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Abstract

Web browsers have an enormous install base and vulnerabilities in them can result in wide-spread infections. In this paper we describe our methodology, experiences and results based on continuous browser testing performed during 2010-2011. The work was done using Radamsa, a general purpose black-box fuzzer being developed at OUSPG, which automatically generates test cases based on samples of unknown formats. In addition to making browsers and various programs using the same libraries more secure, this has given us valuable feedback as to how well the various techniques employed by the tool work in practice for finding previously unknown vulnerabilities in real-world programs. Over the last two years approximately 60 new bugs have been found and reported in widely used browsers, over half of which had potential security impact.
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1 Introduction

Web browsers are the primary means of accessing cloud-based services. Their install base is in the range of hundreds of millions and the market is shared by only a handful of vendors. Ease of injection of malicious data and homogenous environment makes them a good target for malware, which combined with the evolving standards and growing consumer expectations make securing browsers an unprecedented engineering challenge.

Vulnerabilities in browsers, like any complex software, are not a new phenomenon. In the past few years, they have been widely categorized as a major risk. Browser vulnerabilities have resulted in wide-spread intrusions and the existing exploit kits continue to be a cost-effective means of installing malware. Techniques such as data execution prevention (DEP) and address space layout randomization (ASLR) help make exploitation of bugs more difficult than before, and sandboxing is starting to become more widely used as a means of isolating code working on potentially malicious data. While these advances help in making exploitation significantly more difficult than it was a decade ago, they do not often make it impossible. The problem of finding and fixing implementation level security issues has remained largely unchanged from what it was a decade or even two ago, mainly due to the same programming languages being used for writing most widely used programs.

In the beginning browsers were primarily used for displaying static hypertext and related images. Instead of being viewers of static data, current browsers are more like JavaScript programming environments with support for processing many kinds of data. Projecting from current situation it seems likely that many current applications will be ported to run inside a browser, using the
features provided by upcoming HTML5 standard, and that in further future browsers may also host some of their own code and native applications in whatever the runtime will evolve into.

To provide a seamless user experience, current browsers automatically download and process nearly any data they are requested to fetch. From a security perspective, this is a nightmare, since this combined with the multitude of data formats supported in modern browsers makes the attack surface enormous.

In this paper, we describe work done at the Oulu University Secure Programming Group (OUSPG) in the area of black-box browser testing, and how this research has been successfully applied to find several previously unknown vulnerabilities in web browsers.

This paper is structured as follows. In the next section, we describe techniques that are used for robustness testing and the issues involved in systematically testing web browsers. Section 3 describes our methodology and Radamsa, which is our main test tool in this process, followed by Section 4 describing the results of our testing. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section 5.

2 State of the Art

Software testing is a wide and varied field. Security testing attempts to find faults that could be utilized by external parties to compromise the confidentiality, integrity or availability of the product. Security testing refers to processes attempting to uncover issues which might enable such events. As with traditional software testing, security testing tries to uncover faults in the target program, some of which do not have a security impact. Similarly, traditional software testing techniques find faults that do. One exception in these is that in security testing one is typically primarily interested in issues that can be triggered from the outside or with little user assistance.

Programs are often fairly well tested against positive requirements, which give requirements like being able to display email messages sent in UTF-8 correctly. There are also obvious negative requirements, like not crashing in the middle of writing an email message, and not allowing anyone in the world full control over your account on the computer. Unit testing gives a simple way to approximate meeting the positive requirements, for example by randomly picking a valid state or valid data, and checking whether the program behaves as desired. Negative requirements tend to be harder to check, because they require a situation to not be reachable from any of the usually infinitely many starting conditions.

