

Compositional Vulnerability Detection with Insecurity Separation Logic

Toby Murray¹[0000-0002-8271-0289], Pengbo Yan¹[0000-0003-0396-8343], and
Gidon Ernst²[0000-0002-3289-5764]

¹ University of Melbourne, Australia

² LMU Munich, Germany

Abstract. Memory-safety issues and information leakage are known to be depressingly common. We consider the compositional static detection of these kinds of vulnerabilities in first-order C-like programs. Existing methods often treat one type of vulnerability (e.g. memory-safety) but not the other (e.g. information leakage). Indeed the latter are hyper-safety violations, making them more challenging to detect than the former. Existing leakage detection methods like Relational Symbolic Execution treat only non-interactive programs, avoiding the challenges raised by nondeterminism for reasoning about information leakage. Their implementations also do not treat non-trivial leakage policies like value-dependent classification, which are becoming increasingly common. Finally, being whole-program analyses they cannot be applied compositionally—to deduce the presence of vulnerabilities in a program by analysing each of its parts—thereby ruling out the possibility of incremental analysis.

In this paper we remedy these shortcomings by presenting Insecurity Separation Logic (INSECSL), an under-approximate relational program logic for soundly detecting information leakage and memory-safety issues in interactive programs. We show how INSECSL can be soundly automated by bi-abduction based symbolic execution. Based on this, we design and implement a top-down, contextual, compositional, inter-procedural analysis for vulnerability detection. We implement our approach in a proof-of-concept tool, UNDERFLOW, for analysing C programs, which we demonstrate by applying it to various case studies.

Keywords: Under-approximate logic · Symbolic execution · Information-flow security.

1 Introduction

Memory-safety issues and information leakage are known to be depressingly common and are regularly reported to be among the most common vulnerability classes [30,7]. Methods for statically detecting each of these two classes of vulnerabilities have been well-studied in isolation. Modern memory-safety detection methods enjoy virtues such as compositionality (being able to analyse a program

one-function-at-a-time, enabling incremental analysis [5]), and low false positive rates enabled by precise program and memory models [26].

Methods for detecting information leakage vulnerabilities, on the other hand, lag somewhat behind. Existing static information leakage detection methods [13,9,10] enjoy neither the compositionality nor the precision common to memory-safety detectors. Also, they consider only simple, deterministic programming languages. Yet nondeterminism is ubiquitous in real programs. In reality this means their applicability has so far been limited largely to small fragments of non-interactive code, like cryptographic routines, that implement straightforward security policies; excluding programs that interact with their environments and increasingly-common policies, such as those employing *value-dependent classification* [33,2,34,28,29,23,20,16,32,22,21,12].

On the one hand, this situation is understandable: information leakage, being a hypersafety property [8], is naturally more difficult to reason about than simple safety violations: reasoning about the former requires reasoning about *pairs* of program executions. In addition, nondeterminism has long been known to considerably complicate reasoning about information leakage [14]—after all nondeterminism is often used to *abstract away* sources of information, hindering reasoning about the propagation of that information.

In this paper we seek to overcome these shortcomings. To do so we present Insecurity Separation Logic (INSECSL), an under-approximate relational program logic [18,17] for first-order C-like programs. INSECSL is designed to allow sound detection of information leakage and memory-safety issues in interactive programs. We show how INSECSL can be soundly automated by bi-abduction based symbolic execution. Based on this, we design and implement a top-down, contextual, compositional, inter-procedural analysis for vulnerability detection. We implement our approach in a proof-of-concept tool, UNDERFLOW, for analysing C programs, which we demonstrate by applying it to various case studies.

The mechanisation and soundness theorems for INSECSL and its bi-abduction based symbolic execution, plus the tool UNDERFLOW and case studies to which it has been applied are available for download here: https://www.dropbox.com/s/rmxq4ijb6qhmb28/SAS_Supplementary_Material.tar.gz?dl=0

2 Overview and Motivation

2.1 A Motivating Scenario

We use the program in Fig. 1 to both motivate and explain our approach, which implements the core of a simple auction server. The server can run auctions in one of two modes: *public-* or *sealed-bid*. In a sealed-bid auction, all information about bids must be kept secret until after the auction is finished, at which point only the winning bid is announced. In a public-bid auction, bids may be revealed as they are placed.

Bids in this auction are pairs of `ints`: (id, qt) where id is an identifier that identifies the bidder who submitted the bid, and qt is the amount (or *quote*) submitted in the bid. The C struct type `idqt` (whose definition is omitted) pairs these two values together.

```

void run_auction(int is_sealed){
  // ... allocate s, d, bid; start the auction
  while (/* still going */){
    get_bid(is_sealed, bid);
    add_bid(s, d, bid);
  }
  // ... close the auction
}

void add_bid(idqt *s, int *d, idqt *bid){
  // ...
  idqt_max(s, bid);
  // ...
}

void idqt_max(idqt *a, idqt *b){
  if (b->qt > a->qt){
    a->id = b->id;
    a->qt = b->qt;
    log_current_max(a->id, a->qt);
  }
}

```




Fig.1. The core of an auction server, supporting both sealed-bid and public-bid auctions, inspired from <https://bitbucket.org/covern/secc/src/master/examples/case-studies/auction.c>, including its callgraph.

The top-level function `run_auction()` maintains three simple pieces of state: the current maximum bid `s`, the auction status `d`, and the struct `bid` used to store newly submitted bids. New bids are received via the `get_bid()` function, and processed by the `add_bid()` function. To process a new bid, `add_bid()` compares it to the current maximum bid using the function `idqt_max()`, which updates the current maximum so that it always refers to the maximum bid received so far. The top-level parameter `is_sealed` determines whether the auction is a sealed-bid or a public-bid auction.

While simple, this program exhibits features that put it beyond the reach of existing static information flow detection methods. Firstly, `get_bid()` is inherently nondeterministic: it may return arbitrary values, since it is the interface between the program and its environment. Secondly, it exhibits so-called *value-*

dependent classification, in which *whether* some data is considered secret (aka is “classified”) depends on some other data. Specifically, the new bid obtained by calling `get_bid()` should be treated as secret when `is_sealed` is non-zero (i.e. is true), and can be treated as public data otherwise.

Unfortunately, `idqt_max()` is insecure when `is_sealed` is non-zero. To maximise efficiency, it updates the maximum bid only when the newly submitted bid is larger than the current maximum. However, in a sealed-bid auction this gives rise to a timing leak that can be exploited by auction participants to game the auction, since it allows them to infer whether the bid they have submitted is greater than the current maximum or not.

2.2 Nondeterminism and Information Leakage

Why is nondeterminism (like that exhibited by `get_bid()` in Fig. 1) such a challenge for reasoning about information leakage? The trouble is that information leakage is a *hyperproperty* [8] that *compares* program executions. For example, `idqt_max()` from Fig. 1 has a timing leak because when we run it on two different secret inputs it takes differing amounts of time to execute. Specifically, in a sealed-bid auction if the current maximum bid is larger or equal to the newly submitted bid vs. when it is not.

For deterministic programs defining information leakage is straightforward. A deterministic program has an information leak when, if run from two initial states that agree on the values of all public data, the outputs it produces that can be observed by some attacker are distinguishable. Without loss of generality (wlog), assume a simple deterministic programming language over memory states that map (global) program variables to values, and in which all program outputs are recorded in the values of program variables. Let $\stackrel{\text{low}}{=}$ denote the binary relation on memory states that holds precisely when two states agree on the values of all program variables that contain public data. Write $\stackrel{\text{low}}{\neq}$ to denote the complement: $s \stackrel{\text{low}}{\neq} s'$ means that an attacker can distinguish the states s and s' . Then a program c leaks information precisely when there exists initial states s and s' related by $\stackrel{\text{low}}{=}$ from which execution terminates in states t and t' for which $t \stackrel{\text{low}}{\neq} t'$. We can express this as a judgement in relational Hoare logic [4] (in which the usual pre- and post-conditions of Hoare logic are replaced by binary relations) as follows. Program c leaks information when there exists a non-empty pre-relation P for which

$$P \subseteq \stackrel{\text{low}}{=} \quad \text{and} \quad \{P\} c \{\stackrel{\text{low}}{\neq}\}$$

Nondeterminism significantly complicates things. Firstly, depending on the kind of nondeterminism a program exhibits, different definitions of information leakage need to be used. Two factors need to be taken into account: (1) whether the nondeterminism should be hidden from an attacker and (2) whether it can be *refined* (e.g. to a deterministic implementation).

