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Introduction

- Static analysis has been used for security and privacy
- Many analyses rely on the control flow graph
- Challenge:
  - ignoring the framework ⇒ incorrect control flow
    - common cause for imprecision: ‘callbacks’, e.g., onClick
  - analyzing the framework ⇒ 8.6 million lines of code
    - no existing research
Motivating Example

```java
1 public class MainClass {
2     static String url;
3     public static void main(String[] args) {
4         MalComparator mal = new MalComparator();
5         MainClass.value = 42
6         Collections.sort(list, mal);
7         sendToInternet(MainClass.value);
8     }
9 }
10 public class MalComparator implements Comparable<Object> {
11     public int compare(Object arg0, Object arg1) {
12         MainClass.value = \textbf{GPSCoords}
13         return 0;
14     }
15 }
```

Privacy leakage is up to the value of MainClass.value.
Existing Approaches

● Whole program analysis
  ○ state explosion
  ○ redundant efforts (slow-down of static analysis)

● Summary-based analysis
  ○ extensive manual efforts
    ■ incomplete due to the high volume of callbacks
    ■ heuristic summarization: inaccurate
Existing Approaches

```java
//Ljava/util/LinkedList;\add
{
    signature = "<java.util.LinkedList: boolean add(java.lang.Object)>";
    stod = new java.util.LinkedHashMap\<Integer, java.util.List\<Integer>>();
    source = new Integer(8);
    dests = new java.util.ArrayList\<Integer>();
    dests.add(new Integer(thisObject));
    stod.put(source, dests);
    summary.put(signature, stod);
}
```
EdgeMiner

- Summarize framework: list of registration-callback pairs
Concepts

- Callbacks
  - necessary condition: a framework method that can be overridden by an application method
- Registration
  - necessary condition: a framework method that is invokable from the application space
A Data Flow

```java
public class Collections {
    public static void sort(List list, Comparator comparator) {
        ...}
        comparator.compare(e1, e2);
        An object with the callback
    }
}
```
Implementation

- ROP intermediate representation (IR)
  - Well-suited for static analysis
  - SSA format
  - Integral part of Android SDK
- EdgeMiner
  - built on top of ROP
  - performs backward dataflow analysis
  - summarizes implicit control flows through framework
System Architecture
Implementation

● Preprocessing
  ○ transforms individual methods into SSA format
  ○ extracts class hierarchy
    ■ need for generating an over-approximation of the call graph
  ○ generates call graph
    ■ necessary for data-flow analysis

● Potential callback callsites

- The method is public or protected.
- The class in which the method is declared has a public or protected modifier.
- The method is not final or static.
- The class in which the method is declared does not have the final modifier.
- The class in which the method is declared is an interface or has at least one explicitly or implicitly declared, public or protected constructor.
Evaluation

● Tested on Android 2.3, 3.0 and 4.2 frameworks

● Number of registrations and callbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Android Version</th>
<th># Registrations</th>
<th># Callbacks</th>
<th># Pairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 (API 10)</td>
<td>10,998</td>
<td>11,044</td>
<td>1,926,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 (API 11)</td>
<td>12,019</td>
<td>13,391</td>
<td>2,606,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 (API 17)</td>
<td>21,388</td>
<td>19,647</td>
<td>5,125,472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accuracy

- False negative
  - compare with dynamic approach
    - incomplete but accurate
  - 8,195 randomly selected applications
  - 6,906 registration-callback pairs
  - EdgeMiner finds all pairs

- False positive
  - against manual inspection
  - 8 FP out of 200 pairs
Improving Static Analyzer

- Integration with FlowDroid
  - synchronous callbacks: inline invocation
    - e.g., collections.sort and Comparator.compare
  - asynchronous callbacks: delayed invocation
    - e.g., setOnClickListener and onClick
- Patterns of callbacks used by FlowDroid and identified by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th># FlowDroid</th>
<th># EdgeMiner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Listener</em></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Callback</em></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>On</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>19,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improving Static Analyzer