Security testing and software vulnerability detection techniques are traditionally divided into two main categories: white-box testing and black-box testing. Whitebox testing makes extensive use of source code, binary code, runtime tracing or even the modification of the program being tested. The latter one, also called as behavioral testing, can be performed in almost total ignorance of how the test object is constructed. In black-box testing only the interface and the specification of the program are known. The test cases are generated according to this knowledge and the behavior of the program is observed and possible outputs are inspected. There are naturally shades of gray in testing where some available knowledge is used. Intuitively having more data available allows deeper testing of the possible program state space, which while a good thing often seems to lead to testing that sacrifices breadth in favor of depth. [1]

In the security context, white-box techniques include, e.g., source code reviews that search for code patterns that are known to often result in security issues, such as the use of easily misused library calls. Automated static analysis tools, such as Coverity[1] can automate this job. The problem is that they often find thousands of potential defects in large code bases. A large number of the reported issues are real bugs, and some of them do have security implications, but given the list a developer,
typically with no security background, has no clue which of the issues could in fact be triggered from outside of the program. Blindly fixing all of the warnings is both non-trivial and prone to cause new bugs. There have even been instances where “fixing” a warning produced by a code analyzer has resulted in a serious security problem. \cite{2,3}

One way to detect software vulnerabilities is fuzz testing. The technique is based on generating invalid or random inputs and injecting them into a program. This technique can be used as such with very simple instrumentation to perform black-box testing, usually combined with relatively simple heuristics for detecting obviously erroneous program states, such as fatal signals, or it can be paired with more white-box approaches such as runtime program tracing to gain insight which can be used to control the data generation.

One of the important properties of fuzzing is that one can start testing a program with very little knowledge about what it does, and gradually refine the testing by giving better samples and adding better instrumentation. Another benefit is that unlike in static code analysis, each issue comes paired with a proof of concept input which can trigger the error, proving that it is accessible from the outside. This is especially important for programs like browsers where most inputs can be expected to be controlled by malicious parties.

Fuzzing is further often divided into two categories: generation-based fuzzing and mutation-based fuzzing. Generation-based fuzzing \cite{4,5} is based on a fixed model of the input space, which is then used as a basis for building test cases. In some cases, this can be done directly from source code of the software to be tested, but often must be done separately. The method works very well with protocols and file formats that have a formal specification, from which the model can be inferred from. While the model is often tree-structured, as are the protocol definitions, the model can also include fields, such as checksums, which are used by implementations to determine whether the input is valid. One of the important factors of exact models is that essential fields such as these can be automatically filled correctly making it much more likely that the target program does indeed process the contents of the testcase instead of just dropping it as invalid. The main downside of generation-based fuzzing is that developing a comprehensive test suite including all the models is a major manual effort, as the test suite is essentially a minimal implementation of the software to be tested.

Mutation-based fuzzing operates based on samples of data produced by valid implementations. Most mutation-based fuzzers operate by making simple changes to the data without any knowledge about the semantics. Typical mutations include flipping bits at random, omitting data, repeating data and writing random data somewhere. Even though they lack the finesse of generation-based fuzzers, black-box tools are important due to their ease of use and the fact that they can be made general purpose.

Hybrid approaches also exist. Bekrar et al. proposed a gray-box approach to fuzz testing which is based on defining vulnerability patterns at assembly level before the actual fuzzing process. The idea of these patterns is to identify potentially vulnerable code in the binary, for example functions that could lead to memory corruption, and represent them as models. Next, taint analysis is applied by marking all potentially dangerous data as tainted and tracking their propagation during execution. Thus fuzzing can be improved by selecting the most promising test sequences that are likely to trigger potential vulnerabilities and restrict the test space. The actual fuzzed data is then generated by applying mutations on sample inputs or by modeling inputs using some learning methods or the target specification. The execution of the program is observed using systematic path exploration technique, called concolic or symbolic execution, where the constraints tied to branch the instructions are extracted and solved in order to explore new paths and discover new potential vulnerabilities. This strategy has also been used in other fuzzing tools such as Fuzzgrind \cite{6} and SAGE \cite{7}, a white-box file fuzzing tool for Windows applications. In addition, the fuzzing process
is iteratively evaluated using code coverage techniques and search algorithms to improve the test case population and expand the coverage. This makes fuzzing more efficient and increases the probability of finding defects and possibly exploitable vulnerabilities. [8]

Security testing of web browsers has been done in the past using all available methods, including white-box tools. The PROTOS HTTP suite [9] tested the robustness of HTTP header parsing of web browsers and servers, and was written in a white-box manner based on the HTTP specification. Due to the wide variety of data formats that browsers have to support nowadays, and the involved code complexity and size, we conjecture that black-box fuzzing is an efficient way to find many issues.