Regarding issue (1), nondeterminism is often used to model concurrent scheduling. But in many real-world applications, the threat model assumes scheduling

decisions are known to attackers (for instance because scheduling decisions are allowed to be based only on public information [19]). Such nondeterminism need not be hidden from an attacker. On the other hand, nondeterminism that is used to model memory allocation (the choices about which addresses to allocate) is prudent to hide from attackers, e.g. to help defend against attacks on address space layout randomisation (ASLR).

Regarding issue (2), consider a program that implements a perfectly secure one-time-pad to encrypt a single secret bit h : it first nondeterministically selects a key bit k and then XORs k with h before revealing the result to the attacker. One way to define what it means for this program to be secure is via a so-called *possibilistic* security definition that states that no matter the value of h , the same set of outcomes for this program must be possible. However such definitions are ill-suited when nondeterminism can be refined by an implementation. For instance, suppose the mechanism that generates the random key bit k always chooses the bit 0, thereby defeating the encryption. This case is an example of the so-called *refinement-paradox* [14] in which an apparently secure program becomes insecure when nondeterminism is refined away. This issue is a known problem for possibilistic security definitions.

We therefore eschew possibilistic security definitions in this paper. Supposing we can distinguish those nondeterministic choices that a program makes that are allowed to be revealed to an attacker from those it should keep secret (we explain how INSEC SL does this in Section 2.5), we therefore say that a program leaks information when it is run from two initial states that agree on the values of public data, when all nondeterministic choices that are allowed to be revealed to an attacker are made identically in the two executions, but the executions finish in states distinguishable to the attacker.

Perhaps surprisingly, this definition cannot be phrased as a relational Hoare triple. For instance, consider the insecure program that inputs a secret number and immediately reveals it to an attacker. There is no pair of initial states from which *all* final states that execution terminates in are distinguishable.

Indeed, we observe therefore that *over-approximate* reasoning methods (including Hoare logics) are ill-suited for reasoning precisely about information leakage for nondeterministic programs.

2.3 Under-Approximate Reasoning

We therefore adopt under-approximate reasoning instead. Following Murray [18], who showed how to define the relational analogue of de Vries and Koutavas' under-approximate Hoare logic [11], for binary relations P and Q we write

$$[P] c [Q]$$

when for all pairs of final states t and t' related by Q , there exists initial states s and s' related by P from which c executes to terminate in t and t' respectively. In under-approximate judgements like this one, P is called the *presumption* while Q

is called the *result* [25]. Then c exhibits information leakage precisely when [18] there exists a non-empty post-relation Q such that

$$Q \subseteq \stackrel{\text{low}}{\neq} \quad \text{and} \quad [\stackrel{\text{low}}{=}] c [Q].$$

Interestingly, while Murray [18] proposed under-approximate reasoning for detecting information leakage, he did so over a *deterministic* programming language. We show however that for deterministic programs, under-approximate reasoning is no more expressive than its over-approximate counterpart.

Theorem 1. *For all predicates (respectively binary relations) P and Q and programs c , if $[P] c [Q]$ and Q is satisfiable, then there exists some precondition (respectively pre-relation) P' such that $\{P'\} c \{Q\}$ non-vacuously (i.e. P' is satisfiable).*

Proof. The following proof is for the case in which P and Q are predicates (i.e. unary relations). It generalises to binary relations straightforwardly. We write $\langle c, s \rangle \Rightarrow t$ when execution of program c from initial state s terminates in state t .

Given P , c and satisfiable Q such that $[P] c [Q]$, then there exists some final state t such that $Q(t)$, initial state s such that $P(s)$ and $\langle c, s \rangle \Rightarrow t$. Define P' then so that $P'(x) = (x = s)$, i.e. P' holds only for the state s . Since $\langle c, s \rangle \Rightarrow t$ and the program c is deterministic, then t is the only state x for which $\langle c, s \rangle \Rightarrow x$ holds. Also, since $Q(t)$, $Q(x)$ holds for all x for which $\langle c, s \rangle \Rightarrow x$ holds. Thus $\{P'\} c \{Q\}$. Finally, P' is trivially satisfiable since $P'(s)$ by definition. \square

In some sense, under-approximate reasoning therefore *only* has value for non-deterministic programs. This perhaps explains why prior static information leak detection methods like relational symbolic execution [13] that are based on over-approximate relational Hoare logic worked: because they were confined to deterministic programs.

2.4 Under-Approximate Relational Summaries

Under-approximate relational reasoning therefore allows us to detect information leakage. Phrasing such reasoning as judgements in a program logic allows us to carry out this reasoning compositionally.

The judgements of the program logic we present for doing so, INSECSL, provide a *logical* means to *summarise* the insecurity of individual program pieces.

INSECSL's design borrows ideas from the recent under-approximate separation logic ISL [26] and the over-approximate relational separation logic [31] SECCSL [12].

In INSECSL, we can express the insecurity of `idqt_max()` as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & [\&b-\>qt \mapsto bqt * \&a-\>qt \mapsto aqt] \\ & \quad \text{idqt_max}(a, b) \\ & [\text{insec}: bqt > aqt; \ell_A * \&b-\>qt \mapsto bqt * \&a-\>qt \mapsto aqt] \end{aligned}$$

Here the $*$ and \mapsto are INSECSL’s analogues of the traditional separating conjunction and points-to assertions of separation logic. For a pointer expression e_p , $e_p \mapsto e_v$ means that at the heap location to which expression e_p evaluates holds the value to which expression e_v evaluates. $P * Q$ means that the assertions P and Q both hold and, moreover, refer to distinct parts of the heap. For a pointer \mathbf{p} to an `idqt` struct, $\&\mathbf{p}\text{->qt}$ is read $\&(\mathbf{p}\text{->qt})$ and denotes the heap location in which the quote field of the struct lives. For an expression e , assertions $e;\ell_A$ state that e is secret information that should not be leaked.

The relational INSECSL judgement about `idqt_max()` above is read as follows: for all pairs of final states in which the quote fields of the structs to which pointers \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} respectively point hold the (arbitrary) values aqt and bqt respectively, in which the comparison $bqt > aqt$ is secret (not known to the attacker), there exists initial states in which the aforementioned struct fields (necessarily) refer also to aqt and bqt from which execution can occur to reach the final states, at which point the two executions will be distinguishable to the attacker.

The assertion $bqt > aqt;\ell_A$ states that whether $bqt > aqt$ is not known to the attacker. Here ℓ_A denotes the attacker’s *security level* (see Section 3.1). This assertion (like all INSECSL assertions) is evaluated over a pair of states (i.e. it *compares* two states), since INSECSL reasons about (compares) pairs of program executions. The states being compared between these pairs of program executions always represent the attacker’s *knowledge*, in the following sense: if some information (e.g. the value of a variable, or the value stored in a heap location, or the result of a comparison like $bqt > aqt$) is identical in both states being compared, then we say that the attacker *knows* that information. (We make this precise later when we define the semantics of INSECSL assertions in Section 3.6.) Thus when $bqt > aqt;\ell_A$ holds over a pair of states, it means that when we evaluate this greater-than comparison (a boolean value) in each of the states and compare the results they are different: in one state the comparison evaluates to true while in the other it evaluates to false. This explains why the two executions of course branch in different directions and, hence, leak information about this comparison.

