

Finding Your C/C++ Pointer and Array Bugs

(a step-by-step tour
to some useful tools
beyond the debugger)

Klaus Kusche, May 2012

Contents

- **Knowing your enemies**
- **First aid:**
Program checking, debugging, tracing
- **Compiling your code with seatbelts:**
Address sanitizer & Co
- **Dealing with plain off-the-shelf code:**
Valgrind and friends
- **Similar tools for different purposes**

Enemy #1: Bad pointers

- **NULL** pointer
- Uninitialized pointer:
 - Single pointer variable
(simple - usually caught by the compiler)
 - Element of a struct or an array of pointers
(much harder to find - compilers will not detect that!)
- Pointer to a local array or struct after the function has returned:
„use-after-return“

Enemy #2:

Arrays & pointer arithmetic

- Array bounds violations:
 - „Off by one“ errors in loops and size checks
 - Unchecked input values or strings exceeding the target array's size
 - Missing '\0' string termination
- Integer overflow or negative values in index arithmetic or size calculations
- Uninitialized integer values used in pointer or index arithmetic

Enemy #3:

Dynamic memory handling

- malloc object bounds violations
- „use-after-free“: Accessing free'd heap objects
- Double free (of the same object)
- Invalid free (of a pointer not pointing to a malloc objects's beginning)
- Allocation/deallocation function mismatch
(new[] + delete, new + free, malloc + delete, ...)
- (Memory leaks)
- (Memory fragmentation)

Enemy #4:

The dark corners of C / C++

- `printf` format / argument mismatch
(fatal for non-string argument to %s !)
- Variadic functions in general (no typechecking!)
- Pointers ruined by
32 bit / 64 bit casts between pointer and int
(very common in 32 bit code ported to 64 bit!)
- Non-pointer data interpreted as a pointer:
 - wrong case in a union
 - forced casts (e.g. *base class ptr ==> derived class ptr*)

What's so nasty about these bugs?

- Immediate & debuggable crash:
Be happy, you had very good luck! :-)
- Crash with massively corrupted memory:
Debugger is unable to extract any info...
- Delayed crash:
 - Hours later
 - In completely unrelated parts of the program
- No crash at all:
Program just silently gives wrong results...
- Random, unreproducible behaviour.

What makes them even more evil?

Array and pointer bugs
are by far the most frequent reason
for security vulnerabilities!

Exploit technique #1:

- Place your exploit code into some array.
- Overwrite the return address on the stack (or e.g. method pointers in objects) to jump to your exploit code...

Step #0:

The compiler is your friend - use it!

Most important & always forgotten:

Compile with

maximum warning level / options

and

maximum optimization level

(needed for dataflow analysis!).

*Warnings are given for a reason,
read them carefully!*

Step #1: Apply static program checkers

= Tools that try to find bugs
just by looking at the source.

Many marketing catchwords for the same basic principle:
*Dataflow analysis, value or range propagation,
symbolic execution, abstract interpretation, ...*

*==> What range of values
can a variable or pointer contain
at a certain point of code?*

(NULL ? Undefined ? <0 ? Just between x and y ?)

sp1int, uno, ... (Open source), pclint, ... (€)

Expectations and reality...

Many big companies swear on it and require static program analysis for all code written.

My personal experience:

Static analysis used as a quick check
usually provides only limited help:

- Either detects less than a good compiler
- Or produces tons of output
($\geq 80\%$ false positives)
- Works well only with code annotations and carefully selected flags

Step #2:

„My name is 'Dump', 'Core Dump' “

- Compile your code with debugging info: `gcc -g`
- Enable dumps: `ulimit -c ...` (some large value)
- Let your program crash ==> core dump written
- Analyze the dump with the debugger:

`gdb binary core`

Display the crash location: „where“

Display the value of variables: „print ..“

- Or: Run your program within the debugger, set watchpoints on suspected variables

Step #3:

Try `ltrace` and `strace` !

- `ltrace` traces all shared library calls & results
- `strace` traces all system calls & results

Only of limited use for pointer problems:

==> What happened just before the crash?

==> Perhaps the program forgot to check for error return values?

(e.g. NULL return value of `fopen` !)

Both tools don't require any preparation,
not even debug info in the code!

Step #4: Make your binaries foolproof...

Compiler-based solutions ...

- ... add bookkeeping code to each memory allocation & de-allocation (local var's on function entry and exit, ...) to keep track of each valid memory block
- ... replace the malloc / free library functions
- ... perhaps change the memory layout (add guard words to separate valid blocks)
- ... add checking code („points to valid data?“) to each pointer/array access

Old bounds-checking gcc clones: **bgcc** and **MIRO** (1)

Still one of the best (but slowest) checking logics:

- Keeps track of all local and global variables
and all valid heap objects
- For each pointer, knows the object it points to
(only tool which does this!!!)
- Checks not only accesses,
but also all pointer arithmetic
=> finds bad pointers early
(when created, not when dereferenced)

Old bounds-checking gcc clones: **bgcc** and **MIRO** (2)

- Detects all pointer & array bugs, including:
 - Pointers jumping to another valid object
 - Uninitialized pointers!
 - Many cases of use-after-return
- Used to detect all dynamic memory problems (including use-after-free)
- Lists all memory leaks after program ended
- Doesn't catch crashes in library code not compiled with bgcc.
- Doesn't detect uninitialized non-pointer values.