- Run 9 new apps in TaintDroid
  - 4 verified, 2 crash and 3 no leak
- Incorrect call graph → missed privacy leaks
- Performance
  - 34.7 seconds one-time loading
  - only 1.85% overhead added to Flowdroid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>FlowDroid</th>
<th>FlowDroid + EdgeMiner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Apps with ≥ 1 privacy leak</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>294 (285 + 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Privacy leaks (in total)</td>
<td>46,586</td>
<td>51,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Apps timeout</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Security Policy Enforcement

- Security policies regulate access to
  - sensitive data
  - system resources
  - privileged operations
- Policies need to be correctly enforced
Motivation

- Inconsistencies do exist
- According to the Android documentation
  - apps that hold a CALL_PHONE permission can end phone calls

The enforcement of a security policy on different code paths can be inconsistent.
Security Implication

- Privilege escalation
Existing Research

- Inconsistent security policy enforcement is also found in SELinux and Xen [AutoISES Usenix Sec’08]
  - unauthorized user account access
  - permanent data loss
- No solution for Android framework
  - prior work is OS specific
  - Android has no explicitly defined policies
Problem Statement

- Focus on the Android framework
- Seek to answer the following question:
  - How can we systematically detect inconsistent security policy enforcement *without any knowledge of the policies*?
Approach

- Discover app-accessible service interfaces that have overlaps in functionality
  - expected to have consistent security enforcement
- Perform a differential analysis on security checks that two overlapping interfaces employ
Differential Analysis

enforcePhone() checks if the caller’s UID is 1001 (RADIO)
enforcePhone() checks if the caller’s UID is 1001 (RADIO)
App-accessible Service Interfaces

- Analysis scope:
  - system services perform enforcement

- Service interfaces
  - AIDL (Android interface definition language) methods
  - broadcast receivers
Security Checks

- Security enforcement:
  - a set of security checks

- Kratos formulates 4 types of checks
  - permission check
  - UID/PID check
  - package name check
  - thread status check
Kratos Design

Java Class Files → Pre-processing
  - Explore the codebase to find
    - All system services & interfaces
    - Look at service registration

  → Call Graph Construction
    - Build a precise framework call graph
      - Points-to analysis
      - IPC shortcuts

  → Call Graph Annotation
    - Identify security checks applied to each node (method)

  → Inconsistency Detection
    - Compare security enforcement of service interfaces if they
      - Call the same privileged methods

  → Inconsistent Security Enforcement
    - Ranked list for manual investigation

Relevant Security Check Types
1. Permission
2. UID/PID
3. Package name
4. Thread status
Implementation

● Support AOSP and customized frameworks
  ○ obtain java classes from
    ▪ intermediate building output (AOSP)
    ▪ decompiled dex files (customized)

● Build a precise framework call graph
  ○ points-to analysis using Spark
  ○ create an artificial and static entry point including app app-accessible service interfaces

● Perform data-flow analysis
  ○ identify security check methods
  ○ collect system services
Evaluation

- 6 different Android codebases
  - AOSP 4.4, 5.0, 5.1 and M preview
  - HTC one, Samsung Galaxy Note 3
- Accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codebase</th>
<th># Inconsistencies</th>
<th># TP</th>
<th># FP</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th># Exploitable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Android 4.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 5.0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android 5.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Preview</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T HTC One</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung Galaxy Note 3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation

- False positive
  - two interfaces are not equivalent in functionality
  - points-to analysis $\implies$ over-approximated results
- not all inconsistencies are exploitable
  - difficult to construct valid arguments
  - difficult to trigger particular privileged methods
Evaluation

- Found 14 vulnerabilities
- 5 out of 14 affect all codebases
- Bug reports confirmed by Google

![Pie chart showing 6 previously reported or fixed and 8 zero-days vulnerabilities.](image-url)
Case Study 1

- Bypass system permission to change HTTP proxy settings
Case Study 3

- Send arbitrary requests to the radio hardware without any permission
Other Observations

- 11 vulnerable interfaces are hidden to apps
  - not available in the Android SDK
  - invoke using Java reflection
- AOSP frameworks
  - new system services introduce new inconsistencies
  - lead to new vulnerabilities
- Customized frameworks
  - Samsung added many system services
    - introduced 2 additional vulnerabilities
    - 1 vulnerability in AOSP was fixed
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