2.5 Insecurity Separation Logic

INSECSL is carefully designed to neatly treat nondeterminism (both attacker-visible and secret nondeterminism), and to enable precise reasoning about non-trivial security policies including value-dependent classification.

It is formally defined over a core language that, to model nondeterminism, includes the **input** command: for a local variable x and expression e_ℓ denoting a security level, $x := \mathbf{input}(e_\ell)$ denotes nondeterministic input on the *input channel* e_ℓ , placing the result into the variable x . In particular, as is common when proving information flow security for interactive programs [27], we imagine a set of partially ordered security levels ℓ , ordered by \sqsubseteq . For each security level ℓ we imagine the existence of a corresponding input channel. The attacker whose security level is ℓ_A we assume knows all inputs on channels ℓ' for which $\ell' \sqsubseteq \ell_A$, i.e. all channels at or below the level of the attacker. Thus in the simple case

involving two distinct security levels **high** and **low** for which $\mathbf{low} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{high}$, but $\mathbf{high} \not\sqsubseteq \mathbf{low}$, and in which the attacker’s security level is **low**, $x := \mathbf{input}(\mathbf{low})$ models a nondeterministic choice that is allowed to be revealed to the attacker, while $x := \mathbf{input}(\mathbf{high})$ models nondeterminism that should be kept secret from the attacker.

One of the core rules of INSECSL, which illustrates its elegance, is that for input commands. We formally state it later in full generality; however the following is a simplification for when x does not appear free in e_ℓ :

$$[\mathbf{emp}] x := \mathbf{input}(e_\ell) [ok: x :: e_\ell]$$

It says that inputting is safe and that the resulting value that is input is known to the attacker precisely when the attacker’s security level ℓ_A is at or above e_ℓ . The assertion $e :: e_\ell$ is the converse of $e \not\vdash e_\ell$ and defines what information is known to the attacker.

Because the security assertions like $e :: e_\ell$ and $e \not\vdash e_\ell$ support arbitrary expressions e_ℓ denoting security levels, INSECSL naturally supports reasoning about value-dependent classification policies. For example, the behaviour of nondeterministic functions like `get_bid()` is straightforwardly specified. The following summary states that `get_bid()` can return arbitrary bids in `bid` and that the quote of the bid is secret when `is_sealed` is true (i.e. when a sealed-bid auction is being run):

$$\begin{aligned} & [\&bid \rightarrow id \mapsto id * \&bid \rightarrow qt \mapsto qt] \mathbf{get_bid}(\mathbf{is_sealed}, \mathbf{bid}) \\ & [ok: \&bid \rightarrow id \mapsto nid * \&bid \rightarrow qt \mapsto nqt * nqt :: (\mathbf{is_sealed} ? \mathbf{high} : \mathbf{low})] \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

We formally define INSECSL and establish its soundness for detecting vulnerabilities later in Section 3.

2.6 Summary Inference via Symbolic Execution

Our method for automating INSECSL reasoning lifts under-approximate bi-abduction based symbolic execution to the relational setting. It was developed concurrently to and independently of the recent work of Le et al. [15], whose work treats the non-relational logic ISL [26], to which it shares many similarities. Ours is the first to enjoy a mechanised proof of soundness. We illustrate it with a small example.

The top of Fig. 2 depicts a tiny example function that takes an array (pointer) `arr` and offset `off` and branches on whatever value is stored at `arr[off]` and, hence, leaks this value. This insecurity is captured by the following summary:

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\mathbf{arr} + \mathbf{off}) \mapsto x) \mathbf{example}(\mathbf{arr}, \mathbf{off}) \\ & [\mathbf{insec}: x = 0; \ell_A * (\mathbf{arr} + \mathbf{off}) \mapsto x] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Specifically, in accordance with the behaviour of C conditionals, when executing the if-condition, the boolean condition that is branched on is whether whatever value x that is loaded from the pointer `ptr` is zero, where `ptr` at this point is equal to `arr + off`.

```

void example(int *arr, int off){
  int *ptr = arr + off;
  int val = *ptr;
  if (val)
    // ...
}

void example(int *arr, int off){
  [(1) arr = a * off = o (4)* (a + o) ↦ x]
  int *ptr = arr + off;
  [ok:(2) ptr = a + o * arr = a * off = o (3)* (a + o) ↦ x]
  int val = *ptr;
  [insec:(5) val = x * ptr = a + o * arr = a * off =
o * (a + o) ↦ x (6)* x = 0; ℓA]
  if (val)
    // ...
}

```

Fig. 2. A function and inference of an insecurity summary via symbolic execution. Green assertions are those inferred to make forward progress; brown ones infer conditions under which information leakage occurs.

To infer this summary, we apply a variant of forward symbolic execution traditionally applied to automate specification inference in separation logics [6].

How our symbolic execution method does this inference for the example program is depicted in the bottom of Fig. 2. Analysis begins (1) at the start of the function with the assertion $\mathbf{arr} = a * \mathbf{off} = o$ in which the logical variables a and o capture the initial values of the parameters \mathbf{arr} and \mathbf{off} . Symbolically executing the assignment to local variable \mathbf{ptr} yields the fact (2) that $\mathbf{ptr} = a + o$.

Symbolic execution now encounters the dereference (load) of \mathbf{ptr} . Contrary to recent work [26], our symbolic execution method’s goal is to infer as many summaries as possible. Hence, at this point, it considers two possibilities: either the pointer \mathbf{ptr} is invalid or it is valid. The former possibility (after simplification) yields the “error” summary:

$$\begin{aligned}
& [(\mathbf{arr} + \mathbf{off}) \not\mapsto] \text{example}(\mathbf{arr}, \mathbf{off}) \\
& \quad [err: (\mathbf{arr} + \mathbf{off}) \not\mapsto]
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

For a pointer e_p , $e_p \not\mapsto$ says that this pointer is invalid [26]. The inference of this summary is a simpler case of that for the insecurity summary (2). The summary (2) is inferred when considering the second possibility for the load of \mathbf{ptr} : when \mathbf{ptr} is a valid pointer.

To consider this case, symbolic execution infers (3) the requirement that \mathbf{ptr} ’s current value $(a + o)$ is a valid pointer: $(a + o) \mapsto x$ for some fresh logical

variable x . However, the initial state ($\mathbf{arr} = a * \mathbf{off} = o$) from which symbolic execution began said nothing to imply that \mathbf{ptr} would be a valid pointer at this stage of execution. Therefore this new fact $(a + o) \mapsto x$ must be added to the initial state.

By construction, newly inferred facts like $(a + o) \mapsto x$ mention only logical variables (in this case, only a , o , and x) and so can be safely propagated back to the initial state always using separation logic’s *frame rule*:

$$\frac{[P] \text{ c } [Q] \quad \text{mod}(c) \cap \text{fv}(R) = \emptyset}{[P * R] \text{ c } [Q * R]} \text{FRAME}$$

This rule says that a new assertion R can be conjoined to an existing summary $[P] \text{ c } [Q]$ so long as R mentions no variables modified by the program c , which is trivially true when R mentions only logical variables.

Thus applying this rule in the example of Fig. 2 our symbolic execution method (4) pushes the new assertion into the initial state.

Symbolic execution can now proceed (5) past the load $\mathbf{val} = * \mathbf{ptr}$ of pointer \mathbf{ptr} . It now encounters the control-flow branch on \mathbf{val} . As with the earlier load of pointer \mathbf{ptr} , our symbolic execution method considers two possibilities: either the value on which execution is branching is secret or not. The former leads to the summary (2) so we concentrate on it here. Symbolic execution infers (6) that this branch can leak information if \mathbf{val} ’s current value (x) being zero or not is secret, i.e. when $x = 0; \ell_A$.

