

The Case for Less Predictable Operating System Behavior

15th Workshop on Hot Topics in Operating Systems

Ruimin Sun, Donald Porter, Daniela Oliveira,

Matt Bishop





The Monoculture Problem

- Any vulnerability is automatically widespread
 - W32/Blaster infected **1.4 million** systems in **a month**.
 - Code-Red worm 2001



Malware Sizes are Small



We are divergent with the threat...

- Lots of effort to get into a system
- Once malware on, easy to remain



Peiter "Mudge": DARPA Framework for Cyber Security 2011 Similar arguments in S. Forrest. (WEIS 2015)

We Blame Predictability

- After breaking into a system, malware almost always works as expected
 - Ex: Configuration files always in /etc



Maybe Unpredictability is the Solution?

- What if the OS behaved adversarially toward dodgy software?
 - Ex.: Doing the wrong thing for some system calls
- Robust malware would get a lot harder to write...



Good Software is Hard to Write

- Portable, robust software already includes a ton of error-handling code and end-to-end checks
 - E.g., lots of variation among UNIX variants
- And applications increasingly distrust the OS
 - Intel SGX, Haven, Inktag, Virtual Ghost, etc.
 - Protecting against lago attacks amounts to even more careful system call checking

Malware should have to do at least this much work

Toward An Unpredictable OS

- Our prototype: Chameleon
- Focus on unpredictable system call behavior
 - No bug-for-bug compatibility
 - Non-deterministic system call errors
- Applications run in one of three environments
 - Can move over time



Unpredictable: Unknown Software

- Example: Downloaded game, maybe trojan?
- Raise engineering effort for anything to run
 - Disproportionate harm to malware?
- Approach: Perturb system calls in kernel
 - Arguments, return values, drop call altogether
- Monitor software, possibly transition to other environments



Diverse: Known-Good Software

- Fewer instances of same exploit
 - Restrict unpredictability to specification
- Trend to push functionality out of kernel
 - Easier to implement N versions of each piece
- Randomly combine *implementations* at runtime
- More in paper



Deceptive: Known Malware

- Similar to a honeypot
 - Monitor and report to CERT
- System behaves consistently, but falsely
 - E.g., bogus files, fakes actions taken as root
- More in paper



Working Scenario



Bob, 78

living in a retirement community in Florida

- not computer savvy
- clicks in links from phishing email
- installs malware engage in later DDoS attacks
- Bob never notices as malware is active after 1am.

Chameleon Scenario



Preliminary Study

- Hypothesis
 - Malware are more sensitive to unpredictable behavior
- Methodology [more in paper]
 - Interfere with common malware system calls
- Example Strategies
 - 1. Ignore the system call
 - 2. Change buffer bytes (read, write, send)
 - 3. Increase wait time
 - 4. Change file pointer (inject a seek)

Keylogger with Unpredictability

- Strategies on Keylogger
 - Change write (fd, *buf, size) buffer;
 - Change lseek (fd, offset, whence) pointer;



<Ret> <Lshift>hi, testeylogger<Rs<Ret> www.google.com<Ret> xlmtpane passw<Ret> Record

Botnet with Unpredictability

- Strategies on Botnet
 - Silence read(fd, *buf, size);
 - Silence or reduce len in sendto (sockfd, *buf, len, ...);



Spam truncated with bytes lost

3 bots needed to do 1 bot's job

What About Benign Software?

Firefox, Thunderbird and Skype work(ish)





- Works normally most of the time
- Occasional warnings (click "ok")
- Some functionality temporarily unavailable
 - Example: webpage or contacts won't load
 - Usually fixed by retrying

Unpredictability can **disproportionately** harm malware!

Lots to Figure Out

- More precise strategies for unpredictability
 - Malware-specific system call sequences?
 - Other rules or policies for unpredictability
 - Experiment with more software and malware
- User studies with real Bobs (and Alices)
- Abuse OS classes to implement 50+ lib. instances

Conclusion

- Unpredictability can thwart attacker with less effort than generating attacks
- Chameleon's three environments:
 - Diverse: reduce monoculture of benign software
 - Unpredictable: raise engineering effort for malware to at least match other software
 - Deceptive: lures adversaries into revealing strategies



Ruimin Sun: gracesrm@ufl.edu