



Australian Government

Department of Defence Science and Technology

Analyzing trigger-based malware with S2E

Adrian Herrera

🎽 Oxadr1an

Defence Science and Technology Group

April 25, 2023

\$ whoami

- Researcher with the Defence Science and Technology (DST) Group
- PhD student at the Australian National University (ANU)
- S2E developer/maintainer

Outline

- 1. Symbolic execution
- 2. S2E
- 3. Trigger-based malware
- 4. Analyzing trigger-based malware with S2E

What are typical approaches to reversing malware?





Can we get the best of both worlds?

Program analysis technique for **systematically** exploring **all** paths through a program*



Program analysis technique for **systematically** exploring **all** paths through a program*

*Conditions apply

- Program input is provided as a symbolic value rather than concrete data
- Operations (e.g., addition, assignment, etc.) are performed on these symbolic values to generate symbolic expressions
- Conditional statements result in an execution **fork**
- A constraint solver is invoked to find a solution to the symbolic expressions (if one exists) and generates a concrete input for the path explored

An example¹

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
    int x = 1, y = 0;
    if (a != 0) {
        y = 3 + x;
        if (b == 0) {
           x = 2 * (a + b);
        }
    }
    assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

¹"A Survey of Symbolic Execution Techniques", R. Baldoni *et al.*

```
// a \mapsto \alpha, b \mapsto \beta
void foobar(int a, int b) {
    int x = 1, y = 0;
    if (a != 0) {
         y = 3 + x;
         if (b == 0) {
              x = 2 * (a + b);
         }
    }
    assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
     // a \mapsto \alpha, b \mapsto \beta, x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 0
     int x = 1, y = 0;
     if (a != 0) {
          y = 3 + x;
          if (b == 0) {
              x = 2 * (a + b);
          }
     }
     assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
     int x = 1, y = 0;
     // Two possible execution paths:
     // 1. a \mapsto \neg (\alpha \neq 0), b \mapsto \beta, x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 0
     // 2. a \mapsto \alpha \neq 0, b \mapsto \beta, x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 0
     if (a != 0) {
           v = 3 + x;
           if (b == 0) {
                x = 2 * (a + b);
           }
     }
     assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
     int x = 1, y = 0;
     if (a != 0) {
          y = 3 + x;
          if (b == 0) {
              x = 2 * (a + b);
          }
     }
     // Path 1
     // a \mapsto \neg(\alpha \neq 0), b \mapsto \beta, x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 0
     // 1 - 0 = 1 \neq 0
     assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
     int x = 1, y = 0;
     if (a != 0) {
          // Path 2
          // a \mapsto \alpha \neq 0, b \mapsto \beta, x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 3+1=4
          y = 3 + x;
          if (b == 0) {
              x = 2 * (a + b);
          }
     }
     assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
     int x = 1, y = 0;
     if (a != 0) {
           y = 3 + x;
           // Two possible execution paths:
           // 3. a \mapsto \alpha \neq 0, b \mapsto \neg(\beta = 0), x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 4
           // 4. a \mapsto \alpha \neq 0, b \mapsto \beta = 0, x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 4
           if (b == 0) {
                x = 2 * (a + b);
           }
     }
     assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
     int x = 1, y = 0;
     if (a != 0) {
          y = 3 + x;
          if (b == 0) {
              x = 2 * (a + b);
          }
     }
     // Path 3
     // a \mapsto \alpha \neq 0, b \mapsto \neg(\beta = 0), x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 4
     // 1 - 4 = -3 \neq 0
     assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
     int x = 1, y = 0;
     if (a != 0) {
           y = 3 + x;
           if (b == 0) {
                 // Path 4
                 // a \mapsto \alpha \neq 0, b \mapsto \beta = 0,
                 // \mathbf{x} \mapsto 2 \times [(\alpha \neq 0) + (\beta = 0)], \mathbf{y} \mapsto 4
                 x = 2 * (a + b);
           }
     }
     assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
     int x = 1, y = 0;
     if (a != 0) {
           y = 3 + x;
           if (b == 0) {
                 x = 2 * (a + b);
           }
     }
     // a \mapsto \alpha \neq 0, b \mapsto \beta = 0,
     // \mathbf{x} \mapsto 2 \times [(\alpha \neq 0) + (\beta = 0)], \mathbf{y} \mapsto 4
     assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
    int x = 1, y = 0;
    if (a != 0) {
         y = 3 + x;
          if (b == 0) {
              x = 2 * (a + b);
         }
    }
    // 2 \times [(\alpha \neq 0) + (\beta = 0)] - 4 = 0
    // a \mapsto 2, b \mapsto 0
    assert(x - y != 0);
}
```

```
void foobar(int a, int b) {
    int x = 1, y = 0;
    if (a != 0) {
        y = 3 + x;
        if (b == 0) {
            x = 2 * (a + b);
        }
    }
    assert(x - y != 0);
}
// All paths (\times4) explored
```

S2E

Available tools

Many symbolic execution engines available

Available tools

Many symbolic execution engines available









Available tools

Many symbolic execution engines available













S2E is a platform for in-vivo multi-path analysis of software systems

S2E is a platform for in-vivo multi-path analysis of software systems

- Extensible
- Write your own tools

S2E is a platform for in-vivo multi-path analysis of software systems

• On real OSes, with real apps, libraries, drivers

S2E is a platform for in-vivo multi-path analysis of software systems

- Symbolic execution
- Concolic execution
- State merging
- Fuzzing
- ...

