

# DDGF: Dynamic Directed Greybox Fuzzing with Path Profiling

Haoran Fang, Kaikai Zhang, Donghui Yu, Yuanyuan Zhang\*

Shanghai Jiao Tong University

International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA 2024)



# **Coverage-Guided Fuzzing**

- Evolutionary Algorithm
  - simple but effective
- AFL++/Syzkaller/Fuzzilli...
  - general & domain-specific
- Large-Scale Industrial Practice
  - $\circ \quad \text{OSS-Fuzz}\,, \text{OneFuzz}\,..$ 
    - 24/7 continuous fuzzing
    - over 36,000 bugs across 1,000 projects







# Fuzzing is NOT a Black Box

- Start fuzzing, wait for the results
  - crash -> replay
- Coverage Plateau
  - Is current test sufficient?
  - Where is it stuck?
- More Intermediate Status Exposure
  - understand -> direct

last new path : 0 days, 0 hrs, 0 last new path : 0 days, 0 hrs, 0 last uniq crash : none seen yet last uniq hang : none seen yet	<pre>min, 43 sec min, 1 sec untq crashes: 0 untq hangs: 0</pre>
now processing : 261*1 (37.1%)	map density : 5.78% / 13.98%
paths timed out : 0 (0.00%)	count coverage : 3.30 bits/tuple
— stage progress —	
now trying : splice 14	favored paths : 114 (16.22%)
stage execs : 31/32 (96.88%)	new edges on : 167 (23.76%)
total execs : 2.55M	total crashes : 0 (0 unique)
- fuzzing strategy yields	path geometry
bit flips : n/a, n/a, n/a	levels : 11
byte flips : n/a, n/a, n/a	pending : 121
arithmetics : n/a, n/a, n/a	
known ints : n/a, n/a, n/a	own finds : 699
bayes (colice + EAS/1 AEM 103/1 44M	imported : n/a
Dy/custom : 0/0 0/0	stability : 99.88%
trim : 19.25%/53.2k. n/a	[cpu000: 125

#### AFL status screen



#### coverage plateau for libxml2

ISSTA 24

### **Motivation**





- Directed Greybox Fuzzing
  - distance-based
  - recompile to change targets
  - $\circ$  smooth and slow
  - distinguish different cases?
- Communication
  - bitmap in AFL
    - one-way mapping
  - AFLFast long tail map
    - cksum of tracebit
    - decode Index ?

#### **Research Questions**\*

**RQ1.** How can the fuzzer explain what prevents it from progressing ?

**RQ2.** How can we facilitate a more effective communication between fuzzer and security auditor ?

\* "Fuzzing: Challenges and Reflections," in *IEEE Software*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 79-86, May-June 2021



# **Design Overview**



- Share the Same View of Code
  - how to describe a path?
  - Ball-Larus path encoding/profiling
- Interactive Way
  - decode & check paths
  - $\circ \quad \text{ add flags for target path } \\$
- Performance Overhead
  - trade-off
  - profiling for seeds



\*Thomas Ball and James R. Larus. Efficient path profiling. (MICRO 1996).

⚠

Crash

#### **Ball-Larus Path Profiling**



Path	Encoding		
ACDF	0		
ACDEF	1		
ABCDF	2		
ABCDEF	3		
ABDF	4		
ABDEF	5		

• Encoding

- unique number(id)
- reverse topological order
- spanning tree & instrument

#### Decoding

- $\circ$  path  $\Leftrightarrow$  id => hit\_count
- user check & flag
- $\circ$  connection

count[id]++
flag[id] = True/False?

# Path Flagging

- check & decode the path frequency
  - insights from instropection
- add/change the flag for target paths
  - at any time of fuzzing
  - 3 flagging strategies
- flags
  - connection between user and fuzzer
  - influence on seed selection



### **Seed Selection**



- Intuition
  - seeds with flag tend to produce testcases with flag
  - flags(feature) are saved in evolution
- Interactive Evolutionary Algorithm
  - old research topic
  - fitness function + <u>human evaluation</u>
- Back to Motivating Example
  - target path/cases



### Implementation



Dashboard

### Implementation



Path Frequency & Decoding in CFG

#### Implementation



Line Coverage, Combined with Fuzz-Introspector(llvm-cov)

## **Evaluation**

- Magma benchmark & real programs
- Dynamic Introspection
  - insight?
  - typical long-tail shape
  - huge imbalance
    - $\circ$   $\phantom{-}$  20% paths , 80% hits
  - decode top-2 paths
    - blocking path



Blocking paths are highlighted in red.

