

PinDemonium

a DBI-based generic unpacker for Windows executables

Sebastiano Mariani - Lorenzo Fontana - Fabio Gritti - Stefano D'Alessio

Malware Analysis



• **Static analysis :** Analyze the malware without executing it

• **Dynamic analysis :** Analyze the malware while it is executed inside a controlled environment

Malware Analysis



• **Static analysis :** Analyze the malware without executing it

 Dynamic analysis : Analyze the malware while it is executed inside a controlled environment

Static Analysis

- Analysis of disassembled code
- Analysis of imported functions
- Analysis of strings



Maybe in a fairy tale...



What if the malware tries to hinder the analysis process?

- Packed Malware -

- Compress or encrypt the original code Code and strings analysis impossible
- Obfuscate the imported functions Analysis of the imported functions avoided



Solutions



Manual approach

- Very time consuming
- Too many samples to be analyzed every day
- Adapt the approach to deal with different techniques

Automatic approach

- Fast analysis
- Scale well on the number of samples that has to be analyzed every day
- Single approach to deals with multiple techniques



All hail PinDemonium



Overview

PinDemonium is a generic unpacker based on Intel PIN, a dynamic binary instrumentation framework (DBI)







Code Cache







DBI provides the possibility to add user defined code after each:

- Instruction
- Basic Block
- Trace



Code Cache



Code Cache



How can an unpacker be generic?

Exploit the functionalities of the DBI to identify the common behaviour of packers: they have to write new code in memory and eventually execute it

Our stairway to heaven



Packed malware

Original malware



Our journey begins

We begin to build the foundation of our system

Let's exploit the key idea behind a generic unpacker implementing the WxorX handler module

Concepts:

- Write Interval (WI): range of continuously written addresses
- WxorX law broken: instruction written by the program itself and then executed

Idea:

Track each instruction of the program:

- Write instruction: get the target address of the write and update the write interval consequently.
- All instructions: check if the EIP is inside a write interval present in the write set. If the condition is met then the WxorX law is broken.

Steps:





Steps:

1. The current instruction is a write, no WI present, create the new WI



Steps:

- 1. The current instruction is a write, no WI present, create the new WI
- 2. The current instruction is a write, the ranges of the write overlaps an existing WI, update the matched WI



Steps:

- 1. The current instruction is a write, no WI present, create the new WI
- 2. The current instruction is a write, the ranges of the write overlaps an existing WI, update the matched WI
- 3. The current instruction is a write, the ranges of the write don't overlap any WI, create a new WI



Steps:

- The current instruction is a 1 write, no WI present, create the new WI
- 2. The current instruction is a write, the ranges of the write overlaps an existing WI, update the matched WI
- 3. The current instruction is a write, the ranges of the write don't overlap any WI, create a new WI
- 4. The EIP of the current instruction is inside a WI, WxorX law broken!

DUMP THE MEMORY!



ranges

Ok the core of the problem has been resolved...

... but we have just scratch the surface of the problem. Let's collect the results obtained so far...



In order to dump the program we have exploited the capabilities of our dumping module and Scylla



Steps:

 The execution of a written address is detected



In order to dump the program we have exploited the capabilities of our dumping module and Scylla





In order to dump the program we have exploited the capabilities of our dumping module and Scylla



Steps:

- The execution of a written address is detected
- 2. PinDemonium calls Scylla
- 3. Scylla gets the addresses of the main module





Steps:

 The execution of a written address is detected

bláč

- 2. PinDemonium calls Scylla
- 3. Scylla gets the addresses of the main module
- 4. Scylla dumps the main module along with the written addresses on a file

Have we already finished?

Nope...



What if the original code is written on the heap?



Steps:



What if the original code is written on the heap?



Steps:

- The execution of a written address is detected
- 2. PinDemonium calls Scylla
- 3. Scylla gets the addresses of the main module
- 4. Scylla dumps the main module

WRONG!



The OEP doesn't make sense!

🥣 CFF Explorer VIII - [interheap_0.exe	e]								
File Settings ?									
	interheap_0.exe								
v 🖉 👻	Member	Offset	Size	Value	Meaning				
File: interheap_0.exe Jos Header	Magic	000000F8	Word	010B	PE32				
- D II Nt Headers	MajorLinkerVersion	00000FA	Byte	0A					
Optional Header	MinorLinkerVersion	00000FB	Byte	00					
Data Directories [x] Section Headers [x]	SizeOfCode	000000FC	Dword	00003A00					
- Comport Directory	SizeOfInitializedData	00000100	Dword	00003600					
— 🗀 Resource Directory — 🗀 Debug Directory	SizeOfUninitializedD	00000104	Dword	0000000					
— Address Converter — Dependency Walker	AddressOfEntryPoint	00000108	Dword	01E90000	Invalid				
	BaseOfCode	0000010C	Dword	00001000					



Solution

Add the heap memory range in which the WxorX rule has been broken as a new section inside the dumped PE!

