverted economic incentives

● Want to patch your device's vulnerabilities?
  ● Loadset controlled by carrier
  ● Can't patch the device (unless rooted)
"Patches must be integrated and tested for different platforms to ensure the best possible user experience. Therefore, distribution varies by manufacturer and device." - AT&T
What the carriers say

"Patches must be integrated and tested for different platforms to ensure the best possible user experience. Therefore, distribution varies by manufacturer and device."

- AT&T
Privilege escalation vulnerabilities

- **Android security model**
  - Permissions framework, “sandboxing” (Linux uid/gid)
  - Compromise of browser (or other app) ≠ full control of device

- **Privilege escalation vulnerabilities**
  - Unprivileged code execution → Privileged code execution
  - Publicly released to allow users to jailbreak their devices
  - Public exploits reused by mobile malware to root victim's devices

- Ooooh, fancy mobile privesc, right???
Quick trivia

● What's wrong with the following code?

/* Code intended to run with elevated privileges */
do_stuff_as_privileged();

/* Drop privileges to unprivileged user */
setuid(uid);

/* Code intended to run with lower privileges */
do_stuff_as_unprivileged();

● Assuming a uid/euid=0 process dropping privileges...
Zimperlich vulnerability

● Return value not checked! setuid(2) can fail:

EAGAIN The uid does not match the current uid and uid brings process over its RLIMIT_NPROC resource limit.

● Android's zygote does fail if setuid does:

```c
err = setuid(uid);
if (err < 0) {
    LOGW("cannot setuid(%d): %s", uid, strerror(errno));
}
```

● Fork until limit, when setuid fails, app runs as uid 0!
A sampling of privesc vulns

- **ASHMEM**: Android kernel mods, no mprotect check
- **Exploid**: no netlink source check, inherited from udev
- **Exynos**: third-party device driver, kmem read/write
- **Gingerbreak**: no netlink source check, GOT overwrite
- **Levitator**: My_First_Kernel_Module.ko, kmem read/write
- **Mempodroid**: inherited from upstream Linux kernel
- **RageAgainstTheCage**: no setuid retval check
- **Wunderbar**: inherited from upstream Linux kernel
- **Zimperlich**: no setuid retval check
- **ZergRush**: UAF in libsysutils
X-Ray for Android

- How can we measure this problem?

- X-Ray for Android
  - DARPA CFT funded
  - Performing _actual_ vuln assessment on mobile
  - Detects most common privescs
  - Works without any special privileges or permissions

http://xray.io
Static probes

- Static probes
  - Can identify vulnerabilities using static analysis
  - Send up vulnerable component (e.g. binary, library) to service
  - Disassemble and look for patched/vulnerable code paths
Static probe example: Zimperlich

BLX __android_log_print

loc_5A834 ; uid
MOV R0, R6
BLX setuid
CMP R0, #0
BGE loc_5A856

BLX __errno
LDR R3,<=(aCannotSetuidDE - 0x87FC4)
LDR R1,<=(aDalvikvm_0 - 0x87FC4)
LDR R7, [R0]
ADDS R2, R4, R3 ; "cannot setuid(%d) errno: %d"
ADDS R1, R4, R1 ; "dalvikvm"
MOV R0, #5
MOV R3, R6
STR R7, [SP,#0x30+var_30]
BLX __android_log_print
Ok, what does it _really_ look like?

- l33t static analysis...aka ghetto objdump/python/grep

```python
# look for setuid line starting at the setgid line
for j in xrange(i, len(lines)):
    line = lines[j]
    if line.endswith('<dvmAbort>'):  
        dvmabort = True
    if line.endswith('<setuid@plt>'):  
        break
else:
    return base.RESULT_UNKNOWN, 'did not find setuid'

# if we found dvmAbort between setgid and setuid, we're patched
if dvmabort:
    return base.RESULT_PATCHED, 'found dvmAbort'
else:
    return base.RESULT_VULNERABLE, 'did not find dvmAbort'
```

- Do we need to be that smart or perfect? Thankfully, no.
Dynamic probes (aka pseudo-exploits)

- Dynamic probes
  - Not all vulnerabilities are in software components we can access
  - Example: kernel vulns, kernel image not accessible by X-Ray
  - Probe locally for vulnerability presence!
  - Basically sad, neutered, wacky half exploits :-(