One approach to specifically test and improve the robustness of browsers was suggested by Kim et al. They implemented WebDigger, a file fuzzer which utilizes CGI and performs fault injection by creating a HTML document with random data and feeding it to the target when requested. The HTML generator module of the program makes the form of the HTML document. It selects tags and attributes from them and invokes the data generator module to make random data for the value fields of the attributes and contents inside the tags. This way the tags will be untouched by the fuzzer and the fuzzing process does not break the structure of the HTML document. [10]

Comparing the effectiveness of the different approaches is difficult. Benchmarking based on known issues in a given codebase easily results in a pesticide effect: performing a certain type of testing makes the test targets more immune against that particular type of testing in the long run [1].

In the end, finding the vulnerabilities before they are exploited is what matters. Any new technique that minimizes spent resources while also making useful results has thus by definition been useful. Approaches that are technically simple to implement and effective may only be able to report their findings in a way that requires significant human sophistication to understand and classify, and thus are not, in the end, useful [2].

3 Methodology

OUSPG has worked on implementation level security issues of programs for many years. Much of the earlier work concentrated on generation-based testing of protocol implementations. Currently most of the effort is targeted towards making testing as many kinds of programs as easy as possible, in order to make it easier for vendors to start doing at least some security testing against their products. This makes simplicity and scriptability high priorities for the developed tools. Black-box fuzzers are a natural choice for security testing of unknown data formats, so one of the things we have been working on during the last few years is a tool that works like a typical black-box fuzzer, but makes more effective testing data than the similar tools we are aware of, without sacrificing the ease of use. Additionally we have tried to follow the UNIX philosophy of just doing one thing, namely generate data based on input data, instead of bundling the tool together with other functionality such as instrumentation.

Radamsa is our current general purpose black-box fuzzer. Software testing using Radamsa consists of finding sample data for the fuzzer, instrumenting the target program to find out when some input triggers interesting behavior and making a test script that runs the test for a desired period of time while collecting the results.

The benefit to this kind of testing is that it is extremely easy to adapt to various kinds of programs and products. Our initial tests took only a few minutes to set up. Sample files were obtained using a search engine, instrumentation consisted of simply checking if the target program crashed, which is often a manifestation of a potential security bug, and the instrumentation and test script were
handled by a one-line shell script.

This hopefully sounds rather trivial, as it should be. The main goal of our approach is to make a tool allowing this kind of testing be as effective as possible against as many kinds of programs, because in our experience testing has to be extremely simple, or it will often not be done at all. Any results include the input that caused the crash and thus, by definition, can be triggered externally, potentially with a security impact.

3.1 Radamsa

Radamsa is actually a collection of mutation-based fuzzers, the operation of which ranges from trivial common mutations to more novel ones, which often approximate the operation of generation-based ones. The original approach of the tool was called model inference assisted fuzzing, where the inference refers to the process of deriving a model for the data from samples instead of using a manually constructed one. The model, even if it does not correspond to the hypothetical correct one, as implemented by the software to be tested, acts as a lens mapping any random operations performed by the mutator into nontrivial changes in the corresponding raw data output, which often would be extremely unlikely to appear if the mutator was operating solely on the raw data of the samples.

The key concepts that can be used when making a general purpose tool are heuristics for extremely common kinds of data, and more interestingly algorithms, which make use of redundance in the data, e.g., one can compress a piece of data, flip a bit which does not break the archive, and cause interesting changes involving the redundance captured by the compressor after decompressing the changed archive. This might cause a frequent lexical symbol to be swapped or replaced with another frequent symbol or cause some repetition to be longer or shorter.