At this point symbolic execution has inferred the following insecurity summary for the *internal* behaviour of `example()`, where “...” abbreviates the code considered to this point:

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathbf{arr} = a * \mathbf{off} = o * (a + o) \mapsto x] \\ & \dots \\ & [\text{insec: } \mathbf{val} = x * \mathbf{ptr} = a + o * \mathbf{arr} = a * \\ & \quad \mathbf{off} = o * (a + o) \mapsto x * x = 0; \ell_A] \end{aligned}$$

Roughly (see Section 4.1), it can be turned into an insecurity summary for `example()`’s *external* behaviour (to be useful for inter-procedural analysis) by existentially quantifying over the local variables, in this case \mathbf{val} . Doing so, and then simplifying, yields the original insecurity summary (2).

Unlike spatial assertions like $(a + o) \mapsto x$, so-called *pure* assertions like $x = 0; \ell_A$ are not pushed back into the initial state during symbolic execution. This is because they need only appear in the result (post) assertion in function summaries. Specifically, for some function $\text{func}(\text{args})$, any summary $[P] \text{ func}(\text{args}) [Q]$ is logically equivalent to one in which all pure assertions in Q are conjoined with P . This is because pure assertions can refer only to local variables, which remain unchanged after a function call (as in much prior work, stack variables whose addresses are taken are placed into the heap).

Therefore, to avoid duplication, we write function summaries in under-approximate separation logics like INECSL in a *normal form* in which the presumption never contains pure assertions.

```

int CRYPTO_memcmp(const unsigned char *in_a,
                  const char *in_b, size_t len) {
    size_t i;
    unsigned char x = 0;
    for (i = 0; i < len; i++)
        x |= in_a[i] ^ in_b[i];
    return x;
}

```

Fig. 3. The `CRYPTO_memcmp()` function from OpenSSL (taken from the Binsec/Rel benchmarks [9]).

We formalise and prove the soundness of our symbolic execution method later in Section 4.

2.7 Top-Down, Inter-Procedural Analysis

So far this symbolic execution procedure is sufficient to infer summaries for leaf functions, by unrolling loops and recursion to some (possibly dynamically-determined) bound. For a single function, it might infer many summaries. Like traditional symbolic execution, ours can fork its execution to explore multiple execution paths, and each path might yield many different summaries: e.g. in Fig. 2 when encountering the load of pointer `ptr` we consider the two possibilities of `ptr` being invalid and valid respectively.

The summaries for a single function can include, besides insecurity summaries, also “error” summaries like (3) (in which a memory-safety violation occurs, for instance), plus “ok” summaries (like (1)) that describe behaviours of the function in which it terminates without error or insecurity. The latter are inferred when symbolic execution along a particular path reaches the end of the function.

One way to apply symbolic execution, then, would be in the service of a bottom-up analysis (in the style of Le et al. [15]) that begins by inferring summaries for the leaf functions, and then uses those summaries to analyse the leaf functions’ callers and compute summaries for them, and so on until it reaches the roots of the callgraph.

However, in this style of analysis each function is analysed *unconstrained*, i.e. under *no* assumptions about its calling context. For many common functions this style of analysis is likely to yield lots of useless summaries and time wasted exploring execution paths that might not arise in reality. As an example consider the `CRYPTO_memcmp()` function from OpenSSL that uses a for-loop to implement a *constant-time* comparison of two memory buffers `in_a` and `in_b` of (necessarily non-secret) length `len`, shown in Fig. 3.

An unconstrained analysis would have no information to decide how many times to unroll the for-loop. However this function is used throughout the OpenSSL codebase to compare pairs of buffers of varying lengths. If during unconstrained

analysis we decided to unroll the loop say 10 times, we would have sufficient summaries to analyse the call to `CRYPTO_memcmp()` from `tls1_cbc_remove_padding()` (where the loop executes 8 times) but not enough when this function is called from the Poly1305 or AES GCM code (where it compares 16-byte buffers), or PKCS12 (64-bytes). Worse these summaries would include many spurious information leakage summaries that describe how `CRYPTO_memcmp()` leaks the value of its argument `len`, even though in almost all instances in which it is called the `len` argument is a constant value. A similar argument holds for memory error summaries, given that `CRYPTO_memcmp()` is often called with `len`-sized buffers.

To overcome these issues our analysis instead proceeds top-down. When analysing a function f that calls another g we attempt to apply all summaries currently known about g . If none of them apply (either because we have not yet analysed g or because we have but none of the existing summaries are applicable to how g was invoked from f) we perform a *contextual* analysis of g to compute new summaries that are applicable at the callsite from f . To do this we take the current separation logic formula R that describes the state of the program at the call to g and we compute a subset R' of R that describes the state (stack and heap) that is *relevant* to the (arguments passed to the) call. We then symbolically execute the body of g from R' to compute contextual summaries that describe its possible behaviours at this callsite and at other similar ones in which g is invoked with similar arguments.

UNDERFLOW's implementation uses a simple heuristic to compute R' . However different choices are possible: when R' is empty, we obtain (an analysis equivalent to bottom-up) unconstrained symbolic execution; when it is equal to R we generate summaries that are *specific* to this call to g (and unlikely to be useful elsewhere). Our current design (Section 6) is a compromise between these extremes.

Under this design when `CRYPTO_memcmp()` is called from `tls1_cbc_remove_padding()`, `in_b` points by construction to an 8-byte constant buffer while `len` is the constant 8. Under this context, no insecurity summaries are generated (since `len` is a public value that cannot be leaked by definition); neither are any summaries explored in which the dereference `in_b[i]` dereferences an invalid pointer. Finally, any attempt to unroll the loop more than 8 times yields an unsatisfiable state causing those paths to be abandoned. Thus the context also provides useful information about when to stop unrolling the loop.

Returning to the auction server example, analysis begins with the top-level `run_auction()` function. When analysing `add_bid()` the context from `run_auction()` tells us that the two pointers are valid. During this analysis summaries are computed for `idqt_max()` including (2) which is used to conclude that `add_bid()` can leak information and, therefore, so too can `run_auction()` during the second iteration of its loop when `is_sealed` is true.

To understand how contextual summaries affect the analysis, on the first unrolling of the loop in `run_auction()`, `add_bid()` is analysed in a context in which `d` (which stores the auction state) points to the value `Ready`, indicating

that the auction has been started but no bids have yet been recorded. In this context `add_bid()` does not call `idqt_max()` and does not leak information. Thus analysing `add_bid()` in this context does not yield any “insecurity” summaries. On the second iteration of the loop in `run_auction()`, `add_bid()` is re-analysed since the contextual summary computed on the first iteration is inapplicable: `d` now points to the value `Ongoing` rather than `Ready`, indicating that at least one bid has been received. In this state, `add_bid()` does call `idqt_max()` and so an insecurity summary is computed for `idqt_max()` and a contextual summary for `add_bid()` describing how it leaks information via `idqt_max()`. That second contextual summary for `add_bid()` is then applicable on all subsequent iterations of the loop in `run_auction()`: having analysed these two executions of `add_bid()` no further analysis of it is required. This highlights the trade-off that our top-down, compositional, contextual analysis attempts to achieve between tractability and summary reuse.

We note that, in general, computed “error” and “insecure” summaries describe potential vulnerabilities that might arise depending on the calling context. Summaries for the top-level functions (like `run_auction()`) and those for non top-level functions whose presumption is `true` describe *actual* vulnerabilities: ones that arise independently of the calling context.

We explain precisely how a summary $[P_g] g() [Q_g]$ inferred for a callee $g()$ is used during symbolic execution of its caller $f()$ to infer summaries for $f()$ later in Section 5.

3 Insecurity Separation Logic

In this section we design the first practical under-approximate logic for detecting security violations, which we call *Insecurity Separation Logic* (INSECSL). We use INSECSL judgements to describe insecure (and other) behaviours of programs. That is, proving the validity of certain INSECSL judgements means proving the existence of security vulnerabilities in a program. Later, in Section 4, we show how such judgements can be automatically inferred by automating INSECSL via symbolic execution, thereby allowing automatic vulnerability detection that is free from false alarms.

