Reverse Engineering Class 3

Executable Binaries



Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA



- Static analysis based on the executable format
 - Exported functions and variables
 - Imported functions and variables
 - Symbols and Strings tables
 - Debug information
- But, not everything is exported and has symbols!



- When compiling and linking information is lost
 - Function and variables names, comments
 - Variables types
 - Non exported functions location (static) and relocation information
 - Functions parameters
 - This lost may be on purpose: strip a binary for release
 - Compiling is a many-to-many operation
 - Same assembly code, different source code (or viceversa)



- Static analysis on executable code
 - Disassembly heuristics
 - Functions identification
 - Function parameters identification
 - Local and global variables identification
 - "basic blocks" identification (function flow)
 - Cross-references identification
 - All of this can be automated!



- Disassembly heuristics
 - Linear Sweep
 - From a starting point (I.e. function symbol, .text section start or binary entry point) a linear disassembly is done
 - Instructions and operands of variable but known length (x86) or fixed length (ARM)
 - I.e. mov, add, push, etc.



- Disassembly heuristics
 - Recursive Descent
 - Conditional branching (if, while, for, switch)
 - One branch is disassembled and the other one is marked for future disassemble
 - Unconditional branching (jmp, call)
 - Problem: is the jump target known?



- Disassembly heuristics
 - Recursive Descent
 - Unconditional branching (jmp, call)
 - If we know it, disassemble the target. If not, we have a problem.
 - In a call we assume that a "return" to the next instruction exists. Thus, next address is marked as pending for future disassembly.



MOV

mov

C M D

jz.

mov

MOV



.text:0040101A	68	18	80	41	00	
.text:0040101F	8B	45	FC			
.text:00401022	50					
.text:00401023	FF	15	00	10	41	00
.text:00401029	89	45	F8			
.text:0040102C	83	7D	F8	00		
.text:00401030	74	17				
.text:00401032	FF	55	F8			
.text:00401035	89	45	F4			
.text:00401038	8B	4D	F4			
.text:0040103B	51					
.text:0040103C	68	20	80	41	00	
.text:00401041	E8	4A	00	00	00	

offset ProcName push eax, [ebp+hModule] push. eax call. ds:GetProcAddress [ebp+var 8], eax [ebp+var 8], 0 short loc 401049 [ebp+var 8] call [ebp+var C], eax ecx, [ebp+var C] push ecx offset aReturnD ; push call sub 401090



.text:0040101A 68 18 80 41 00 .text:0040101F 8B 45 FC .text:00401022 50 .text:00401023 FF 15 00 10 41 00 .text:00401029 89 45 F8	push mov push call mov	<pre>offset ProcName ; eax, [ebp+hModule] eax ; ds:GetProcAddress [ebp+var_8], eax</pre>
.text:0040102C 83 7D F8 00 .text:00401030 74 17 .text:00401032 FF 55 F8 .text:00401035 99 45 F4	omp jz call mov	[enp+var_8], 0 short loc_401049 [ebp+var_8] [ebp+var_0], eax
.text:00401038 88 40 F4 .text:0040103B 51 .text:0040103C 68 20 80 41 00 .text:00401041 E8 4A 00 00 00	push push call	ecx, [ebp+var_C] ecx offset aReturnD ; sub_401090

Where to continue disassembling? CALL to an address held in a local variable, only known in run time

Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA



- In CISC architectures like x86/x86_64 (with extended instructions sets), many opcodes may be valid.
- However, not every instruction is equally likely or frequent. Executable binary type may provide hints: are we expecting floating point instructions?
- Can we differentiate an executable binary manually written in assembly from one generated by a compiler? Can we identify idioms or patterns?



- Compilers tend to use certain instructions more frequently and generate specific patterns following conventions or binary interfaces (ABIs).
- It's important to be able to make a judgment about the correctness of a disassembly
 - And provide a hint to the disassembler regarding where to start.



• Where should we start disassembling?