A major goal of our approach is to add more depth to pure black-box testing and reduce domain-specific knowledge to a minimum. This has the advantage of being the easiest kind of testing, and thus has most promise for being picked up by vendors and projects for their own testing purposes. It is also most likely among the first techniques a black-hat would be using in order to find bugs for exploitation purposes, so even if a vendor performs systematic white-box testing, they should also always apply at least some black box testing to make sure they have not compromised too much breadth in favor of depth.

Radamsa combines various tactics in order to maximize the kinds of mutations it can make. The initial version of the tool used several distinct techniques in parallel. The modules used in the first iteration of the tool are listed in Table 1. We are currently working on a more lightweight set of mutations that would continue to find similar issues, based on experience from seeing the minimal mutations that would have found each issue found by the previous version.

The fubwt algorithm performs roughly as was suggested before. The Burrows-Wheeler transform is a central part of some compression algorithms, since it is a reversible operation which builds an array out of data usually has more repetition than the original data, because it is in fact closely related to the suffix array of the corresponding data, making the data then easier to compress using for example run-length encoding. The fubwt module computes the transformation, but makes a random change to the result before decompression. The test case generated alternates between the original data and the decompressed one.

The first algorithm we developed, grafu, operates by making changes to a grammar which has been inferred from the samples. We later learned the algorithm had already independently been discovered and applied in another field at [11]. The intuition of the algorithm is that by making a more compact representation of the data, such as this particular grammar, allows finding the kind
Table 1. Modules included in Radamsa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grafu</td>
<td>Mutate a grammar inferred from the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fubwt</td>
<td>Mutate using a disturbed Burrows-Wheeler transformation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permu</td>
<td>Permute content around the edges of common substrings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rambo</td>
<td>A traditional file fuzzer making simple changes to raw data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enumr</td>
<td>Enumerate all byte sequences after a few shared prefixes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stutr</td>
<td>Add repetitions to the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tehfu</td>
<td>Build a tree using simple rules and mutate it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cutup</td>
<td>Splice and permute the contents of the files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flipr</td>
<td>A bit flipper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walkr</td>
<td>Systematically perform simple mutations to all positions of all samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range</td>
<td>Generate chunks of random data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noise</td>
<td>Mix sample data and noise signals together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forml</td>
<td>Generate data using random formal languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proby</td>
<td>Fill holes from samples by using successor probabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surfy</td>
<td>Jump between locations with shared data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>Test case reducer and simplifier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of structures that might be beneficial to operate on in testing. The rules of the grammar can for example correspond to lexical or functional parts of data, which can thus be subjected to random changes often without significantly breaking the semantics of the test case. This approach has worked well for both textual and binary data.

Permu recursively abstracts out a large common substring from the input files [12] and constructs a nondeterministic finite automate (NFA) by merging the strings of the left and right sides of the shared section. For example, given the input strings 'slartibart' and 'bartfast', one will get a language with four words, including the original two, 'bart' and 'slartibartfast'. The shared substrings are searched using suffix arrays [13] and multiple sequence alignment [14].

Many of the other modules capture kinds of mutations we know or suspects are implemented in other similar testing tools. Some of the ideas, such as jumping from one position in a sample to another, have however been further refined, such as by making jumps to places with a shared suffix more probable. This heuristic caused a memory corruption, which affected most tested browsers, email readers and many other programs handling images, to be repeatedly found in only a few hours using the same sample test and test setup which had been running for months without finding it, and has since kept stumbling into interesting bugs fairly often.

After the approach of having various experimental modules we wrote the second version of Radamsa to address some of the issues we ran into, such as data generation speed, memory requirements and scriptability. Many of the algorithms used earlier needed all of the sample data to be in memory and subjected to a global algorithm, which in cases like the grammar induction can take a long time and lots of memory for large inputs. Therefore we set the goal of trying to keep finding new bugs while reducing the memory requirements to almost a constant size and making data generation orders of magnitude faster. This version of the tool has been in use for the late part of 2011, and a third version is planned for early 2012 which merges ideas from both earlier approaches.
3.2 Testing

Starting from 2010 we have applied our methodology to web browsers, as they make a perfect test subject due to the breadth of testing required and the potential impact of vulnerabilities.

