

SIGMA: A Semantic Integrated Graph Matching Approach For Identifying Reused Functions In Binary Code

By Saed Alrabaee, Paria Shirani, Lingyu Wang and Mourad Debbabi

Presented At

The Digital Forensic Research Conference **DFRWS 2015 EU** Dublin, Ireland (Mar 23rd- 26th)

DFRWS is dedicated to the sharing of knowledge and ideas about digital forensics research. Ever since it organized the first open workshop devoted to digital forensics in 2001, DFRWS continues to bring academics and practitioners together in an informal environment. As a non-profit, volunteer organization, DFRWS sponsors technical working groups, annual conferences and challenges to help drive the direction of research and development.

http:/dfrws.org

SIGMA: A Semantic Integrated Graph Matching Approach for Identifying Reused Functions in Binary Code

Paria Shirani Saed Alrabaee, Lingyu Wang, and Mourad Debbabi







- Introduction
- Binary Representations
- SIGMA
- Case Study & Experimental Results
- Concluding Remarks



Introduction

- Why SIGMA?
 - SIGMA: Semantic Integrated Graph Matching Approach
 - A technique for identifying reused functions in binary code (recognizing reused functions are needed in different fields such as Malware Analysis, Copyright Infringement, Digital Forensics, etc.)
 - To improve the efficiency of reverse engineering
- How SIGMA works?
 - SIGMA enhances and merges several existing concepts from classic program analysis into a new graph called SIG
 - SIGMA applies exact and inexact graph matching to identify reused functions



Contributions

- Introduce a new representation (SIG) of binary code
 - To unify various semantic information
 - To facilitate more efficient graph matching
- Define different types of traces over SIG graphs such as
 - normal traces
 - AND-traces
 - OR-traces
- Demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach through a case study using two known malware



Outline

- Introduction
- Binary Representations
- SIGMA
- Case Study & Experimental Results
- Concluding Remarks



Binary Representation

Take Bubble Sort as an example

```
procedure bubbleSort( A : list of sortable items )
n = length(A)
repeat
swapped = false
for i = 1 to n-1 inclusive do
    /* if this pair is out of order */
    if A[i-1] > A[i] then
        /* swap them and remember something changed */
        swap( A[i-1], A[i] )
        swapped = true
    end if
    end for
    until not swapped
end procedure
```

80483c4:	push	ebp
80483c5:	mov	ebp, e <i>s</i> p
80483c7:	sub	esp, 0x10
80483ca:	movl	-0x4(ebp), 0x1
80483d1:	jmp	804844b
80483d3:	movl	-0x4(ebp), 0x0
80483da:	movl	-0x8(ebp), 0x1
80483e1:	jmp	8048443
80483e3:	mov	eax, -0x8(ebp)

6	1	2	3	4	5	unsorted
6	1	2	3	4	5	6 > 1, swap
1	6	2	3	4	5	6 > 2, swap
1	2	6	3	4	5	6 > 3, swap
1	2	3	6	4	5	6 > 4, swap
1	2	3	4	6	5	6 > 5, swap
1	2	3	4	5	6	1 < 2, ok
1	2	3	4	5	6	2 < 3, ok
1	2	3	4	5	6	3 < 4, ok
1	2	3	4	5	6	4 < 5, ok
1	2	3	4	5	6	sorted



- CFG (Control Flow Graph)
 - Represents the structure of the binaries
 - Consists of basic blocks and edges