- Keep track of writeintervals located on the heap
- 2. Dump the heap-zone where the WxorX rule is broken
- 3. Add it as a new section inside the PE
- 4. Set the OEP inside this new added section



The OEP is correct!

🥩 CFF Explorer VIII - [interheap_0.ex	(e]								
File Settings ?									
	interheap_0.exe								
V) 🧳 🕅	Member	Offset	Size	Value	Meaning				
File: interheap_0.exe Jos Header	Magic	000000F8	Word	010B	PE32				
- D II Nt Headers	MajorLinkerVersion	000000FA	Byte	0A					
File Header	MinorLinkerVersion	000000FB	Byte	00					
 Data Directories [x] Section Headers [x] Import Directory 	SizeOfCode	00000FC	Dword	00003A00					
	SizeOfInitializedData	00000100	Dword	00003600					
🖾 Resource Directory 🛅 Debug Directory	SizeOfUninitializedD	00000104	Dword	00000000					
— 🐁 Address Converter — 🐁 Dependency Walker	AddressOfEntryPoint	00000108	Dword	0001A000	.heap				



However, the dumped heap-zone can contain references to addresses inside other <u>not dumped</u> memory areas!





Solution

Dump all the heap-zones and load them in IDA in order to allow static analysis!

- 1. Retrieve all the currently allocated heap-zones
- 2. Identify the new allocated or modified ones by comparing the MD5 of their previous content
- 3. Dump these heap-zones
- 4. Create new segments inside the .idb for each of them
- 5. Copy the heap-zones content inside these new segments!



E	IDA View-A 🛛 🛛	O	Hex View-1	×	A	Structures	×		Enums	×	1	Imports	×		
	.heap:0041A000		assume	es:seg	021, s	s:seg021, ds:	_data,	s:nothi	ng, gs:nothi	ng					
	.heap:0041A000		public	start											
	.heap:0041A000	start:				; DATA X	REF: HE	DER:004	002D4To						
	.neap:0041H000		add	eax,	1										
	• hear:00410006		mou	edx,	dword i	tr ds.aAaaa	G - "00)	00"							
	 .heap:0041A00B 		mov	eax.	220000	Sh	• ,								
	.heap:0041A010		call	eax		CA1									
	.heap:0041A010	;				····; ····¥···									
	.heap:0041A012		dw 0	0.001		- 1×									
	.heap:0041A014	.neap:0041A014	align	align 200n		; Segment	type: Re	gular							
	hop:00414200	hoan	uu Jõe onde	n aah(:	,	; Segment	alignmer	it '' car	n not be rep	resented	l in ass	embly			
	hean:00410200	-ucah	enus			seg021	SE	gment pa	ara private	'' use32	2				
	seg010:0200000]010:020D0000 ; ===============================					as 	SUME CS	:Seguzi 8885						
	seg010:0200000						,org 22000000 assume estrothing screathing dstrathing fstrathing astrathing								
	seg010:020D000						xor edx. edx								
	seg010:020D000	0 ; Segme	ment alignment '' can not be rep			.et	pt	ish ea	ax						
	seq010:020000	0 seq010	segme	nt para	privat	- 100 UDE									

Two down, two still standing!

Reverser we are coming for you! Let's **deobfuscate some imported functions**...

Deobfuscate the IAT



Extended Scylla functionalities:

• IAT Search : Used Advanced and Basic IAT search functionalities provided by Scylla

• IAT Deobfuscation : Extended the plugin system of Scylla for IAT deobfuscation
Deobfuscate the IAT





Steps:

- 1. Is the address 0x04000012
 inside the DLL memory
 region? No, continue until
 next jump...
 ins_delta = 0
- 2. Is the address 0x04001000
 inside the DLL memory
 region? No, continue until
 next jump...
 ins_delta = 8
- 3. Is the address 0x75000010 inside the DLL memory region? YES! Let's patch the IAT entry ins_delta = 16

[0x4000012] = (0x75000010 - 16) = 0x75000000

CORRECT!

One last step...

Too many dumps, too many programs making too many problems... Can't you see? This is the land of confusion



We have to find a way to identify the correct dump

Idea

Give for each dump a "quality" index using the heuristics defined in our heuristics module 1. Entropy difference



We have to find a way to identify the correct dump

Idea

Give for each dump a "quality" index using the heuristics defined in our heuristics module

- 1. Entropy difference
- 2. Far jump



We have to find a way to identify the correct dump

Idea

Give for each dump a "quality" index using the heuristics defined in our heuristics module

- 1. Entropy difference
- 2. Far jump
- 3. Jump outer section



We have to find a way to identify the correct dump

Idea

Give for each dump a "quality" index using the heuristics defined in our heuristics module

- 1. Entropy difference
- 2. Far jump
- 3. Jump outer section
- 4. Yara rules

Yara Rules



Yara is executed on the dumped memory and a set of rules is checked for two main reasons:

Detecting Evasive code

Detect patterns of evasive code which may have prevented the complete unpacking of the malware like Anti-VM and Anti-Debug techniques

Identifying malware family

When a known malware family rule is matched after multiple unpacking layers probably this is the correct dump

Advanced Problems

You either die a hero or you live long enough to see yourself become the villain

Exploit PIN functionality to break PIN

A.k.a. Self modifying code







Steps:

 The trace is collected in the code cache







Steps:

- The trace is collected in the code cache
- 2. The execution starts in the code cache





Steps:

- 1. The trace is collected in the code cache
- 2. The execution starts in the code cache
- 3. The wrong instruction is patched in the main module





Steps:

- 1. The trace is collected in the code cache
- 2. The execution starts in the code cache
- 3. The wrong instruction is patched in the main module
- 4. The wrong_ins_3 is executed

CRASH!

Solution



Steps:



List of written addresses



Steps:

1. Insert one analysis routine before each instruction and another one if the instruction is a write



List of written addresses



Steps:

- 1. Insert one analysis routine before each instruction and another one if the instruction is a write
- 2. Execute the analysis routine before the write







Steps:

- 1. Insert one analysis routine before each instruction and another one if the instruction is a write
- 2. Execute the analysis routine before the write
- 3. The crash_ins_3 is patched in the main module





Steps:

- 1. Insert one analysis routine before each instruction and another one if the instruction is a write
- 2. Execute the analysis routine before the write
- 3. The crash_ins_3 is patched in the main module
- 4. Check if ins_2 address is inside the list

NOPE...





- Insert one analysis routine before each instruction and another one if the instruction is a write
- 2. Execute the analysis routine before the write
- 3. The crash_ins_3 is patched in the main module
- 4. Check if ins_2 address is inside the list

NOPE...

5. Check if crash_ins_3 address is inside the list

YES!







Steps:

- 1. Insert one analysis routine before each instruction and another one if the instruction is a write
- 2. Execute the analysis routine before the write
- 3. The crash_ins_3 is patched in the main module
- 4. Check if ins_2 address is inside the list

NOPE...

5. Check if crash_ins_3 address is inside the list

YES!

6. Stop the execution



List of written addresses crash_ins_3_addr



Steps:

- 1. Insert one analysis routine before each instruction and another one if the instruction is a write
- 2. Execute the analysis routine before the write
- 3. The crash_ins_3 is patched in the main module
- 4. Check if ins_2 address is inside the list

NOPE...

5. Check if crash_ins_3 address is inside the list

YES!

- 6. Stop the execution
- 7. Recollect the new trace

CORRECT!

Are there other ways to break the WxorX rule?

Process Injection

Process Injection



Inject code into the memory space of a different process and then execute it

- Dll injection
- Reflective Dll injection

- Process hollowing
- Entry point patching

OUR WxorX TRACKER IS NO MORE SUFFICIENT!

Solution

Process Injection



Identify remote writes to other processes by hooking system calls:

- NtWriteVirutalMemory
- NtMapViewOfSection

Identify remote execution of written memory by hooking system calls:

- NtCreateThreadEx
- NtResumeThread
- NtQueueApcThread

Finally for the SWAG!







→ Test 1: test our tool against the same binary packed with different known packers.

→ Test 2 : test our tool against a series of packed malware sample collected from VirusTotal.



Experiment1: known packers

	Upx	FSG	Mew	mpress	PeCompa ct	Obsidium	ExePacker	ezip
MessageBox. exe	4	~	1	1	√	×	√	√
WinRAR.exe	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	×	\checkmark	\checkmark

	Xcom p	PEloc k	ASProte ct	ASPack	eXpress or	exe32pac ker	beropac ker	Hyperio n	PeSpin
MessageBox. exe	~		!	1	!	\checkmark	\checkmark	1	√
WinRAR.exe	\checkmark	!		\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark

Original code dumped but Import directory not reconstructed

Experiment 2: wild samples



Number of packed (checked manually) samples 1066

	N°	%
Unpacked and working	519	49
Unpacked but Different behaviour	150	14
Unpacked but not working	139	13
Not unpacked	258	24

Experiment 2: wild samples



Number of packed (checked manually) samples 1066

	N°	% of all	
Unpacked and working	519	49	/
Unpacked but Different behaviour	150	14	0
Unpacked but not working	139	13	
Not unpacked	258	24	

DEMO

Limitations



More advanced IAT obfuscation techniques are not handled

Packers which reencrypt / compress code after its execution are not supported



Conclusions

Generic unpacker based on a DBI

Able to reconstruct a working version of the original binary

Able to deal with IAT obfuscation and dumping on the heap

17 common packers defeated

63% of random samples correctly unpacked (known and custom packers employed) The source code is available at

https://github.com/Seba0691/PINdemonium


Thank you!