There are some challenges in testing browsers. It is well known that for many, especially binary, file formats it is enough to flip random bits from sample data in order to often find potential security bugs, especially if one is using good samples. For example, many of the vulnerabilities used for winning hacking competitions are still found by using methods like this. Browsers also process many file formats that would usually fall into this category, but they have been usually already tested fairly extensively. There are also many other formats with very different textual structure which is usually fairly immune to simple raw data changes that are often sufficient against other formats. Browsers are thus an excellent benchmark for testing general purpose fuzzers, because the code quality is generally quite high, yet they utilize numerous file formats, which helps to prevent over-fitting the heuristics to be effective against only some formats.

Table 2. Formats tested and sample origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Description of samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HTML</td>
<td>W3C HTML5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>W3C CSS, HTML5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>Google and PNG image test suites, manually created and random samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPEG</td>
<td>Google image test suite, random internet samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Vendor web pages, random internet samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVG</td>
<td>W3C test suites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JavaScript</td>
<td>ECMAscript Test262, SunSpider, JS1k and JS10k demos, test suites (modified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIF</td>
<td>Google image test suite, animated gifs from popular webboard, random internet samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Flash</td>
<td>Random samples from the internet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Samples

The sources of samples used are summarized in Table 2. The samples were initially chosen randomly, but as we soon started utilizing various test suites to easily gain testing material with wide coverage. Existing test suites are usually good samples, because they by nature cover lots of functionality and often have fairly little less interesting noise data around the essential parts. For example ECMAscript Test262 is a widely used JavaScript test suite containing thousands of individual small tests. [15]

W3C provides a wide variety of test suites for testing the interoperability among CSS implementations. [16] We selected CSS 2.1 and Selectors test suites, because of the state of the test suites and the state of the implementation of CSS specification among the browsers we were testing upon.

The purpose of the W3C HTML5 test suite[2] and Internet Explorer testdrive[3] is to promote interoperability and test the latest features of HTML5, JavaScript and CSS3. Samples picked from 1k and 10k JavaScript demo contests[4] were also quite useful in testing, because of their compact size and creativity.

After finding and preparing better samples started to require several hours we decided to also approach this problem from a different angle and wrote a tool called Blab, which generates data based on a given context free grammar. Many of the RFC:s and W3C standards were easily converted to such grammars, often with minimal changes to the corresponding RFCs or shell script processed W3C pages. The tool has since been used as a part of the testing process to generate samples for Radamsa, though it has also on occasion found bugs without any further fuzzing.

3.4 Test setup

Improvements were also made on other areas. The initial browser tests were made using whatever hardware happened to be available at the office, like an old laptop overnight. In September 2011 we got our first computers dedicated to running tests, which have since mostly continuously been testing browsers and other programs.

Our instrumentation and test framework has also grown from a one-line shell script into a multi-machine, multi-threaded set of scripts, which synchronize testing scripts and data from a centralized server to available testing machines, which handle automatic system updates, running the tests, some analysis of interesting results and notification of new interesting issues. As with the testing tools, the goal has been to make everything as simple and automatic as possible.

We have done some initial work using the coverage of samples as a metric for limiting the number of samples to avoid testing similar functionality much of the time, but given limited human- and hardware resources have not done much work on this area. We also assume users to not spend time finding the optimal sample set, and therefore prefer to make the tools more effective than spend time improving sample sets in our own tests.

Bug detection has also been refined from plain crash detection. One valuable asset has been Address Sanitizer [17] which allows detecting many memory related security issues, which are typical sources of security issues, even if they don’t usually cause the program to crash. In addition to reporting the issue ASan also provides valuable information about the nature of the error when it is detected.