S2E is a platform for in-vivo multi-path analysis of software systems

- Bug finding
- Verification
- Testing
- Security checking

S2E is a platform for in-vivo multi-path analysis of software systems

Pretty much anything that runs on a computer

S2E architecture



- S2E uses QEMU
- S2E intercepts and replaces /dev/kvm
- QEMU's dynamic binary translator translates guest instructions to LLVM
- LLVM instructions symbolically executed by KLEE

S2E architecture



Path selection plugins

- What input to make symbolic?
- What input to make concrete?
- Search heuristics

Analysis plugins

- Check for crashes
- Check for vulnerability conditions
- Performance measurements

Why S2E?

- Works on unmodified binaries
- Operates at any level of the software stack
- Does not require environment modelling

Why S2E?

- Works on unmodified binaries
- Operates at any level of the software stack
- Does not require environment modelling

Perfect for malware analysis

Trigger-based malware

Trigger-based malware

"Hidden behavior/certain code paths that are only executed under certain *trigger conditions*"²

² "Automatically Identifying Trigger-based Behavior in Malware", D. Brumley *et al.* 30 Science and Technology for Safeguarding Australia

Trigger examples

- Internet connectivity
- Mutex objects
- Existence of files
- Existence of Registry entries
- Data read from a file
- ...

```
Trigger example – time <sup>3</sup>
```

```
SYSTEMTIME systime;
LPCSTR site = "https://federation.edu.au/icsl/mre2019";
```

```
GetLocalTime(&systime);
```

```
if (9 == systime.wDay) {
    if (10 == systime.wHour) {
        if (11 == systime.wMonth) {
            if (6 == systime.wMinute) {
                ddos(site);
            }
        }
    }
}
```

³ "Automatically Identifying Trigger-based Behavior in Malware", D. Brumley *et al.* 32 Science and Technology for Safeguarding Australia

Trigger example – network

<pre>mov esi, data_4313d0 {"http://www.iugerfsodp9ifjaposdfj"}</pre>							
lea edi, [esp+0x8 {var_50}]							
xor eax, eax {0x0}							
rep movsd dword [edi], [esi] {0x0}							
movsb byte [edi], [esi] {0x0}							
<pre>mov dword [esp+0x41 {var_17}], eax {0x0}</pre>							
mov dword [esp+0x45 {var_13}], eax {0x0}							
mov dword [esp+0x49 {var_f}], eax {0x0}							
mov dword [esp+0x4d {var_b}], eax {0x0}							
<pre>mov dword [esp+0x51 {var_7}], eax {0x0}</pre>							
<pre>mov word [esp+0x55 {var_3}], ax {0x0}</pre>							
push eax {0x0}							
push eax {var_60} {0x0}							
push eax {var_64} {0x0}							
push 0x1 {var_68}							
push eax {0x0}							
mov byte [esp+0x6b {var_1}], al {0x0}							
call dword [InternetOpenA@IAT]							
push 0x0							
push 0x84000000 {var_60} {0x84000000}							
push 0x0 {var_64}							
	ecx, [esp+0x14 {var_50}]						
mov esi, eax							
push 0x0 {var_68}							
push	ecx {var_50} {var_6c}						
push							
call	dword [InternetOpenUrlA@						
mov	edi, eax						
push	esi {var_5c}						
mov esi, dword [InternetCloseHandle@IAT]							
test edi, edi							
jne	0x4081bc						
		T			_		
		L					
call	esi		call	esi			
push	edi {var 5c 1}		push	0x0			
call	esi		call	esi			
рор	edi {saved_edi}						

Analyzing trigger-based malware

Why is it hard?

Analyzing trigger-based malware

Why is it hard?

- Typical dynamic analysis cannot determine the trigger conditions to go down the correct path
- Code may be **obfuscated**, so hard to determine trigger conditions **statically**

Analyzing trigger-based malware

Why is it hard?

- Typical dynamic analysis cannot determine the trigger conditions to go down the correct path
- Code may be **obfuscated**, so hard to determine trigger conditions **statically**

Symbolic execution can help

Analyzing trigger-based malware with S2E

Why not fuzz?

Possible approach:

- 1. Identify trigger types of interest (e.g., time, network, etc.)
- 2. Generate random trigger inputs
- 3. goto 2 until trigger condition is met

Why not fuzz?