0x004012d0:	push	ebp
0x004012d1:	mov	ebp, esp
0x004012d3:	mov	eax, DWORD PTR [ebp+12]
0x004012d6:	add	eax, DWORD PTR [ebp+8]
0x004012d9:	pop	ebp
0x004012da:	ret	
0x004012db:	push	ebp
0x004012dc:	mov	ebp, esp
0x004012de:	mov	eax, DWORD PTR [ebp+8]
0x004012e1:	imul	eax, DWORD PTR [ebp+12]
0x004012e5:	pop	ebp
0x004012e6:	ret	
0x004012ed:	mov	eax, DWORD PTR [ebp+8]
0x004012f0:	cmp	eax, DWORD PTR [ebp+12]
0x004012f3:	jge	0x401301
0x004012f5:	mov	ds:0x403020, 0x4012d0
0x004012ff:	jmp	0x40130b
0x00401301:		
	mov	ds:0x403020, 0x4012db
0x0040130b:	mov sub	ds:0x403020, 0x4012db esp, 0x8
0x0040130b: 0x0040130e:	mov sub push	ds:0x403020, 0x4012db esp, 0x8 DWORD PTR [ebp+12]
0x0040130b: 0x0040130e: 0x00401311:	mov sub push push	ds:0x403020, 0x4012db esp, 0x8 DWORD PTR [ebp+12] DWORD PTR [ebp+8]
0x0040130b: 0x0040130e: 0x00401311: 0x00401314:	mov sub push push mov	ds:0x403020, 0x4012db esp, 0x8 DWORD PTR [ebp+12] DWORD PTR [ebp+8] eax, ds:0x403020
0x0040130b: 0x0040130e: 0x00401311: 0x00401314: 0x00401319:	mov sub push push mov call	ds:0x403020, 0x4012db esp, 0x8 DWORD PTR [ebp+12] DWORD PTR [ebp+8] eax, ds:0x403020 eax





CFG of bubble sort

- True (t)
- False (f)
- No condition (ϵ)

Two different functions may have the same CFG





RFG (Register Flow Graph)



Class	Arithmetic	Logical	Generic	Stack
1	1	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	0
3	0	0	1	0
4	0	0	0	1
5	1	1	0	0
6	1	0	1	0
7	1	0	0	1
8	1	1	1	0
9	1	1	0	1
10	1	0	1	0
11	1	1	1	1
12	0	1	1	0
13	0	1	0	1
14	0	0	1	1
15	0	1	1	1



RFG of bubble sort





Concordia Institute for Information Systems Engineering

Some operands such as

- FCG (Function Call Graph) of bubble sort
 - I : Internal call
 - E: External call

Internal calls are not comparable across different programs





Outline

- Introduction
- Binary Representations
- SIGMA
- Experimental Results & Case studies
- Concluding Remarks



SIGMA Architecture





SIG Components

• *i*CFG

• Applying structural information to color the nodes

Category	Description		
Data Transfer (DT)	Data transfer instructions such		
Data Hansiel (DI)	as mov, movzx, movsx		
	Test instructions such as cmp,		
	test		
	Arithmetic and logical		
Amto	instructions such as add, sub,		
AILO	mul, div, imul, idiv, and, or,		
	xor, sar, shr		
	System call, API call, and Load		
CaLe	effective instructions such as		
	lea		
Stool	Stack instructions such as push,		
SUACK	pop		



• *i*CFG

Considering the two highest and lowest amounts

Color Classes	Majority	Minority
1/2/3	DT, T	ArLo/Stack/CaLe
4/5/6	DT, ArLo	T/CaLe/Stack
7/8/9	DT, CaLe	ArLo/Stack/T
10/11/12	DT, Stack	T/CaLe/ArLo
13/14/15	T, ArLo	DT/CaLe/Stack
16/17/18	T, CaLe	DT/ArLo/Stack
19/20/21	T, Stack	DT/ArLo/CaLe
22/23/24	ArLo, Stack	T/DT/CaLe
25/26/27	ArLo, CaLe	Stack/DT/T
28/29/30	Stack, Cale	T/DT/ArLo







*m*RFG

- Include constants (C), and memory locations (ML)
- Include *test* instructions
- Merge classes
- Consider a (cost for instruction counts)

Class	Arithmetic	Logical	Generic	Stack	CC	$C \operatorname{Reg}$	ML ML	ML Reg	ML C
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
8	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
10	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
15	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1





