A file system for safely interacting with untrusted USB flash drives

Ke Zhong, Zhihao Jiang*, Ke Ma*, and Sebastian Angel University of Pennsylvania *Shanghai Jiao Tong University





Most Storage has moved to cloud!



USB flash drives remain popular

♦ Legacy data

No network connections

♦ Store confidential data

- Bitcoin keys
- Medical records
- ID photos

USB stack has several issues

Trust-by-default design principle

Devices can bypass kernel and access memory (DMA)

Driver code tends to be buggy

There are many drivers by third party producers

♦ Masquerade as other devices

– A device could declare to be a keyboard

USB stack has several issues

Trust-by-default design principle

Devices can bypass kernel and access memory (DMA)

Driver code tends to be buggy

There are many drivers by third party producers

♦ Masquerade as other devices

A device could declare to be a keyboard

Could be exploited by a malicious flash drive

USB stack has several issues

Trust-by-default design principle

Devices can bypass kernel and access memory (DMA)

- Driver code tends to be buggy
 - There are many drivers by third party producers

- ♦ Masquerade as other devices
 - A device could declare to be a keyboard



Previous work

Packet filtering

- Cinch: Security'16
- USBFilter: Security'16

Device authentication

– ProvUSB: CCS'16

♦ Sandbox the device

– GoodUSB: ACSAS'15

Limitation

Packet filtering

- Malicious payload that changes dynamically avoids rule-based detection

Device authentication

Require new hardware/kernel modifications

Sandbox the device

- False negative (i.e., a device is malicious but sandbox says it's ok)

We propose **RBFuse**, which is a file system that accesses flash drives without interacting with the USB stack on the host machine

Key idea

RBFuse remaps memory space of host controller to a virtual machine, and exports file system of flash drives as a mountable virtual file system



Virtual machine







































Compromised virtual machine



Compromised virtual machine



Compromised virtual machine













How to address those challenges

- Optimizations
- Encrypted communication
- Formally verified serializer and parser

Preliminary evaluation

Discussion & Conclusion


♦ How to address those challenges

- Optimizations
- Encrypted communication
- Formally verified serializer and parser

Preliminary evaluation

Discussion & Conclusion

















Batching operations Write 1024KB Virtual machine to "foo"! USB Directory write 128KB + write 128KB VFS + Server **Execute** + write 128KB **VFS** Client write 128KB + write 128KB ÷ IOMMU Multiple write are combined into one + write 128KB Ψ

Batching operations Write 1024KB Virtual machine to "foo"! USB Directory write 128KB + write 128KB VFS +Server **Execute** + write 128KB **VFS** Client write 128KB + write 128KB IOMMU Multiple write are combined into one + write 128KB Other requests related to write can also be merged – getattr, mknod, getattr, open, write, close Speculatively respond to requests first By monitoring remaining size of flash drives, Ψ if size permitted, then responds "succeed" Ο



How to address those challenges

- Optimizations
- Encrypted communication
- Formally verified serializer and parser

Preliminary evaluation

Conclusion & Discussion

Encrypted communication



Encrypted communication







How to address those challenges

- Optimizations
- Encrypted communication
- Formally verified serializer and parser

Preliminary evaluation

Conclusion & Discussion

Formally verified serializer and parser





♦ How to address those challenges

- Optimizations
- Encrypted communication
- Formally verified serializer and parser

Preliminary evaluation

Discussion & Conclusion

Experiment setup

♦ For virtual machine we run Ubuntu 16.04 (Linux 4.15.0-45) on QEMU. Host machine is also Ubuntu 16.04 with KVM.

Adapter for authentication and data encryption is built on a BeagleBone Black which runs Debian 9.1 (Linux 4.4.88-ti-r125).

♦ We used *filebench* to run our experiments.

♦ Our baseline is flash drive connected to the host without any of our mechanisms.

One large file (500MB)



One large file (500MB)



Takeaway:

RBFuse itself brings little overhead
 RBFuse + adapter brings about 3x-10x overhead, due to the bad performance of adapter and increased roundtrips between flash drive and host



Takeaway:

① RBFuse itself brings 2x-4x overhead



① RBFuse itself brings 2x-4x overhead ② For write, RBFuse + adapter outperforms directly accessing due to better performance of adapter on this

Note: adapter could be viewed as another machine with Debian



Note: adapter could be viewed as another machine with Debian





♦ How to address those challenges

- Optimizations
- Encrypted communication
- Formally verified serializer and parser

Preliminary evaluation

Discussion & Conclusion

• We modified and ran crashmonkey (OSDI'18) on RBFuse

- ext4
- vfat

♦ We modified and ran crashmonkey (OSDI'18) on RBFuse

- ext4
- vfat

```
open foo O_RDWR|O_CREAT 0777
fsync foo
checkpoint 1
close foo
```

♦ We modified and ran crashmonkey (OSDI'18) on RBFuse

- ext4
- vfat

```
open foo O_RDWR|O_CREAT 0777
fsync foo
checkpoint 1
close foo
```

vfat and RBFuse on vfat would fail!

♦ We modified and ran crashmonkey (OSDI'18) on RBFuse

- ext4
- vfat

```
open foo O_RDWR|O_CREAT 0777
fsync foo
checkpoint 1
close foo
```

Hydra (SOSP'19): **Parent directory** of foo need to be **sync**

vfat and RBFuse on vfat would fail!

Previous file system fuzzing

◆ Janus (S&P'19): two-dimensional input fuzzing





Previous file system fuzzing

◆ Janus (S&P'19): two-dimensional input fuzzing

Image fuzzing

File system



Previous file system fuzzing

◆ Janus (S&P'19): two-dimensional input fuzzing



Client program fuzzing



Server side fuzzing

♦ We assume the (file system) server is malicious





Server side fuzzing

♦ We assume the (file system) server is malicious





Malicious messages fuzzing

Formal verification

♦ VFS interface is small, has better-defined semantics than USB

Formal verification on our system

Getting the virtual file system interface "right"

Conclusion

♦ We propose RBFuse, which is a file system that accesses flash drives without interacting with the USB stack on the host machine with reasonable overhead

Discussion

- Crash consistency test for RBFuse
- Server side fuzzing
- Formal verification

Thank you! Any questions or suggestions?

♦ We propose RBFuse, which is a file system that accesses flash drives without interacting with the USB stack on the host machine with reasonable overhead

Discussion

- Crash consistency test for RBFuse
- Server side fuzzing
- Formal verification