Fuzzing wasted too much resources on these paths.

#### ISSTA 24

### **Evaluation**





#### String Checking

Rejected by first if statement

### **Evaluation**

- Dynamic Direction
  - up to 100x~ speedup
  - only 1 flag: TIF008-10x
- Flagging Strategies
  - #1 Exclude the Blocking Path
  - #2 Identify the Key Control-Flow
  - #3 Identify the Key Data-Flow

Bug ID	AFL++	DDGF	Speedup	#Flags	Strategy
SND001	7.41m	4s	>100x	13	
SND005	15.22m	2s	>400x	4	
SND006	39.30m	16s	>140x	4	
SND007	20.01m	13s	>90x	16	1
SND017	13.48m	2.21m	6x	62	
SND020	30.25m	3.19m	10x	62	
SND024	14.39m	6s	>140x	10	
TIF012	4.39m	0.98m	4.5x	1	2
TIF014	4.29m	2.11m	$2\mathbf{x}$	11	
TIF014-cp	34.24m	6.89m	5x	11	1
XML003	12.71m	7.15m	1.7x	22	
XML009	11.8m	2.28m	5x	22	
PNG007	1.62h	0.49h	3.3x	2	
TIF002	13.39h	4.35h	3.0x	1	2
TIF008	19.88h	1.67h	11.9x	1	
SQL002	12.4m	10.6m	1.1x	3	
SQL014	2.07h	0.73h	2.8x	21	1
SQL018	1.31h	0.76h	1.7x	8	2
SQL020	10.0h	2.0h	5x	3	3
SSL020	17.6h	1.86h	9.5x	10	
PDF003	1.86h	11.5m	9.7x	6	2
PDF010	2.13h	2.29m	55x	36	1
PDF019	T.O	16.99h	>1.4x	110	1
PDF018	19.67h	42s	>1600x	1	
PDF021	T.O	T.O	-	6	2

# Strategy 1: Exclude the Blocking Path

Listing 3: Code Snippet for Flagging Stragety 1



Exclude top blocking path(TYPE\_UNDEFINED), and add flags for all remaining paths.

TTE acceleration:  $20\min \Rightarrow 13s$ 

# Strategy 2 : Identify the Key Control-Flow

```
Listing 4: Code Snippet for Flagging Stragety 2
```

```
static int NeXTDecode(TIFF* tif, ..) {
       switch (n) {
 3
           case 1: .. break
           case 2: .. break
 4
 5
             ...
           default: // MAGMA LOG(TIF008)
 6
 7
 8
 9
   int TIFFInitNeXT(TIFF* tif, int scheme) {
10
       (void) scheme;
11
       tif ->tif predecode = NeXTPreDecode;
12
       tif ->tif decoderow = NeXTDecode;
13
        tif -> tif_decodestrip = NeXTDecode;
14
        tif -> tif_decodetile = NeXTDecode:
15
       return (1);
16
17 }
```

6,000 Seeds, 0 Hits for the first 15h.

What hinders the triggering?

function pointer initialization

only 6 Hits, no more than 6/6000 seeds

Add only 1 flag for this key control-flow path . TTE acceleration:  $19.88h \Rightarrow 1.67h$ 

# **Strategy 3 : Identify the Key Data-Flow**



#### **Performance Overhead**

Table 3: Comparison of Runtime Overhead between DDGF and AFL++.

Program	AFL++	DDGF	Overhead
sndfile_fuzzer	6.52M	6.11M	6%
tiff_read_rgb_fuzzer	101M	89.9M	11%
sqlite3_fuzzer	41.2M	37.5M	9%
xml_read_memory_fuzzer	22.3M	17.6M	21%
pdf_fuzzer	209k	173k	19%
libpng_read_fuzzer	312M	281M	10%

Total # executions for 2 Hours

# **Thanks**