0	db	.text:004012FF
89h	db	.text:00401300
15h	db	.text:00401301
0D 4 h	db	.text:00401302
87h	db	.text:00401303
41h	db	.text:00401304
0	db	.text:00401305
ØE8h	db	.text:00401306
5	db	.text:00401307
ØFFh	db	.text:00401308
ØFFh	db	.text:00401309
ØFFh	db	.text:0040130A
83h	db	.text:0040130B
ØF8h	db	.text:0040130C
ØFFh	db	.text:0040130D
75h	db	.text:0040130E
5	db	.text:0040130F





• Does it look correct?

.text:004012FE .text:004012FF .text:00401300	db 41h db 0 db 89h	; A ; ë	
.text:00401301	db 15h		
.text: <mark>00401302</mark> text:00401304	aam inc	<mark>87h</mark> ecx	
.text:00401305	add	al, ch	
.text:0040130C		dword ofr [obo+5]	
.text:00401310	or imp	eax, OFFFFFFFF	
.text:00401313 ;	чиц 	SHULE TOC_401370	6
.text:00401315 .text:00401316	db 6Ah db 0	;]	242
.text:00401317	db 6Ah	; j	144

Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA



Does it look correct? no X





Does it look correct?

.text:00401300 ; .text:00401300
.text:00401306
.text:00401308
.text:0040130E
.text:00401310
.text:00401313
.text:00401315 ; -

mov d call s cmp e jnz s or e jmp s

dword_4187D4, edx sub_401210 eax, OFFFFFFFF short loc_401315 eax, OFFFFFFFFF short loc_401370





• Does it look correct?: yes





- In previous examples we assume that binary is not obfuscated / packed, and that is genuine compiler assembly
 - Use case example: DLLs or SYS modules diffing from security patches
 - When analyzing malware, these assumptions may not be true
- Part of this is "training"



- Functions identification
 - Exported functions
 - CALL instructions targets
 - Epilogues (ABIs)
- Functions parameters identification
 - Calling conventions (I.e. x86 ABI) to determine parameters count
 - "mov" instructions for size



- Functions parameters identification
 - Is up to the reverser to determine:
 - Pointers meaning
 - Structures
 - When are their members written or read? That provides semantic value.
 - Data types
 - I.e. are floating point operations applied on a parameter?



- Calling conventions Application Binary Interface (ABI)
- How is a function called at the assembly level?
 - Send parameters (values, alignment, structures)
 - Return address
 - Return value
 - Stack balance
 - Which registers are saved? Who is responsible for that?
- A convention is needed: code generated by one compiler may call libraries generated by a different compiler.
- These conventions depend on the CPU architecture and the platform (Windows, Unix, etc.)

0xFFFFFFFF



x86

Stack 1 stack in user-space per main thread



sub_401060 proc near

arg_0=	dword	ptr	8
arg_4=	dword	ptr	ØCh
arg_8=	dword	ptr	1 Oh
arg_C=	dword	ptr	14h

push	ebp	
mov	ebp,	esp
mov	eax,	[ebp+arg_C]
push	eax	
mov	ecx,	[ebp+arg_8]
push	ecx	
mov	edx,	[ebp+arg_4]
push	edx	
mov	eax,	[ebp+ <mark>arg_0</mark>]
push	eax	



- Calling conventions x86
 - Cdecl
 - Caller function balances the stack (parameters cleanup)
 - Stdcall
 - Callee function balances the stack (parameters cleanup)
 - Common in Windows API
 - Fastcall
 - Parameters by registers

Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA



- int __stdcall function_a(int p1) { return ++p1; }
- int __cdecl function_b(int p1) { return ++p1; }
- int __fastcall function_c(int p1) { return ++p1; }

```
void main(void) {
    printf("function_a: %d\n", function_a(0));
    printf("function_b: %d\n", function_b(1));
    printf("function_c: %d\n", function_c(2));
```