INSECSL is defined for a simple imperative language with pointers and dynamic memory allocation, plus nondeterministic input. INSECSL is tailored specifically to detecting violations of *timing-sensitive noninterference*. INSECSL’s soundness has been mechanised in Isabelle/HOL.

3.1 Timing-Sensitive Security (Attacker Model)

We imagine that the execution of the program in question is being observed by an *attacker*, who has certain observational powers and initial knowledge and is trying to deduce secret information that the program is trying to protect. An information leak occurs if the attacker can deduce some secret information that they did not already know.

As standard, the attacker is assumed to know the program being executed. They are also assumed to know certain initial values in memory. The program may input new values during its execution and the attacker is assumed to know some of these inputs. All other information is considered *secret*, and noninterference requires that the attacker can never learn any new information above that which they were assumed to know initially.

The attacker is assumed to be *unable* to read any of the program’s memory during or after its execution. However, the programming language (see Section 3.2 later) includes an **output** command: **output**(ℓ, e). Here ℓ denotes an output channel and e the value being output. Certain channels are assumed visible to the attacker. Specifically, the channels names ℓ are ordered in a complete lattice \sqsubseteq . The attacker is assigned a *security level* ℓ_A which defines the channels that they can observe, namely all those ℓ for which $\ell \sqsubseteq \ell_A$.

The language also includes an input command: $x := \mathbf{input}(\ell)$, where x is a local variable and ℓ denotes an input channel. The attacker is assumed to know all inputs from channels ℓ for which $\ell \sqsubseteq \ell_A$. Any value may be input from any channel at any time (i.e. input is totally nondeterministic).

As mentioned, the security property for INSECSL is *timing-sensitive*. This means that the attacker can not only observe outputs on attacker-observable channels, but also at what times they occur. As is typical, time is measured in terms of the number of small-steps of execution in the language’s small-step operational semantics (defined later in Section 3.6).

Hence, while loops whose guards depend on a secret are forbidden.

Additionally, the security property targeted by INSECSL assumes an attacker who is able to observe at each point in time (i.e. after each small-step of the semantics) the program code that is running. This implies that e.g. when executing an if-conditions **if** e **then** c_1 **else** c_2 **endif** where $c_1 \neq c_2$, that the attacker can infer some information about e (namely whether it evaluated to true or not), since they will be able to tell in the subsequent execution step whether c_1 or c_2 is being executed. A similar argument applies to while-loops.

While not as strong as *constant-time security* [3], INSECSL can be easily extended to cover the stronger attacker model of constant-time security if desired (see Section 3.7).

We define the absence of information leaks under this attacker model as follows, using English instead of semantic notation which has not yet been introduced.

Definition 1 (Timing-Sensitive Noninterference). *A program c satisfies timing sensitive noninterference when, for all initial states σ and σ' that agree on the values of variables assumed to be known to the attacker, for all (partial) executions resulting in states τ and τ' after the same number of execution steps, in which identical values have been input on all channels at or below the level of the attacker, it is the case that the remaining program to be executed in τ and τ' is identical, and that the sequences of attacker-visible outputs produced in the two executions are the same.*

3.2 The Language of INECSL

Commands c in the language are drawn from the following grammar, where e is a pure expression that can mention program variables x :

$$c ::= \mathbf{skip} \mid x := e \mid x := [e] \mid [e] := e' \mid x := \mathbf{alloc}(e) \mid \mathbf{free}(e) \mid \\ \mathbf{output}(e, e') \mid x := \mathbf{input}(e) \mid \\ c_1; c_2 \mid \mathbf{if } e \mathbf{ then } c_1 \mathbf{ else } c_2 \mathbf{ endif} \mid \mathbf{while } e \mathbf{ do } c \mathbf{ done}$$

Here $[e]$ denotes dereferencing pointer e and e.g. in C would be written $*e$. The commands are standard, except $x := \mathbf{input}(e)$ and $\mathbf{output}(e, e')$. Here, e is an expression denoting a security *level* ℓ , i.e. an input (respectively output) channel. $x := \mathbf{input}(e)$ means input a value from the channel denoted by e and assign the inputted value to the variable x ; $\mathbf{output}(e, e')$ means output the value denoted by the expression e' on the output channel denoted by e .

As in ISL [26], commands in INECSL carry an optional label L that is used for error-reporting. We denote the command c with label L by $L: c$.

3.3 INECSL Assertions

Assertions P, Q of INECSL combine standard separation logic connectives (separating conjunction “ $*$ ”, points-to “ $e \mapsto e'$ ” and the empty heap \mathbf{emp}) with the $e_p \not\mapsto$ operator from ISL [26], which means that pointer denoted by expression e_p is known to be invalid (i.e. to not refer to valid memory) and so dereferencing it is an error. Additionally, INECSL assertions include the security assertion $e :: e_\ell$ of SECCSL [12], which means that an attacker whose security level is greater than or equal to that denoted by the expression e_ℓ knows the data contained in expression e . This assertion is used, for instance, to specify when the attacker is assumed to know a particular value that was input, as well as to specify what initial data the attacker is assumed to know.

A key innovation of ISL to facilitate under-approximate separation logic reasoning was to introduce the $e_p \not\mapsto$ assertion. It can be seen as the “erroneous” dual of the traditional points-to assertion $e_p \mapsto e_v$: when the latter holds dereferencing the pointer e_p is OK; however when the former holds, it is erroneous. In a similar manner, INECSL adds *insecurity assertions* as the dual to SECCSL’s $e :: e_\ell$. The INECSL assertion $e; \not e_\ell$ means that the attacker’s security level is greater or equal to that denoted by the expression e_ℓ and they do *not* know (all of) the data contained in expression e . Put another way, it means that the attacker has some *uncertainty* about the value of e . Note that this is stronger than saying $e :: \ell'$ for some level ℓ' above that of the attacker, which means only that the attacker *might* have some uncertainty about e . When the attacker’s level is greater or equal to that denoted by e_ℓ , outputting some value e on channel e_ℓ is OK when $e :: e_\ell$ holds, but is insecure when $e; \not e_\ell$ is satisfiable.

All INECSL assertions are *relational* [31], meaning that they are evaluated over a pair of states (and so their semantics, defined later in Section 3.6, defines a

binary state relation). INSECSL’s non-spatial assertions ρ are as follows, where e, e' range over pure expressions, including boolean propositions:

$$\rho ::= e \mid \rho \Longrightarrow \rho \mid e :: e' \mid e \not\vdash e'$$

Then INSECSL’s assertions P, Q are defined according to the following grammar:

$$P ::= \mathbf{emp} \mid \rho \mid e \mapsto e' \mid e \not\vdash \mid P * Q \mid \exists x. P \ x \mid \mathbf{false} \mid P \Longrightarrow Q$$

3.4 INSECSL Judgements

INSECSL is carefully designed to resemble a traditional separation logic, enabling its reasoning to be automated by symbolic execution as explained in Section 4.

Like prior incorrectness logics [25,26], INSECSL has multiple kinds of judgements. The judgement $\vdash_\ell [P] c [ok: Q]$ means that for all pairs of final states satisfying Q we can find a pair of initial states satisfying P under which c can execute twice to respectively reach the Q states, at which point both executions of c have terminated without error, and without leaking information to any ℓ -level attacker. It represents under-approximation of the successful and secure execution of command c .

INSECSL also supports *two* judgements for reasoning about problematic behaviour. The judgement $\vdash_\ell [P] c [err(L): Q]$ is for provably detecting errors like memory-safety violations in c and is akin to the error judgement of [26]’s Incorrectness Separation Logic (ISL). It says that for all pairs of final states satisfying Q , there exists a pair of initial states satisfying P , from which when c executes from each, both executions terminate at the Q -states respectively, however in a distinguished **abort** semantic configuration, meaning that each execution has behaved erroneously. As in ISL, the label L recorded in the judgement is that of the erroneous program command.