• *c*FCG

• C system calls

$$f(c) = \begin{cases} \alpha = 0 & \text{if } c \text{ is internal system call} \\ 0 < \alpha < 1 & \text{if } c \text{ is external system call} \end{cases}$$



Category	API Functions
File	CreateFileMapping, GetFileAttributes, ReplaceFile
Network	gethostbyname, getaddrinfo, recv, WSAAccept
Registry	RegCreateKey, RegQueryValue, SHRegSetPath
Crypto	CryptGenKey, CryptSetKey, CryptDecodeObject
Service	QueryServiceLockStatus, SetServiceObjectSecurity
Memory	VirtualAlloc, VirtualUnlock, ReadProcessMemory



• *c*FCG





SIG Graph

SIG

- () *i*CFG
- _____ *m*RFG









SIG Features and Traces

Features

Exact matching



Features	Frequency
Total # of Nodes	15
Total # of Edges	18
# of Control Nodes	5
# of Control Edges	8
# of Call Nodes	4
# of Register Nodes	6
Connected Graphs	3
k-Cone	1,2



SIG Features and Traces

Traces

Inexact Matching



	Node	Traces	Traces type
	22	ε, ε, C8	out
`		t	in
)	4	f, C14	out
		ε, f	in
	22 OR 4	ε, C8, C14, f	out
		f, t, ε	in
	4 AND 3	f	out
		f	in



Outline

- Introduction
- Binary Representations
- SIGMA
- Case Study & Experimental Results
- Concluding Remarks



Case Study : Citadel to Zeus

SIG for RC4 in Citadel
 SIG for RC4 in Zeus





Case Study : Citadel to Zeus

Exact matching

Features	SIG-RC4 (Zeus)	SIG-RC4 (Citadel)	Similarity
Total # of Nodes	7	9	78%
Total # of Edges	8	11	72%
# of Control Nodes	5	5	100%
# of Control Edges	6	7	86%
# of Call Nodes	1	0	50%
# of Register Nodes	2	3	67%
Connected Graphs	3	3	100%
K-Cone	1,2,3,4	1,2,3	75%
Average Similarity			78.5%



Case Study : Citadel to Zeus

Inexact matching



ONCOR

Citadel node	Zeus node	Costs	Node(s) with minimum cost	Cost %
13	12	1 out, 0 in	12	(1/10)
	28	1 out, 1 in	-	
	4	1 out, 2 in	-	
	29	1 out, 1 in	-	
	11	0 out, 2 in	-	
28	12	3 out, 0 in	-	
	28	0 out, 0 in	28 (Select this)	0
	4	3 out, 1 in	-	
	29	0 out, 0 in	29	
	11	0 out, 1 in	-	
4	12	0 out, 0 in	12 (Already chosen)	
	28	1 out, 1 in	-	
	4	0 out, 0 in	4 (Select this)	0
	29	1 out, 1 in	-	
	11	0 out, 0 in	11	
11	12	2 out, 0 in	-	
	28	1 out, 0 in	28 (Already chosen)	
	4	2 out, 2 in	-	
	29	1 out, 0 in	29 (Select this)	(1/10)
	11	0 out, 2 in	-	
12	12	2 out, 0 in	-	
	28	1 out, 1 in	-	
	4	2 out, 0 in	-	
	29	1 out, 1 in	-	
	11	0 out, 1 in	11	(1/9)
Total Cost				0.311



Experimental Results

Similarity Score





Experimental Results (Cont'd)

Accuracy





Outline

- Introduction
- Binary Representations
- SIGMA
- Case Study & Experimental Results
- Concluding Remarks



Summary

- Introduce a novel approach for effectively identifying reused functions in binary code
- Enhance and combine multiple representations into one joint data structure, called SIG
- Apply exact and inexact graph matching
- Evaluate our approach using sort and encryption functions
- Both experimental results have demonstrated the effectiveness of our method



Future Work

- Test larger datasets
- Improve graph matching algorithm
- Develop a search engine for identifying assembly fragments in binary code