MSVC calling conventions



int __stdcall function_a(int p1) { return ++p1; }



moveax, [ebp+arg_0]Callee balances the stack,popebpfreeing up space used for the
parameter

function_a function

Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA





function_b function

Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA



int ___fastcall function_c(int p1) { return ++p1; }





- Variables identification
 - Similar to parameters identification
 - Local variables are referenced (in x86) by EBP - offset
 - Compiler can reference them with ESP
 - Can be held in registers, depending on optimization levels
 - Global variables are references to .data (initialized) and .bss (uninitialized) segments



sub_4026F4 proc near

var_	C =	dword	ptr -	OCh
var	8=	dword	ptr -	8
var_	<mark>1</mark> -	byte p	tr -1	
arg_	0=	dword	ptr	8
arg_	4=	dword	ptr	0Ch

mov	edi, edi
push	ebp
mov	ebp, esp
sub	esp, OCh
mov	eax, [ebp+arg_0]
lea	ecx, [ebp+ <mark>var_1</mark>]
mov	[ebp+var_8], eax
mov	[ebp+var Cl. eax





Basic blocks

Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA



- Cross references identification
 - Based on offsets
 - + symbols information
 - + value (I.e. String)
 - Bidirectional search
 - Good strategy to understand what a function does



push	ebp
mov	ebp, esp
sub	esp, OCh
push	offset LibFileName ; "test.dll"
call	ds:LoadLibraryA

Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA



- Patterns identification
 - From assembly to source code
 - A disassembler parses opcodes and shows the instructions mnemonic.
 - A decompiler makes high level abstractions to show C code or pseudocode.



call	_puts
mov	eax, [esp+14h]
стр	eax, OAh
jg	short loc_8048814







36



Patterns identification

if (condition_1 && condition_2 ... &&
 condition_n) {
 do;
 }



II 🖌 🖼	
1oc_80	489C4:
lea	eax, [esp+13h]
mov	[esp+4], eax
mov	dword ptr [esp], offset aC ; "%c"
call	isoc99 scanf
movzx	eax, byte ptr [esp+13h]
cmp	al, OAh
jnz	short loc_80489C4







Patterns identification

while (condition_1) { do; }



MOV	eop, esp
sub	esp, OCh
mov	[ebp+var_C], 1
mov	[ebp+var_8], 3
mov	[ebp+var_4], 0
jmp	short loc 401026









Patterns identification

```
int max = 3;
for ( int i = 0; i < max; i++ ) {
    ...
}</pre>
```











Patterns identification

```
if ( condition_1 ) {
  goto error;
if ( condition_2 ) {
  goto error;
error:
  return 0;
```









Patterns identification

switch (variable) { case 0:

break; case 1: break;

}

Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA



рор	ebp 22
MOV	esp, ebp
call	<pre>@security_check_cookie@4 ;security</pre>
xor	ecx, ebp
MOV	ecx, [ebp+var_4]
xor	eax, eax
call	[ebp+var_18]
MOV	[ebp+var_18], offset sub_401000
MOV	[ebp+var_8], 4
MOV	[ebp+var_C], 33h
MOV	[ebp+var_10], 2
MOV	[ebp+var_14], 1
	Frek







Patterns identification

```
int ( * f_ptr ) ( ) = f;
( * f_ptr ) ( );
```



- Dynamic analysis on executable code
 - IDA Pro (debugger)
 - Other debuggers
 - Windbg, gdb, Ollydbg, etc.
 - strace (Linux)
 - API monitor (Windows)
 - Wireshark



- Dynamic analysis on executable code
 - Tools to monitor registry changes (Windows)
 - Tools to monitor filesystem changes
 - Integrated suite: Cuckoo



- Execution traces
 - Do not stop execution (in opposition to braekpoints) and record:
 - Instructions execution
 - Memory reads or writes
 - From which instruction was memory accessed
 - Other state changes (i.e. registers)
 - Thread that executed
 - Other information (I.e. call-graph)
 - May generate too much information. Filtering is required.