The final judgement of INSECSL is $\vdash_\ell [P] c [insec(L): Q]$. Rather than (ordinary) erroneous behaviour, $\vdash_\ell [P] c [insec(L): Q]$ captures provable *insecure* behaviour of command c . Specifically, that c can be executed from a pair of initial states satisfying P and in doing so leak information to a ℓ -level attacker. More formally, for all pairs of final states satisfying Q , there exist a pair of initial P -states from which c can execute to reach the Q -states and at this point of the execution the ℓ -level attacker has been able to infer secret information (i.e. information that we did not assume the attacker knew initially), either by observing an output (to some level $\ell' \sqsubseteq \ell$), or because c has branched on a secret.

We defer formalising these meanings until Section 3.6.

3.5 The Rules of INSECSL

The rules of INSECSL are depicted in Fig. 4. The notation $\vdash_\ell [P] c [\epsilon: Q]$ is borrowed from ISL [26] and is used in many of the rules to generalise over the three kinds of judgements: *ok*, *err*, and *insec*. When it appears more than once in

a rule, it should be read as meaning that the kinds of the judgements must match. For instance, the DISJ rule allows one to derive $\vdash_\ell [P_1 \vee P_2] c [ok: Q_1 \vee Q_2]$, knowing $\vdash_\ell [P_i] c [ok: Q_i]$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and likewise if all three judgements are *err* or *insec*, but one cannot use it to mix judgements of different kinds.

The rules DISJ and CONS are familiar from under-approximate relational logic [18]. Note in particular that the directions of the entailments in the CONS rule are reversed from usual in over-approximate logic. Entailment between INSECSL assertions is written $P \xRightarrow{\ell} Q$ and is defined relative to the level of the attacker ℓ , because INSECSL assertions are evaluated relative to the attacker-level ℓ (see Section 3.6). $P \xRightarrow{\ell} Q$ means that Q holds whenever P does, where both are evaluated relative to ℓ .

INSECSL purposefully resembles a traditional separation logic, and the under-approximate Incorrectness Separation Logic (ISL) [26] in particular, to enable its automation. Hence many of its rules are familiar and operate analogously to their ISL counterparts. For instance, its rules FREEERR detects double-free errors. LOADERR and STOREERR detect use-after-free errors, and so on. We refer the reader to [26] for further details.

The main differences between INSECSL and ISL concern the *INSEC rules, the INPUT rule, and the OUTOK rule. The INPUT rule neatly states precisely under which conditions the ℓ -level attacker is assumed to know the value that has been input: precisely when ℓ is at or below the level e of the channel from which the input x is drawn, which is exactly the semantics of $x :: e$ (under the appropriate substitution in case x appears free in e). Observe the symmetry between this rule and the assignment rule ASSIGN.

OUTOK reasons about outputs in which the value being output e is assumed to be known to the ℓ -level attacker: $e :: \ell$. OUTINSEC detects the case in which an output is insecure, because the ℓ -level attacker does not know the value e being output: $e; \not\ell$. Notice that the (in)security assertions in these rules appear in the result rather than in their presumption. One can of course use the FRAME rule to derive versions of these rules in which these conditions appear in the presumption, since output commands modify no state. The two rules can be combined, of course, with the DISJ rule to consider both cases, in much the same way as one does with e.g. the LOADOK and LOADERR rules in ISL.

The IFINSEC rule (and its analogous counterpart for while loops) detects insecure if-conditions (respectively loops) that branch on a value b whose truth is not known to the ℓ -level attacker: $(b = \mathbf{true}); \not\ell$.

3.6 Model and Soundness

Language Semantics The language of INSECSL is given a small-step semantics, allowing judgements to talk about partial executions (e.g. as is required for the insecurity judgement $\vdash_\ell [P] c [insec(L): Q]$). Importantly this semantics records the values that are input, which is necessary to state the formal security properties used in INSECSL's soundness theorem.

Semantic configurations include a *stack* s that maps variables x to *values* of some type *Val*; plus a heap h , whose addresses are synonymous with the type *Val*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [x = x'] x := \mathbf{input}(e) [ok: x :: e[x'/x]]} \text{INPUT} \qquad \frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [x = x'] x := e [ok: x = e[x'/x]]} \text{ASSIGN} \\
\\
\frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [P] \mathbf{skip} [ok: P]} \text{SKIP} \qquad \frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [x = x' * p \mapsto e] x := [p] [ok: x = e[x'/x] * p \mapsto e[x'/x]]} \text{LOADOK} \\
\\
\frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [p \mapsto e] [p] := e' [ok: p \mapsto e']} \text{STOREOK} \qquad \frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [p \not\mapsto] L: x := [p] [err(L): p \not\mapsto]} \text{LOADERR} \\
\\
\frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [p \not\mapsto] L: [p] := e [err(L): p \not\mapsto]} \text{STOREERR} \qquad \frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [\mathbf{emp}] x := \mathbf{alloc}(e) [ok: x \mapsto e]} \text{ALLOC1} \\
\\
\frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [p \not\mapsto] x := \mathbf{alloc}(e) [ok: x = p * p \mapsto e]} \text{ALLOC2} \qquad \frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [p \mapsto e] \mathbf{free}(p) [ok: p \not\mapsto]} \text{FREEOK} \\
\\
\frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [p \not\mapsto] L: \mathbf{free}(p) [err(L): p \not\mapsto]} \text{FREEERR} \qquad \frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [\mathbf{emp}] \mathbf{output}(\ell', e) [ok: e :: \ell']} \text{OUTOK} \\
\\
\frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [\mathbf{emp}] L: \mathbf{output}(\ell', e) [insec(L): e; \ell']} \text{OUTINSEC} \\
\\
\frac{\vdash_{\ell} [b * P] c_1 [\epsilon: Q]}{\vdash_{\ell} [P] \mathbf{if } b \mathbf{ then } c_1 \mathbf{ else } c_2 \mathbf{ endif } [\epsilon: Q]} \text{IFTRUE} \qquad \frac{\vdash_{\ell} [\neg b * P] c_2 [\epsilon: Q]}{\vdash_{\ell} [P] \mathbf{if } b \mathbf{ then } c_1 \mathbf{ else } c_2 \mathbf{ endif } [\epsilon: Q]} \text{IFFALSE} \\
\\
\frac{c = L: \mathbf{if } b \mathbf{ then } c_1 \mathbf{ else } c_2 \mathbf{ endif} \quad c_1 \neq c_2}{\vdash_{\ell} [(b = \mathbf{true}); \ell * F] c [insec(L): (b = \mathbf{true}); \ell * F]} \text{IFINSEC} \\
\\
\frac{\vdash_{\ell} [b * P] c; \mathbf{while } b \mathbf{ do } c \mathbf{ done } [\epsilon: Q]}{\vdash_{\ell} [P] \mathbf{while } b \mathbf{ do } c \mathbf{ done } [\epsilon: Q]} \text{WHILETRUE} \\
\\
\frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [\neg b * F] \mathbf{while } b \mathbf{ do } c \mathbf{ done } [ok: \neg b * F]} \text{WHILEFALSE} \\
\\
\frac{}{\vdash_{\ell} [(b = \mathbf{true}); \ell * F] L: \mathbf{while } b \mathbf{ do } c \mathbf{ done } [insec(L): (b = \mathbf{true}); \ell * F]} \text{WHILEINSEC} \\
\\
\frac{\vdash_{\ell} [P] c_1 [ok: Q] \quad \vdash_{\ell} [Q] c_2 [\epsilon: R]}{\vdash_{\ell} [P] c_1; c_2 [\epsilon: R]} \text{SEQOK} \qquad \frac{\vdash_{\ell} [P] c_1 [err(L): Q]}{\vdash_{\ell} [P] c_1; c_2 [err(L): Q]} \text{SEQERR} \\
\\
\frac{\vdash_{\ell} [P] c_1 [insec(L): Q]}{\vdash_{\ell} [P] c_1; c_2 [insec(L): Q]} \text{SEQINSEC} \qquad \frac{\vdash_{\ell} [P] c [\epsilon: Q] \quad \text{mod}(c) \cap \text{fv}(R) = \emptyset}{\vdash_{\ell} [P * R] c [\epsilon: Q * R]} \text{FRAME} \\
\\
\frac{P' \xrightarrow{\ell} P \quad \vdash_{\ell} [P'] c [\epsilon: Q'] \quad Q \xrightarrow{\ell} Q'}{\vdash_{\ell} [P] c [\epsilon: Q]} \text{CONS} \qquad \frac{\vdash_{\ell} [P_1] c [\epsilon: Q_1] \quad \vdash_{\ell} [P_2] c [\epsilon: Q_2]}{\vdash_{\ell} [P_1 \vee P_2] c [\epsilon: Q_1 \vee Q_2]} \text{DISJ} \\
\\
\frac{\vdash_{\ell} [P] c [\epsilon: Q] \quad x \notin \text{fv}(c)}{\vdash_{\ell} [\exists x. P x] c [\epsilon: \exists x. Q x]} \text{EX}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 4. The rules of INSECSL.