3.5 Analysis of bugs

There are automated tools for assessing the impact of crashes, such as !exploitable from Microsoft and CrashWrangler from Apple. We have done a similar implementation for Linux as a part of our work. These kinds of tools are useful in giving an initial estimate for the severity of a given defect. However, the tools are far from complete and can result in both serious bugs being downplayed and unexploitable ones being classified as critical.

For the most part, post-mortem analysis was done by the vendors. In the past, we have been somewhat skeptical about doing this, as in our previous experience software vendors have had difficulties in taking in bug reports consisting only of the file that caused anomalous behavior. Browser vendors however have not only been interested in such cases, but have repeatedly promptly fixed them and have often found potential security impact in bugs that we initially thought to be likely harmless. We have repeatedly seen turn-around times of mere hours between filing a bug and the fix landing in the development branch after verification, classification and security assessment.

At the end of our test period, the number of crashes in the browsers we are finding has reduced significantly, and are often not reproducible. Most issues we are seeing now are results of regressions, which are often caught before the affected code ends up in a stable version of a browser. This alone does not mean that the browsers are robust, but that they are getting more robust against the kind
of attacks we have been subjecting them against. Still, new bugs are found soon after swapping the sample set or adding a new kind of mutation to the testing tool.

4 Results

The total number of previously undiscovered, unique, bugs found during 2010-2011 is around 60. Roughly half of these were suspected to have a security impact, varying from denial of service conditions in individual browsers to more serious data corruptions in widely used support libraries. While these numbers are higher than we initially suspected, we also strongly believe they would be even higher had we gotten hardware for continuous testing earlier. 23 out of the 35 unique browser bugs found in 2011 have been found in the last roughly 3 months since we got our first dedicated testing computers. 18 of these issues were previously undiscovered ones which were suspected to have some security impact.

The goal of this testing has been to make various programs more secure and get feedback for development of our own tools. While the practical results suggest both of these goals are being fulfilled, it is difficult to draw any scientific conclusions about the data given the varying human- and computer resources we have been able to spend on testing. A significant number of bugs has been found, most of which could not have been found by flipping bits from the sample files, or would have been extremely unlikely to appear given random mutations, but we do not have an identical test setup to prove that this would not have happened.

One of the initial theses we have based on work on is that automatic model inference could be used to significantly improve the effectiveness of black-box fuzzing. The first version of Radamsa was in effect a proof of concept tool to test this hypothesis. After it seemed to hold at least in practice, the second version of Radamsa has been written during the tests to address practical aspects and reduce the computational requirements. The varying set of mutations, their patterns of use, varying samples and continuously updating target programs make tracking even the progress of one tool laborious.

Differences in available resources make comparing our results using our tools to those of others using their ones difficult. Our current test cluster has eight nettop computers, worth approx. 2500e. Google recently made a 3-week long fuzzing test run using 2000 cores targeting just one file format. Given that a typical modern desktop computer processor core roughly corresponds to one dual-core Atom, of which we have 8 in continuous testing use, the test run by Google against one format spent more computing power than our fuzzing cluster could do in a decade, assuming it was targeting just that one test. Yet we continue to find relevant bugs.

5 Conclusions and Future Work

Our approach for black-box fuzzing has proven to be an effective way of finding previously vulnerabilities in large, complex, codebases that contain many interfaces, such as web browsers. It provides a breadth-first method for getting relevant results with minimal human effort. Other, more labor-intensive, types of testing can then be used to further improve quality.

In the future, we will try new areas, such as web-based cloud services, as test subjects. Sample selection based on coverage has also shown to be a promising area for further work, but with many products, results can be found using even a few, completely randomly chosen, samples.

Algorithmic improvements to the fuzzers and the addition of instrumentation to more effectively capture erroneous behavior of test subjects may allow Radamsa to be more effective at hitting bugs, but in our experience instead of tool efficiency the biggest hurdle is getting vendors and projects
to start doing any kind of fuzz testing. We have tried to make the hurdle as small as possible, and aim to make it even smaller in the future. Ideally, all software would be continuously tested, automatically, in the cloud.
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