Possible approach:

- 1. Identify trigger types of interest (e.g., time, network, etc.)
- 2. Generate random trigger inputs
- 3. goto 2 until trigger condition is met

Problems:

- Highly inefficient small probability of guessing the *exact* trigger value
- Not interested in exploring program only in the trigger path

Symbolic execution approach

- 1. Identify trigger types of interest (e.g., time, network, etc.)
- 2. Represent trigger inputs symbolically
- 3. Collect constraints and fork at conditional statements
- 4. Solve constraints \rightarrow trigger values

S2E approach

- Hook trigger sources (e.g., GetLocalTime, InternetOpenURL, etc.)
- 2. Make return value symbolic (via S2E API)

S2E approach

- Hook trigger sources (e.g., GetLocalTime, InternetOpenURL, etc.)
- 2. Make return value symbolic (via S2E API)

S2E handles everything else

S2E approach

- Hook trigger sources (e.g., GetLocalTime, InternetOpenURL, etc.)
- 2. Make return value symbolic (via S2E API)

S2E handles everything else

Hook with **EasyHook** (https://easyhook.github.io/)

```
SYSTEMTIME systime;
LPCSTR site = "https://federation.edu.au/icsl/mre2019";
```

```
GetLocalTime(&systime);
```

```
#include <s2e/s2e.h>
```

```
"systime");
```

}

// TODO: Initialize EasyHook



S2E produces the following trigger input:

This is a byte-level representation of expected constraints:

systime.wDay = $9 \land$ systime.wHour = 10 \land systime.wMonth = $11 \land$ systime.wMinute = 6

	<pre>mov esi, data_4313d0 {"http://www.iuqerfsodp9ifjaposdfj"}</pre>								
	lea	edi, [esp+0x8 {var_50}]							
	xor	eax, eax {0x0}							
	rep movsd dword [edi], [esi] {0x0}								
	movsb	ovsb byte [edi], [esi] {0x0}							
	mov	v dword [esp+0x41 {var_17}], eax {0x0}							
	mov	dword [esp+0x45 {var_13}], eax {0x0}							
	mov	dword [esp+0x49 {var_f}], eax {0x0}							
	mov	ov dword [esp+0x4d {var_b}], eax {0x0}							
	mov dword [esp+0x51 {var 7}], eax {0x0}								
	mov	v word [esp+0x55 {var 3}], ax {0x0}							
	push	ush eax {0x0}							
	push eax {var 60} {0x0}								
	push eax {var 64} {0x0}								
	push 0x1 {var 68}								
	push eax {0x0}								
	mov byte [esp+0x6b {var 1}], al {0x0}								
	call dword [InternetOpenA@IAT]								
	push 0x0								
	push 0x84000000 {var 60} {0x84000000}								
	push 0x0 {var 64}								
	lea ecx. [esp+0x14 {var 50}]								
	mov esi, eax								
	push 0x0 {var 68}								
	push ecx {var 50} {var 6c}								
	push	esi {var_70}							
	call	dword [InternetOpenUrlA@	IAT						
	mov	edi, eax							
	push	esi {var_5c}							
	mov esi, dword [InternetCloseHandle@IAT]								
	test edi, edi								
	jne								
- 5					-				
		•	L						
	call	esi	call	esi					
	push	edi {var 5c 1}	push	0×0					
	call	esi	call	esi					
	mov push mov test jne call push call	ed1, eax esi {var_5c} esi {var_5c} ed1, ed1 0x4001bc esi ed1 {var_5c_1} esi	eHandle@I call push call	AT] esi 0x0 esi					

static std::set<HINTERNET> dummyHandles;

```
static HINTERNET WINAPI InternetOpenUrlAHook(
         HINTERNET hInternet, /* ... */ ) {
     UINT8 returnResource = S2ESymbolicChar("hInternet", 1);
     if (returnResource) {
         // Create and return a dummy handle
         HINTERNET resourceHandle = (HINTERNET) malloc(
             sizeof(HINTERNET));
         dummyHandles.insert(resourceHandle);
         return resourceHandle;
     } else {
         // Simulate InternetOpenUrlA "failing"
         return NULL;
     }
 }
ΔΔ
```

```
static BOOL WINAPI InternetCloseHandleHook(
        HINTERNET hInternet) {
    std::set<HINTERNET>::iterator it =
        dummyHandles.find(hInternet);
    if (it == dummyHandles.end()) {
        // Could be real a real handle
        return InternetCloseHandle(hInternet);
    } else {
        // A dummy handle
        free(*it);
        dummyHandles.erase(it);
        return TRUE;
    }
}
```



Conclusion

- Recreated David Brumley's paper in S2E
- Explore more of the program than a typical dynamic analysis
- Scalability is an issue

All material available at

https://github.com/adrianherrera/malware-s2e

Conclusion

- Recreated David Brumley's paper in S2E
- Explore more of the program than a typical dynamic analysis
- Scalability is an issue

All material available at

https://github.com/adrianherrera/malware-s2e

Questions?