of values. As in ISL [26], the heap model differs from the partial functions of standard separation logic. Heaps h are partial functions from values, where each value $x \in \text{Val}$ in the domain $\text{dom}(h)$ of heap h can map either to a value or to the distinguished element \perp , i.e. $h :: \text{Val} \rightarrow \text{Val} \cup \{\perp\}$.

Semantic configurations are of three kinds: the configuration $\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “}c\text{” } s \ h \rangle$ represents a running program c with stack s and heap h ; $\langle \mathbf{stop} \ s \ h \rangle$ captures successful termination with final stack and heap s and h ; $\langle \mathbf{abort} \ s \ h \rangle$ captures abnormal (erroneous) termination, with stack s and heap h at the point of the error recorded in the configuration.

The semantics of the language appear in Fig. 5. The small-step semantics records information about the execution steps in the *schedule* σ , explained below. For configurations k and k' and schedule σ , we write $k \xrightarrow{\sigma} k'$ to mean that execution transitions from k to k' in a single step, producing schedule σ .

The schedule is a list of events, each of which is either τ , $\text{in}\langle \ell, v \rangle$, $\text{out}\langle \ell, v \rangle$, or $\text{allocate}\langle v \rangle$ for security level ℓ and value $v \in \text{Val}$. τ represents a single, non-**input**, non-**output**, non-**alloc** step of computation. $\text{in}\langle \ell, v \rangle$ records that value v was input at security level (i.e. on the input channel) ℓ . $\text{out}\langle \ell, v \rangle$ records that value v was output at security level (i.e. on the output channel) ℓ , while $\text{allocate}\langle v \rangle$ records that address v was dynamically allocated (and is simply included as a convenience to ensure determinism of the resulting small-step semantics with respect to the schedule σ). All atomic commands execute producing single-element schedules σ .

We write $k \xrightarrow{\sigma^*} k'$ to denote execution from configuration k to k' producing schedule σ in zero or more steps, i.e. the transitive reflexive closure of the small-step semantics in which the schedules of each consecutive step in the execution are concatenated together to form σ . Note that the length of the resulting schedule σ corresponds exactly to the step counter (i.e. to the number of small steps that have been executed when transitioning from k to k').

Assertion Semantics The semantics of INECSL assertions are given in Fig. 6. Most of these are familiar and inherited from their counterparts in SECCSL [12]. As in SECCSL, INECSL assertions are given a relational semantics [31], i.e. are evaluated against a pair of states (s, h) , (s', h') . We write $(s, h) \ (s', h') \models_{\ell} P$ to mean that assertion P holds in the pair of states $(s, h) \ (s', h')$. The security level ℓ denotes the security level of the attacker (see Section 3.1).

Implication and **false** are lifted in the obvious way. $\exists x. P \ x$ holds when a pair of values v, v' can be found for x in the left and right states respectively to make P hold. Pure expressions e are given a boolean interpretation by testing whether they evaluate to a distinguished value **true** in both states. Similarly, spatial assertions like **emp**, $e_p \mapsto e_v$ and $e_p \not\mapsto$ essentially assert the standard separation logic assertion semantics over both states. Separating conjunction lifts its ordinary separation logic counterpart over pairs of states: $P_1 * P_2$ holds when each heap can be partitioned into a left and right part, so that P_1 holds of the two left parts, and P_2 does likewise for the two right parts.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “skip” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s \ h \rangle \\
\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} x := \mathbf{input}(e) \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\text{in}(\langle [e]_s, v \rangle)]} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s(x := v) \ h \rangle \\
\frac{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} x := e \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s(x := [e]_s) \ h \rangle \quad \frac{a = [p]_s \quad a \notin \text{dom}(h) \vee h(a) = \perp}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} x := [p] \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{abort} \ s \ h \rangle}}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} x := [p] \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s(x := v) \ h \rangle} \quad \frac{a = [p]_s \quad h(a) = v \quad a \notin \text{dom}(h) \vee h(a) = \perp}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} [p] := e \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{abort} \ s \ h \rangle}}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} [p] := e \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s \ h(a := [e]_s) \rangle} \\
\frac{a = [p]_s \quad h(a) = v \quad a \notin \text{dom}(h) \vee h(a) = \perp}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} x := \mathbf{alloc}(e) \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\text{allocate}(a)]} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s(x := a) \ h(a := [e]_s) \rangle} \\
\frac{a = [p]_s \quad h(a) = v \quad a \notin \text{dom}(h) \vee h(a) = \perp}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “free}(p) \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s \ h(a := \perp) \rangle} \quad \frac{a = [p]_s \quad a \notin \text{dom}(h) \vee h(a) = \perp}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “free}(p) \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{abort} \ s \ h \rangle}}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “output}(e_\ell, e) \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\text{out}(\langle [e_\ell]_s, [e]_s \rangle)]} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s \ h \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c_1 \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma} \langle \mathbf{abort} \ s' \ h' \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c_1; c_2 \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma} \langle \mathbf{abort} \ s' \ h' \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c_1 \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s' \ h' \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c_1; c_2 \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma} \langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c_2 \text{” } s' \ h' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c_1 \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma} \langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c'_1 \text{” } s' \ h' \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c_1; c_2 \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma} \langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c'_1; c_2 \text{” } s' \ h' \rangle} \\
\frac{[b]_s = \mathbf{true}}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \text{ endif” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c_1 \text{” } s \ h \rangle} \\
\frac{[b]_s \neq \mathbf{true}}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \text{ endif” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c_2 \text{” } s \ h \rangle} \\
\frac{[b]_s = \mathbf{true}}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “while } b \text{ do } c \text{ done” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “} c; \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \text{ done” } s \ h \rangle} \\
\frac{[b]_s \neq \mathbf{true}}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “while } b \text{ do } c \text{ done” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “skip” } s \ h \rangle} \\
\frac{[b]_s = \mathbf{true}}{\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “assume}(b) \text{” } s \ h \rangle \xrightarrow{[\tau]} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s \ h \rangle}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 5. Small step semantics of the language for INSECSL. For a function f we write $f(x := v)$ to denote function update, i.e. to abbreviate the function that behaves like f everywhere except for the argument x for which it returns v .

