

# **Program Analysis**

## **Information Flow Analysis**

### **(Part 3)**

**Prof. Dr. Michael Pradel**

**Software Lab, University of Stuttgart**

**Winter 2020/2021**

# Outline

---

## 1. Introduction

## 2. Information Flow Policy

## 3. Analyzing Information Flows ←

Mostly based on these papers:

- *A Lattice Model of Secure Information Flow*, Denning, Comm ACM, 1976
- *Dytan: A Generic Dynamic Taint Analysis Framework*, Clause et al., ISSTA 2007

# Analyzing Information Flows

---

Given an information flow policy,  
analysis **checks for policy violations**

## Applications:

- Detect **vulnerable code** (e.g., potential SQL injections)
- Detect **malicious code** (e.g., privacy violations)
- Check if program **behaves as expected** (e.g., secret data should never be written to console)

# Explicit vs. Implicit Flows

---

- **Explicit flows:** Caused by data flow dependence
- **Implicit flows:** Caused by control flow dependence

# Explicit vs. Implicit Flows

---

- **Explicit flows:** Caused by data flow dependence
- **Implicit flows:** Caused by control flow dependence

```
var creditCardNb = 1234;  
var x = creditCardNb;  
var visible = false;  
if (x > 1000) {  
    visible = true;  
}
```

# Explicit vs. Implicit Flows

---

- **Explicit flows:** Caused by data flow dependence
- **Implicit flows:** Caused by control flow dependence

```
var creditCardNb = 1234;  
var x = creditCardNb;  
var visible = false;  
if (x > 1000) {  
    visible = true;  
}
```

Explicit flow from  
creditCardNb to x

Implicit flow from  
x > 1000 to visible

# Explicit vs. Implicit Flows

---

- **Explicit flows:** Caused by data flow dependence  
Some analyses consider only these
- **Implicit flows:** Caused by control flow dependence

```
var creditCardNb = 1234;  
var x = creditCardNb;  
var visible = false;  
if (x > 1000) {  
    visible = true;  
}
```

Explicit flow from creditCardNb to x

Implicit flow from x > 1000 to visible

# Static and Dynamic Analysis

---

## ■ **Static information flow analysis**

- **Overapproximate** all possible data and control flow dependences
- Result: Whether information "**may flow**" from secret source to untrusted sink

## ■ **Dynamic information flow analysis**

- Associate security labels ("**taint markings**") with **memory locations**
- **Propagate** labels at **runtime**

# Static and Dynamic Analysis

---

## ■ **Static information flow analysis**

- **Overapproximate** all possible data and control flow dependences
- Result: Whether information "**may flow**" from secret source to untrusted sink

## ■ **Dynamic information flow analysis**

- Associate security labels ("**taint markings**") with **memory locations**
- **Propagate** labels at **runtime**

**Focus of rest of this lecture**

# Taint Sources and Sinks

---

- **Possible sources:**
  - Variables
  - Return values of a particular function
  - Data from a particular I/O stream

# Taint Sources and Sinks

---

## ■ Possible sources:

- Variables
- Return values of a particular function
- Data from a particular I/O stream

## ■ Possible sinks:

- Variables
- Parameters given to a particular function
- Instructions of a particular type (e.g., jump instructions)

# Taint Sources and Sinks

---

## ■ Possible sources:

- Variables
- Return values of a particular function
- Data from a particular I/O stream

## ■ Possible sinks:

- Variables
- Parameters given to a particular function
- Instructions of a particular type (e.g., jump instructions)

**Report illegal flow if taint marking flows to a sink where it should not flow**

# Taint Propagation

---

## 1) **Explicit flows**

**For every operation that produces a new value, propagate labels of inputs to label of output:**

$$label(result) \leftarrow label(inp_1) \oplus \dots \oplus label(inp_2)$$

# Taint Propagation (2)

---

## 2) Implicit flows

- Maintain **security stack**  $S$ : Labels of all values that influence the current flow of control
- When  $x$  influences a **branch decision** at location  $loc$ , **push**  $label(x)$  on  $S$
- When control flow reaches **immediate post-dominator** of  $loc$ , **pop**  $label(x)$  from  $S$
- When an operation is executed while  $S$  is non-empty, consider all **labels on  $S$  as input** to the operation

## Example 1

- Policy:
- security classes: public, secret
  - source: variable "creditCardNb"
  - sink: variable "visible"

```

var creditCardNb = 1234;
var x = creditCardNb;
var visible = false;
if (x > 1000) {
  visible = true;
}

```

label(creditCardNb) = secret

explicit flow: label(x) = secret

label(visible) = public

produce intermediate value b,

label(b) = label(x) ⊕ label(1000)

= secret ⊕ public = secret

push "secret" onto S

labels on S are part of input

label(visible) = secret ⊕ label(true)

= secret ⊕ public = secret

→ violation of policy

# Example 2: Quiz

---

```
var x = getX();  
var y = x + 5;  
var z = true;  
if (y === 10)  
    z = false;  
foo(z);
```

## Policy:

- Security classes: public, secret
- Source: `getX`
- Sink: `foo()`

**Suppose that `getX` returns 5. Write down the labels after each operation.**

**Is there a policy violation?**

# Hidden Implicit Flows

---

- Implicit flows may happen even though a **branch is not executed**
- Approach explained so far will **miss such "hidden" flows**

```
// label(x) = public, label(secret) = private  
var x = false;  
if (secret)  
    x = true;
```

# Hidden Implicit Flows

---

- Implicit flows may happen even though a **branch is not executed**
- Approach explained so far will **miss such "hidden" flows**

```
// label(x) = public, label(secret) = private  
var x = false;  
if (secret)  
    x = true;
```

**Copies secret into x**

**But: Execution where  
secret is false does not  
propagate anything**

# Hidden Implicit Flows (2)

---

Approach to **reveal hidden flows**:

For every conditional with branches  $b_1$   
and  $b_2$ :

- Conservatively overapproximate which **values may be defined** in  $b_1$
- Add **spurious definitions** into  $b_2$

# Hidden Implicit Flows (2)

---

Approach to **reveal hidden flows**:

For every conditional with branches  $b_1$   
and  $b_2$ :

- Conservatively overapproximate which **values**  
**may be defined** in  $b_1$
- Add **spurious definitions** into  $b_2$

```
var x = false;  
if (secret)  
    x = true;  
else  
    x = x;    // spurious definition
```

**All executions propagate  
"secret" label to x**

# Implementation in Dytan

---

## Dynamic information flow analysis for **x86 binaries**

- Taint markings stored as **bit vectors**
- One bit vector **per byte** of memory
- Propagation implemented via **instrumentation**  
(i.e., add instructions to existing program)
- Computes immediate post-dominators via **static control flow graph**

# Summary

---

- **Information flow analysis:**
  - Track secrecy of information handled by program
- Goal: Check information flow **policy**
  - Security classes, sources, sinks
- Various **applications**
  - E.g., malware detection, check for vulnerabilities
- There exist channels missed by information flow analysis
  - E.g., power consumption, timing