![Diagram](image.png)
pkg.ui32BridgeID = CONNECT_SERVICES;
pkg.ui32Size = sizeof(pkg);
pkg.ui32InBufferSize = 0;
pkg.pvParamIn = NULL;
pkg.ui32OutBufferSize = DUMP_SIZE;
pkg.pvParamOut = dump;

ret = ioctl(fd, 0, &pkg);
if (ret == 0) {
    result = "vulnerable|leaked kernel memory";
    goto done;
} else {
    result = "patched|can't leak kernel memory";
    goto done;
}
Dynamic probe example: Exploid

```c
snprintf(buf, sizeof(buf), "ACTION=add%cDEVPATH=/" DEV_NODE "%cSUBSYSTEM=exploid%c"

ret = sendmsg(sock, &msg, 0);
if (ret == -1) {
    result = "patched|can't send payload";
    goto close;
}

sleep(1);

ret = stat(DEV_PATH, &sbuf);
if (ret == -1) {
    result = "patched|can't find exploid device";
} else {
    result = "vulnerable|found exploid device";
}

snprintf(buf, sizeof(buf), "ACTION=remove%cDEVPATH=/" DEV_NODE "%cSUBSYSTEM=exploid%c"
```
Probe manifests in JSON

Static probe:

```json
{
  "id": "webkit",
  "type": "static",
  "name": "WebKit (inactive)",
  "query_url": "/xray/webkit/query",
  "probe_url": "/xray/webkit/probe",
  "static_payload": "/system/lib/libwebcore.so"
}
```

Dynamic probe:

```json
{
  "id": "exynos",
  "type": "dynamic",
  "name": "Exynos",
  "result_url": "/xray/exynos/result",
  "dynamic_slot": 
"06",
  "dynamic_payload_armeabi": 
"/xray/static/exynos/armeabi/libexynos_v1.so",
  "dynamic_signature_armeabi": "vrX...",
  "dynamic_payload_armeabi-v7a": 
"/xray/static/exynos/armeabi-v7a/libexynos_v1.so",
  "dynamic_signature_armeabi-v7a": "mbe...",
  "dynamic_payload_mips": 
"/xray/static/exynos/mips/libexynos_v1.so",
  "dynamic_signature_mips": "F33...",
  "dynamic_payload_x86": 
"/xray/static/exynos/x86/libexynos_v1.so",
  "dynamic_signature_x86": 
"Lu7..."
}
```
### X-Ray distribution

- Not in Google Play*, but free for download at [http://xray.io](http://xray.io)

- Results collected by us (and Five Eyes) from users who ran the X-Ray app on their Android device:

  | 74,405 devices | 4,312 models | 190 countries |

* don’t ask
Aside: Android exploitation challenges

- Android fragmentation is _real_
  - Not for app dev, but for exploit dev

- X-Ray’s binary dataset
  - 3,124 unique libsystutils.so
  - 5,936 unique libdvm.so
  - 5,303 unique vold

- If only there was a way to collect all those binaries...
Scary numbers

- 6 months after the X-Ray release…
- Percent of the global Android population that are vulnerable to a privilege escalation detected by X-Ray…

60.6% vulnerable
Methodology

- How to extrapolate out to global Android population?
  - Selection bias?

- Google provides stats on Android versions →

- If we saw 98.8% of 2.2 devices were vulnerable, and 2.2 makes up 15.5% of Android globally, that contributes 15.3% to the total % of vulnerable Android devices.
Death of an Android vuln
Changes over time

Late 2012: 60.6% vulnerable
Early 2013: 41.2% vulnerable
Early 2014: 13.4% vulnerable

Looks like OK progress, but...
Only measuring those original 8 ancient privesc vulns from X-Ray 1.0, not any new ones!
OEM vendor fuckups

- Versions that shouldn’t be patched, but are!
  - Version 2.3.2, but not vuln to gingerbreak
  - Backports without version bumps

- Versions that should be patched, but aren’t!
  - Version 4.1, but still vuln to mempodroid
  - Incomplete patching, regressions

- OEM vendors relying on public exploits to do vuln assessment
Failed exploit != patched

● OEM vendor inquiry:

I was trying out X-Ray on a device, and Levitator is flagged as being vulnerable. From a quick read of the PoC and the Google bug, this should have been fixed in the version of Android used on (2.6.35), but since the code fix is not public I was not able to confirm against the source code.

I did try building and running your PoC, and it fails with this output:

$ ./levitator
[+] looking for symbols...
[+] resolved symbol commit_creds to 0xc00a72dc
[+] resolved symbol prepare_kernel_cred to 0xc00a714c
[-] dev_attr_ro symbol not found, aborting!

Is X-Ray mistaken here, or do you have a modified PoC that works on later kernels?