Old bounds-checking gcc clones: **bgcc** and **MIRO** (3)

bgcc is C only,
with leak finder & very good error messages

MIRO checks C and C++, but without leak finder

- Huge CPU ($\cdot 10-30$) and memory ($\cdot 3$) overhead
- Have been „the king of the road“ for 1995 - 2008
- Unmaintained since 2005 (bgcc) / 2008 (MIRO)

(slowly becoming incompatible with current software:
For example, bgcc fails to catch all malloc / free calls
with modern versions of glibc...)

Address Sanitizer („Asan“)

The new „King of the road“:

- Started by Google
- Included in standard LLVM/clang (for years)
(LLVM/clang = Apple's open source C/C++ compiler)
and in standard gcc (since 4.8)
- Handles C and C++
- Much faster than anything else
(slowdown ≤ 2 !)

Address Sanitizer's brothers

- **Thread Sanitizer:**

Detects *data races* in multithreaded code

- **Memory Sanitizer:**

Detects *reads of uninitialized memory*

- **Leak Sanitizer:**

Provides a *memory leak* listing

Address Sanitizer's principles

- **Direct mapping** of each byte in the address space to a huge valid / invalid table (byte based, not block/object based!)
=> **Very fast** (only bit shift & add, no searching) but allocates 16 TB of virtual memory (only mapped to real mem on access to corresponding bytes)
- **Guard words** are inserted around each local array and each heap block
=> „Off-bounds“ pointers are caught before they reach the next valid memory block

Address Sanitizer's features

- Bounds-checks local, global and heap data (needs additional compile/link options for global data)
- Detect *most* use-after-free and *some* use-after-return bugs
- Detects most double free etc.
- Doesn't detect crashes in system libraries
- Doesn't detect most uninitialized values
- Doesn't detect pointers randomly pointing or jumping to another valid memory area

Other bounds-checking compilers

- **FailSafe C (open source):**

- C only

- Not updated for > 5 years

- I never tried it ...

- **Parasoft Insure++:**

- Most powerful & most expensive commercial product ...

Step #5:

Valgrind runs any code checked!

Valgrind is an open source universal x86 binary code interpreter framework* ...

* the truth is by far more complex!

==> doesn't need the source, not even debug info!

==> works on plain, unmodified exe's and lib's!
(no need to recompile / relink!)

==> also checks all library code!

... where plugins may add code
before and after each instruction executed!

Valgrind's memcheck plugin

- ... maintains a „valid“ bit and an „initialized“ bit (set at first write) for each byte in memory,
- ... checks each memory access,
- ... replaces the **malloc / free** (new / delete) library calls and all system calls.

The bad news:

- Code runs 10-30 times slower
- ... and becomes about 15 times larger!
- 3 times as much memory is needed for data!

Memcheck's power ...

Memcheck detects

- almost all dynamic memory (heap) problems
- all accesses to uninitialized data
- all accesses to invalid memory areas
- most system calls with invalid pointers

... in your code and in any library!

... and it gives a complete memory leak listing!

... and blind spots

Memcheck will not detect

- bounds violations for local and global data
(it checks bounds only for malloc'ed blocks, it can't insert guards on stack or global data!)
- most local object pointers used after return
- pointers jumping to another valid memory area

Valgrind's SGCheck plugin

... detects what memcheck misses (but nothing else):

For local and global data only (but not the heap!):

- *Bounds violations*
- *Pointers jumping between objects*
- *Use-after-return*

How?

- It reads the size and location of each local / global array from the debug info.
- For each pointer to locals/globals, it remembers to which array it is pointing (like bgcc / MIRO).

Valgrind's other plugins...

- **Cachegrind:**
Cache and branch prediction hit rate
- **Callgrind, BBV, Lackey:**
Execution profiling and call graphs
- **Helgrind, DRD:**
Multithreading lock & race condition check
- **Massif, DHAT:**
Heap object access profiling

Projects similar to Valgrind

DrMemory (new, active Open Source project, developed at Google for Chrome):

- Also works on unmodified exe's and lib's by runtime code modification
- Also uses runtime code instrumentation
- Offers almost the same features as Valgrind's memcheck
- Said to be faster
- x86_32 only (no 64 bit version yet)

The commercial competition

Market leader: IBM/Rational Purify / Quantify

- About as powerful (and as slow) as Valgrind
- Works by analyzing and adding checking code to all exe's and lib's before execution
 - ==> no source or special compiler needed
 - ==> separate „code instrumentation“ step for all exe's and lib's needed (slow!)
- Very expensive (>> 5000 € per seat and year!)

Others: **Micro Focus BoundsChecker**, ...

Wrong tool #1: gcc's „Stack Smashing Protector“

Compile with **-fstack-protector**

Catches only (without showing the culprit!) ...

- ... writes behind the end of local arrays which damage the return address
- ... by inserting a guard value below the return address of each function call
- ... and checking it when the function returns

==> Fast, very little overhead! (< 5 %, often on by default)

==> Security feature, but useless for debugging!

Wrong tool #2:

Simple malloc replacements

Replace the malloc/free (new/delete) library:

Google Perftools, Dmalloc, MemProf, Mpatrol, ...

Main purpose:

Find memory leaks.

Dmalloc & Mpatrol (and in many cases standard glibc itself !) also detect simple cases of

- double free, free of bad pointers
- malloc object bounds violations (at malloc/free time!) by inserting boundary guard words

==> Won't help against most of our enemies!

Wrong tool #3:

VM-based malloc replacements

Electric Fence / DUMA (old, unmaintained!) use

Virtual Memory Management

for protection: They allocate

- one separate VM page per malloc object
- + one invalid page between two allocated pages.

==> They detect some gross bounds violations
and some use-after-free cases ...

==> ... but require huge amounts
of real & virtual memory!