FirmUp: Precise Static Detection of Common Vulnerabilities in Firmware

Yaniv David, Nimrod Partush, Eran Yahav @ Technion



*The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) under grant agreement no. 615688 - ERC-COG-PRIME and the Israel Ministry of Science and Technology, grant no. 3-9779.

Motivation











· -

Sereo A

Open Source Is Everywhere



Open Source Vulnerabilities on the Rise



https://www.cvedetails.com/browse-by-date.php

Finding a known vulnerability in a Firmware



https://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2014-4877

Finding a known vulnerability in a Firmware



Challenge: Code Is Syntactically Different

jalr	t9		
move	s2,	a0	
move	s5,	v 0	
li	v0,	0x1F	
lw	gp,	0x28+sp	
bne	s5,	v0, 0x40E744	
move	v0,	s5	

addiu	a2,	sp, 0x20
move	s4,	a1
jal	0x4(B2AC
move	s5,	a0
li	v1,	0x1F
beq	v0,	v1, 0x40B518
lui	s6,	0x47

gcc v5.2 -02

NETGEAR product firmware

Challenge: Control-Flow-Graph Will Not Help



Query CFG:

Finding a known vulnerability in a Firmware



Procedure–Centric Search Misses



Best match relation – is **not symmetric**

Using Executable–Centric Search



Challenge: Procedure Structure Will Not Help



Finding Vulnerabilities

- Precise avoid false positives
- Flexible find similarities even when using:
 - Various CPU Architectures (ISA differs syntactically)
 - Custom tool-chains (Compiler vendors, -O123s)
- Scalable fast enough to work in our scenario
 - Only the minimal partial-matching is calculated



Our Approach

I want to play a game

The Rules of the Game

• The game is played by a player and a rival



- Player needs to create a partial matching
 - Must contain q_v the vulnerable procedure
- Rival tries to find inconsistencies in player's matches
- "skipping" a best match allowed only by expanding the partial-match

The Rules of the Game (2)

- Player wins the game by finding a **consistent** match
- Rival wins when player gives up (or by timeout / too many game steps)
- This is a two-player game in the formal sense
- Here we only provide some intuition
- Full details in the paper

Game: Find Match for q_v



Game: Reverse Search by Rival



Game: Explain the Skip



Game: First Match



Game: Working Up the Stack



Game: Three Steps Forward



Game: Getting Back To q_v



Game: Partial Match Found



Evaluation

Prototype of our approach - FirmUp

Evaluation

• Corpus

- ~5000 Firmware images crawled from public repositories
 NETGEAR[®], D-Link[®]
- ~2000 contained relevant executables (Arch + OS)
 - 32bit Architectures:
- Total of ~200,000 executables
- Containing ~40,000,000 procedures
- Queries 7 real world public vulnerabilities (CVE) from diverse types
 - DOS, BOF, input validation, information disclosure, and path traversal

Finding Vulnerabilities Using FirmUp

373 confirmed vulnerabilities, 147 in the latest available Firmware

#	CVE	Package	New versions => new procedures =>						
1	2011-0762	vsftpd	vsf_filename_passes_	symmo	etry is	s pro	oken	23	2m
2	2009-4593	bftpd	bftpdutmp_log	63			NETGEAR	15	4m
3	2012-0036	libcurl	curl_easy_unescape	1			NETGEAR	0	12s
4	2013-1944	libcurl	tailmatch	5			ASUS,D-Link	2	1m
5	2013-2168	dbus	printf_string_upper_bound	10			D-Link, NETGEAR	5	7m
6	2014-4877	wget	ftp_retrieve_glob	69	14		ASUS, NETGEAR	35	18m
7	2016-8618	libcurl	alloc_addbyter	149	0	ASI	JS,D-Link, NETGEAR	61	25m

The Importance of the Game



Game Steps Used

Wait, Where Are the False-Negatives?

- Data from the "wild" is not labeled => no false-negatives
 - To save space debug information **is stripped** in firmware build
- Some non-stripped executables existed in corpus
 - Usually found in early versions of firmware (maybe for debugging)
 - Library procedure names cannot be stripped (importing/calling by name)
- Extended experiment by Including two more CVEs

GitZ Vs FirmUp

GitZ [PLDI17] - our previous work, procedure-centric similarity search



GitZ encountered 34% false positives compared with 9.88% for FirmUp

BinDiff Vs FirmUp

BinDiff - Industry standard tool (recently made free)



BinDiff encountered over 69.3% false results overall compared with 6% for FirmUp

Similar Structure ≠ Similar Semantics



Summary

- Procedure-centric search is lacking
 - shown in comparison to GitZ
- Executable-centric search uses available information to improve search
- Full-equivalence is expensive, game-inspired partial equivalence instead
- Evaluated on data from the "wild" : 373 confirmed vulnerabilities, 147 in the latest available firmware

Questions?

