# **Module: Sandboxing**

Escaping seccomp

Yan Shoshitaishvili Arizona State University

## **Breaking out**

Generally, to do anything useful, a sandboxed process needs to be able to communicate with the privileged process.

Normally, this means allowing the sandboxed process to use \*some\* system calls. This opens up some attack vectors:

- permissive policies
- syscall confusion
- kernel vulnerabilities in the syscall handlers

#### **Permissive Policies**

Combination of:

- 1. System calls are complex, and there are a lot of them...
- 2. Developers might avoid breaking functionality by erring on the side of permissiveness.

**Well-known example:** depending on system configuration, allowing the **ptrace()** system call could let a sandboxed process to "puppet" a non-sandboxed process.

#### Some less well-known effects:

- **sendmsg()** can transfer file descriptors between processes
- prct1() has bizarre possible effects
- process\_vm\_writev() allows direct access to other process' memory

### **Syscall Confusion**

Many 64-bit architectures are backwards compatible with their 32-bit ancestors:

amd64 / x86\_64 | x86 aarch64 | arm mips64 | mips powerpc64 | ppc sparc64 | sparc

On some systems (including amd64), you can switch between 32-bit mode and 64-bit mode *in the same process*, so the kernel must be ready for either.

Interestingly, system call numbers differ between architectures, including 32-bit and 64-bit variants of the same architecture!

Policies that allow both 32-bit and 64-bit system calls can fail to properly sandbox one or the other mode.

Example: exit() is syscall 60 (mov rax, 60; syscall) on amd64, 1 (mov eax, 1; int 0x80) on x86.

### **Kernel Vulnerabilities**

The last resort...

If the seccomp sandbox is correctly configured, the attacker can't do anything useful...

But they can still interact with the system calls that *are* allowed! This allows the attacker to try to trigger vulnerabilities in the kernel.

Powerful! Over 30 Chrome sandbox escapes in 2019 alone: https://github.com/allpaca/chrome-sbx-db

Stay tuned for the Kernel Exploitation module!

#### Unless....?

Think: what is your goal, as an attacker?

Is it always code execution?

### Screaming into the void...

Often, your goal is data exfiltration (like /flag!).

Even if you can't directly communicate with the outside world, often you can send "smoke signals":

- Runtime of a process (see **sleep(x)** system call) can convey a lot of data.
- Clean termination or a crash? This can convey one bit.
- Return value of a program (**exit(x)**) can convey one byte.

Real-world example: attackers use DNS queries to bypass network egress filters.

As long as you can communicate **1 bit**, you can repeat the attack to get more and more bits!