• Trace example

∃≣ 00000E20

1	00000F20				ST0=FFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFF
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+3	sub	esp, 14h	ESP=0042FA34 PF=0
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+6	push	ebx	ESP=0042FA30
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+7	cpuid		EAX=00000000 EBX=00000000 ECX=00000000 EDX=00000000
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+9	rdtsc		EAX=DDA53517 EDX=000002FE
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+B	mov	[ebp+var_C], eax	
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+E	mov	[ebp+var_8], edx	
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+11	mov	[ebp+var_4], 0	
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+18	jmp	short loc_2F13E3	
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0:loc_2F13E3	cmp	[ebp+var_4], 8	CF=1 AF=1 SF=1
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+27	jnb	short loc_2F13FE	
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+29	mov	ecx, 8	ECX=0000008
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+2E	sub	ecx, [ebp+var_4]	CF=0 AF=0 SF=0
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+31	mov	edx, [ebp+var_4]	EDX=0000000
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+34	mov	al, [ebp+ecx+var_D]	EAX=DDA53500
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+38	mov	byte ptr [ebp+edx+var_14], al	
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+3C	jmp	short loc_2F13DA	
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0:loc_2F13DA	mov	eax, [ebp+var_4]	EAX=0000000
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+1D	add	eax, 1	EAX=0000001
₽	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+20	mov	[ebp+var_4], eax	
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0:loc_2F13E3	cmp	[ebp+var_4], 8	CF=1 PF=1 AF=1 SF=1
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+27	jnb	short loc_2F13FE	

Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA



• Trace example (filtering by 0x42FA48)

	00000F20	.text:sub_2F13C0+45	mov	esp, ebp		ESP=0042FA48
1	00000F20	.text:_main+16	call	sub_2F1210		ESP=0042FA48
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F1210+1	mov	ebp, esp		debug021:0042FA48: 58
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F1210+1	mov	ebp, esp		EBP=0042FA48
1	00000F20	.text:sub_2F1000+5E	рор	ebp		EBP=0042FA48 ESP=0042FA24
H	00000F20	.text:sub_2F1000+5E	рор	ebp		EBP=0042FA48 ESP=0042FA24
â B	00000F20	.text:sub_2F1000+5E	рор	ebp		EBP=0042FA48 ESP=0042FA24
<u>ال</u>	00000F20	.text:sub_2F1210:loc_2F12E2	mov	esp, ebp		ESP=0042FA48
S	00000F20	.text:_main+27	push	0	; bInitialOwner	ESP=0042FA48
1	00000F20	KERNELBASE:kernelbase_CreateMutexA+A	jz s	hort near ptr unk_76	58717C8	debug021:0042FA48: 00
1	00000F20	.text:_main+38	push	0	; dwCreationFlags	ESP=0042FA48
1	00000F20	kernel32:kernel32_CreateThread+D	push	dword ptr [ebp+14	łh]	debug021:0042FA48: 00
ŧ III	00000F20	.text:_main+50	push	0	; dwCreationFlags	ESP=0042FA48
1	00000F20	kernel32:kernel32_CreateThread+D	push	dword ptr [ebp+14	4h]	debug021:0042FA48: 00
ŧ I	00000F20	.text:_main+6B	push	eax	; hHandle	ESP=0042FA48
2	00000F20	kernel32:kernel32_WaitForSingleObject+D	call	near ptr kernel32_W	aitForSingleObjectEx	debug021:0042FA48: 34



- Which is the proper strategy to analyze an...
 - "stripped" binary? (no symbols)
 - obfuscated or packed binary?
- Code-coverage in dynamic analysis:
 - how can we trigger every possible execution flow?





- Answer is on case-by-case basis and will probably involve a combination of different techniques
 - Static analysis may require a high effort: too much information to analyze!
 - Dynamic analysis based on debugging may require a high effort too
 - Dynamic analysis based on monitoring tools may not be enough

Question



Which approach would you use to analyze a binary that encrypts communications with a custom cryptographic algorithm?



Lab 3.1



Analyze the binary, describe the logic and extract communicated data



Reverse Engineering | Class 3 | Martin Balao | martin.uy/reverse | v1.0 EN | CC BY-SA

References



- https://github.com/cuckoosandbox/cuckoo
- The IDA Pro Book