● SORRY. I WRITE CRAPPY EXPLOITS.
"The vulnerability affects Android devices with the PowerVR SGX chipset which includes popular models like the Nexus S and Galaxy S series. The vulnerability was patched in the Android 2.3.6 OTA update."

```
mysql> SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT(model))
FROM results
WHERE probe='levitator'
AND result='vulnerable';
+------------------------+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT(DISTINCT(model))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
+------------------------+
```

```
mysql> SELECT DISTINCT(model)
FROM results
WHERE probe='levitator'
AND result='vulnerable'
AND model LIKE '%Kindle%';
+-------------+
| model       |
+-------------+
| Kindle Fire |
+-------------+
```

It’s like PRISM...for Android!
XRAY Project Results

➢ (S//SI//REL) Covert platform for mobile TAO implants
   ○ Highly successful (~75,000 active implants worldwide)

➢ (S//SI) Metadata selector types
   ○ Device ID, manufacturer, model, version, carrier, country, IP address, vulnerability state

➢ (S//SI) Integrates with POOPCHUTE and BLAMEVUPEN
   ○ Palm Pilot support in development
Lessons learned from X-Ray

- Man, OEMs and carriers sure suck at patching.
- If only there was some way to patch these vulns ourselves!
- BRING OUT THE GERMAN!
Use Bug to Gain Root to Patch Bug
Use Bug to Gain Root to Patch Bug

Introducing

PatchDroid
Introducing PatchDroid

...but we actually have users root their devices
Challenges

- **No access to source code**
  - AOSP != code running on devices
  - modifications by OEMs

- **Can’t modify system files and/or partitions**
  - patched binaries might brick device
  - cannot replace signed partitions or files on them

- **Scalability and testing**
  - too many different devices and OS versions
  - patches need to be decoupled from source code
PatchDroid

● Third-party security patches for Android
  ○ includes: attack detection and warning mechanism

● Independent of device and Android version
  ○ support for Dalvik bytecode and native code
PatchDroid cont.

● **Scalable**
  ○ only develop patch once, patch any device
  ○ test patches in the field

● **Practical**
  ○ almost no overhead (user won’t notice any)
  ○ we don’t need source code
    ■ not everything of Android is open source
PatchDroid - The System

- **In-memory patching at runtime**
  - need to patch processes at startup
    - before process executes vulnerable code
    - monitor system for new processes
  - no need to modify system files or system partitions
    - important!
PatchDroid - The System cont.

- **Patches as independent code**
  - self-contained shared library
  - patching via function hooking
  - no access to original source code required
  - scale across different OS versions
Overview

- PatchDroid system architecture
- Patches in our system
  - creating a patch
- Technical insights
- ReKey!
  - a public release of PatchDroid
- Demo
Architecture
Architecture

Identify newly created processes - trace init and zygote
Deploy patch into process - library injection
Monitor execution of patch code
- check for instabilities
- collect logs
Architecture

Analyze log for exploitation attempt
Architecture

PatchDroid App
- GUI
- display alerts
Architecture

PatchDroid cloud infrastructure
- central logging + reporting
- patch repository
Anatomy of a Patch

● **Replacement for vulnerable function**
  ○ equivalent code without vulnerability
  ○ wrapper that adds input/output sanitization

● **Install**
  ○ hook vulnerable function
    ■ keep original function usable, we will need it later

● **Communication link**
  ○ read config parameters
  ○ write log messages, report attacks
Lifetime of a Patch

- **Deployment**
  - trace target process
  - setup communication
  - inject patch library
Lifetime of a Patch

- **Installation**
  - connect communication
  - hook function(s)
Lifetime of a Patch

- Fixed function is called
  - log (and report attack)
  - collect telemetry
  - (call original function)
Lifetime of a Patch

● Patch failure
  ○ detected using telemetry
  ○ failing patch is removed

● This is tricky
  ○ works only to certain extent
  ○ but enables some kind of field testing
Creating a Patch

- Extract patch from source, **transform** to PatchDroid patch
  - apply patch strategy best suited for vulnerability
  - sources: e.g., AOSP, Cyanogen, etc...

- Develop custom patch
  - vulnerability known, but no patch available
Patching Strategies

- replace
- proxy
- add return value check
Source Patch -> PatchDroid Patch

- Missing return value check
  - `mEntries.put()` returns != null, key is already used
  - `dup key == multiple zip entries with same name`
Transform

- **Hook:** `java.lang.LinkedHashMap.put()`
  - call orig method and check return value
  - throw exception if result != null

- **LinkedHashMap is used outside of ZipFile**
  - need to only patch behavior in ZipFile code

- **Hook:** `java.util.ZipFile.readCentralDir()`
  - install hook for LinkedHashMap
  - call original readCentralDir()
  - unhook LinkedHashMap
PatchDroid - Implementation

- **patchd**: the patch daemon
  - monitor system for newly created process
  - inject patches into process
  - monitor patched process

- **PatchDroid App**
  - UI
  - Helper Service
  - Attack Notification
PatchDroid - Implementation

- **patchd**: the patch daemon
  - Monitor newly created processes
  - Inject patches into processes
  - Monitor patched processes

