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State machines

- Every application that implements a protocol has to implement the corresponding state machine
- Mealy machines as formal representation
  - Set of states
  - Input alphabet
  - Output alphabet
- Specify in all states for each input
  - Returned output
  - Next state
- Unambiguous representation
State machine inference

- Extract state machines from implementations by communicating with them
- Fuzzing of message order
- Security analysis
  - Discover bugs
  - Provides interesting insights in the code
  - Will not find carefully hidden backdoors
- Manual analysis by looking for unexpected transitions and other strange behaviour
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Automated learning

- Deterministic Mealy machine
- Learner
  - Adapted L* algorithm by Niese
- Teacher
  - Equivalence queries approximated
    - Random traces
    - Chow’s W-method

Diagram:
- Learner
  - Reset
  - Output query
  - Output
  - Equivalence query
  - Yes / Counterexample
- Teacher
State machine inference for security
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Learning of TLS implementations

- LearnLib by TU Dortmund
  - Implementation of adapted L* and equivalence algorithms
- Equivalence checking using modified W-method
  - Given an upper bound it is guaranteed to find the correct state machine
  - Depth specified to search for counter-examples
  - After a socket is closed no data will be received
- Custom test harness for TLS
- Manual analysis if we see unexpected behavior
Short introduction to TLS

**Client**
- ClientHello
- ClientKeyExchange
- ChangeCipherSpec
- Finished

**Server**
- ServerHello
- Certificate
- ServerHelloDone
- ChangeCipherSpec
- Finished
- ApplicationData

**Application Data**
- ApplicationData
Test harness

- (Almost) stateless TLS implementation
- Minimal state in test harness to handle encryption
- Support to test clients and servers
- All regular TLS messages and Heartbeat extensions
  - RSA and DH key exchange
  - Client authentication
  - Some special symbols that correspond to exceptions in the test harness
Analysis of TLS servers

- 9 TLS implementations
  - OpenSSL / BoringSSL / LibreSSL
  - GnuTLS
  - Java Secure Socket Extension
  - mbed TLS (previously PolarSSL)
  - NSS
  - RSA BSAFE for C
  - RSA BSAFE for Java
  - miTLS
  - nqsb-TLS

- Every learned model different
Learned models
Learned models
Results

- Used demo applications when provided
- 6 to 16 states
- 6 minutes to over 8 hours
  - Under 1 hour if connections are properly closed
  - Dependent on implementation specific time-outs (100ms to 1,5s)
- Several new flaws in different implementations
Java Secure Socket Extension

- Possible to skip ChangeCipherSpec message
- Server will accept plaintext data
- Problem also present in client
- Also found by the Prosecco group at INRIA
- Fixed in January 2015
GnuTLS

- Shadow path after sending HeartbeatRequest during handshake
- Buffer handshake messages for hash in Finished reset
- Same problem present in the client
nqsb-TLS

- Plaintext alerts returned after ChangeCipherSpec
- No security flaw
- Quickly fixed
- Shows it is a useful technique during development
- Different interpretation of the specification
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Conclusions

- State machine inference is a useful technique to find security flaws and other bugs.

- Everybody interprets specifications differently and makes different design decisions
  - Can be used for fingerprinting!

- It would be good to include state machines in specifications.
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Thank you for your attention!