- **PatchDroid App**
  - **UI**
  - **Helper Service**
  - **Attack Notification**
Hooking Techniques

- **Native patches based on ADBI**
  - framework for hooking native code on Android

- **Dalvik patches based on DDI**
  - framework for hooking Dalvik methods
Insights

- **patchd uses `ptrace()` for monitoring and injection**
  - most target processes run as root
  - `patchd ->` requires root

- **PatchDroid app lives in `/data/data/...`**
  - no need to modify ‘/system’ file system
    - often signed and checked by bootloader
  - can be installed/removed like any other app
    - we don’t want to brick devices
Patches

- **Native**
  - Zimperlich
  - GingerBreak
  - ZergRush

- **Dalvik**
  - Local SMS Spoofing
  - MasterKey
Patches

- Native
  - Zimperlich: zygote
  - GingerBreak: vold
  - ZergRush: vold

- Dalvik
  - Local SMS Spoofing: system_server
  - MasterKey: system_server
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MasterKey Bug

- Discovered by the guys from BlueBox

- Bug in handling of APK files
  - APK can be modified without breaking its signature

- Can be used for privilege escalation (root device)
  - modify APK signed with platform/oem key
  - that APK roots any device from given OEM!
MasterKey Bug cont.

- Actually multiple bugs

- Bugs in Java code (Dalvik bytecode)
  - first priv esc vuln due to bug in Dalvik bytecode

- Bug present in AOSP until version 4.3
  - Affected almost all Android devices at that time
Patching MasterKey Bug(s)

- **Patching Strategies**
  - Add missing return value check
  - Add input/output sanitisation (thru proxy function)

- **Fast turnaround**
  - 3 hours for initial version, coding + testing
ReKey

● Special version of PatchDroid
  ○ Patches for MasterKey only!

● Released on July 16th 2013
  ○ Available Google Play!

● ReKey your device
  ○ http://rekey.io
PatchDroid / ReKey - Demo
Data & Stats

- Google Play
- ReKey opt-in
ReKey Stats - installs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APP NAME</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>CURRENT / TOTAL INSTALLS</th>
<th>AVG. RATING / TOTAL #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ReKey (for rooted phones) 1.0.6</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>8,057 / 32,732</td>
<td>★ 4.04 / 368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

remember: we require a pre-rooted device
## ReKey Stats - Android versions

**CURRENT Installs by device on Mar 10, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Android Version</th>
<th>YOUR APP</th>
<th>ALL APPS IN TOOLS</th>
<th>TOP 10 ANDROID VERSIONS FOR TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Android 4.1</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>33.09%</td>
<td>29.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 2.3.3 - 2.3.7</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>22.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 4.2</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 4.0.3 - 4.0.4</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 4.3</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>9.46%</td>
<td>13.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 4.4</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 2.2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 2.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 3.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ReKey Stats - Devices

CURRENT INSTALLS BY DEVICE ON MAR 10, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hlsense New Androm...</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung Galaxy S2 (...</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>6.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung Galaxy S3 (...</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Nexus 7 (group...)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Nexus 4 (mako)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTC Desire (bravo)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung Galaxy S (G...</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung Galaxy Note...</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung Galaxy S4 (j...</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung Galaxy Nexo...</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>69.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ReKey opt-in data

- 7k logs
- 942 unique device models
- Android versions
  - 1.5.1 to 4.4.2
“My ZTE Score M, is badly hacked and your software detected it, after I found obvious examples (all of which I videotaped). Help please if possible? Thank you.”
Conclusions

- Android security is fucked
- More public pressure on the responsible parties
  - Top-down from Google
  - Bottom-up from users and companies
- Open up platform security to third-parties?
  - Allow enterprises, third-parties to offload patching responsibility
- Better platform security in general, less vulns to patch
What’s Next?

- **PatchDroid / ReKey**
  - basically working but still a PoC

- **Add patches for vendor specific bugs!?**
  - that’s a lot of bugs

- **Open Source it?**
  - X-Ray probes are woefully out of date
  - Exynos, Webkit, MasterKey, etc
  - Interest in open source version for community development and new probes?
http://x-ray.io
http://rekey.io
http://patchdroid.com

detailed academic paper

twitter:
@collinrm  @jonooberheide
Thanks & Greetz

- mudge
  - DARPA $$$
- Joshua ‘jduck’ Drake
  - heavy PatchDroid testing
- Greetz
  - zach, ben, van Hauser, i0nic, AHH crew
Alternative ‘Hotpatching’ Tools

● Xposed framework
  ○ made for modding Android without reflashing FW
  ○ replaces zygote

● Cydia Substrate
  ○ mode for modding Android without reflashing FW
  ○ complex