Using the abbreviations:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (s, h) \models e_p \mapsto e_v &\iff h = \{[e_p]_s \mapsto [e_v]_s\} \\
 (s, h) \models e_p \not\mapsto &\iff h = \{[e_p]_s \mapsto \perp\} \\
 (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell e &\iff [e]_s = \mathbf{true} \wedge [e]_{s'} = \mathbf{true} \wedge h = h' = \emptyset \\
 (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell e :: e_\ell &\iff [e]_s = [e]_{s'} \wedge ([e]_s \sqsubseteq \ell \implies [e]_s = [e]_{s'}) \wedge h = h' = \emptyset \\
 (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell e ; e_\ell &\iff [e]_s = [e]_{s'} \wedge [e]_s \sqsubseteq \ell \wedge [e]_s \neq [e]_{s'} \wedge h = h' = \emptyset \\
 (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell \mathbf{emp} &\iff h = h' = \emptyset \\
 (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell e_p \mapsto e_v &\iff (s, h) \models e_p \mapsto e_v \wedge (s', h') \models e_p \mapsto e_v \\
 (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell e_p \not\mapsto &\iff (s, h) \models e_p \not\mapsto \wedge (s', h') \models e_p \not\mapsto \\
 (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell P_1 * P_2 &\iff \text{there are disjoint subheaps } h_1, h_2, \text{ and } h'_1, h'_2 \\
 &\quad \text{where } h = h_1 \uplus h_2 \wedge h' = h'_1 \uplus h'_2 \\
 &\quad \text{such that } (s, h_1) (s', h'_1) \models_\ell P_1 \text{ and } (s, h_2) (s', h'_2) \models_\ell P_2 \\
 (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell \exists x. P x &\iff \text{there are values } v, v' \\
 &\quad \text{such that } (s(x := v), h) (s'(x := v'), h') \models_\ell P \\
 (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell P \implies Q &\iff (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell P \text{ implies } (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell Q \\
 (s, h) (s', h') \models_\ell \mathbf{false} &\quad \text{never}
 \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 6. Semantics of INECSL assertions.

The semantics of $e :: e_\ell$ remain unchanged from SECCSL, and assert that e is known to the attacker if the attacker is able to observe e_ℓ -level outputs or, equivalently, e is known to the attacker if the attacker's level is greater than or equal to that denoted by e_ℓ . Recall that ℓ denotes the attacker's security level. We say that in a pair of states the attacker knows the value of some expression e , if e evaluates to identical values in those two states. Thus $e :: e_\ell$ holds between two states precisely when, if the level denoted by e_ℓ is observable to the attacker ($[e]_s \sqsubseteq \ell$), the two states agree on the value of e .

Agreement on e between the two states formalises that the attacker knows e . For this reason, *disagreement* on e formalises that the attacker has some uncertainty about e . Hence, the semantics for $e ; e_\ell$.

Successful, Erroneous and Insecure Execution As the final step towards the soundness statement for INECSL, we can now formalise what it means for a program execution to be *OK* (free of insecurity and errors), *erroneous*, and *insecure* respectively.

A key ingredient of these definitions is the notion of *input-equivalence* for two schedules σ and σ' . Recall that our threat model (Section 3.1) assumes that all inputs at or below the level of the attacker are known to the attacker. Recall also that inputs are stored in the schedule. Given a schedule σ we therefore write $\mathbf{inputs}_\ell(\sigma)$ to refer to the list of input events $\langle \ell', v \rangle$ in σ known to the ℓ -level attacker, namely those for which $\ell' \sqsubseteq \ell$. Then we say that two schedules σ and σ' are *input-equivalent* for the ℓ -level attacker when $\mathbf{inputs}_\ell(\sigma) = \mathbf{inputs}_\ell(\sigma')$.

We formalise the notion of insecure behaviour first, i.e. what it means for a program to leak information.

Definition 2 (Insecure Behaviour). *We say that the presumption P and result Q witness insecurity of program c against the ℓ -level attacker when for all (final) states s, h, s', h' such that $(s, h) \models_\ell Q$, there exist $s_0, h_0, s'_0, h'_0, \sigma, \sigma', k$ and k' such that $(s_0, h_0) \models_\ell P$, $\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “}c\text{” } s_0 \ h_0 \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma^*} k$, $\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “}c\text{” } s'_0 \ h'_0 \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma'^*} k'$, where σ and σ' have equal lengths and are input-equivalent, and the stack and heap of k are respectively s and h and likewise for k', s' and h' , and finally:*

- either the outputs in σ and σ' observable to the ℓ -level attacker differ, or
- k and k' both denote running configurations with distinct program commands.

For presumption P and program c , if there exists some satisfiable result Q for which P and Q witness insecurity of c (Definition 2), then c does not satisfy timing-sensitive noninterference (Definition 1). Specifically, there exist two input-equivalent executions beginning from P -states that the attacker can distinguish, and so the program c leaks information to the timing-sensitive ℓ -level attacker of Section 3.1.

Erroneous and OK behaviour are defined similarly, although more straightforwardly.

Definition 3 (Erroneous Behaviour). *We say that the presumption P and result Q witness erroneous execution of program c against the ℓ -level attacker when for all (final) states s, h, s', h' such that $(s, h) \models_\ell Q$, there exist $s_0, h_0, s'_0, h'_0, \sigma, \sigma'$, such that $(s_0, h_0) \models_\ell P$, $\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “}c\text{” } s_0 \ h_0 \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma^*} \langle \mathbf{abort} \ s \ h \rangle$, $\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “}c\text{” } s'_0 \ h'_0 \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma'^*} \langle \mathbf{abort} \ s' \ h' \rangle$, where σ and σ' have equal lengths and are input-equivalent, and the outputs in σ and σ' observable to the ℓ -level attacker are equal.*

Definition 4 (OK (Non-Erroneous, Non-Insecure) Behaviour). *We say that the presumption P and result Q witness OK execution of program c against the ℓ -level attacker when for all (final) states s, h, s', h' such that $(s, h) \models_\ell Q$, there exist $s_0, h_0, s'_0, h'_0, \sigma, \sigma'$, such that $(s_0, h_0) \models_\ell P$, $\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “}c\text{” } s_0 \ h_0 \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma^*} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s \ h \rangle$, $\langle \mathbf{run} \text{ “}c\text{” } s'_0 \ h'_0 \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma'^*} \langle \mathbf{stop} \ s' \ h' \rangle$, where σ and σ' have equal lengths and are input-equivalent, and the outputs in σ and σ' observable to the ℓ -level attacker are equal.*

Soundness The soundness statement for INSECSL comprises three theorems: one for each of its judgements. Each theorem states that when the corresponding type of judgement holds, then the presumption and result of the judgement witness the corresponding type of execution. Thus, for instance, INSECSL’s insecurity judgement $\vdash_\ell [P] \ c \ [\mathit{insec}(L) : Q]$ only detects real violations of timing-sensitive noninterference (Theorem 4). Like ISL, its error judgement only detects real erroneous program behaviours (Theorem 3).

Theorem 2. *If $\vdash_\ell [P] c [ok : Q]$ then P and Q witness OK execution of c against the ℓ -level attacker. according to Definition 4.*

Theorem 3. *If $\vdash_\ell [P] c [err(L) : Q]$ then P and Q witness erroneous execution of c against the ℓ -level attacker. according to Definition 3.*

Theorem 4. *If $\vdash_\ell [P] c [insec(L) : Q]$ then P and Q witness insecure execution of c against the ℓ -level attacker. according to Definition 2.*

We refer the reader to our Isabelle/HOL formalisation for the details of these proofs.

3.7 Extending INECSL to Constant-Time Security

We noted earlier in Section 3.1 that the security property and attacker model targeted by INECSL is weaker than that of *constant-time security* [3]. INECSL forbids a program to explicitly output or branch on secrets. Constant-time security additionally forbids a program from performing secret-dependent memory accesses.

Extending INECSL to constant-time security is straightforward. We briefly sketch how. Doing so adds additional rules for loading and storing to the heap to detect insecurity. Similarly to OUTINSEC, these rules have in their result that the pointer p being loaded from (respectively stored to) is not known to the attacker: $p;\ell$. The existing OK rules have the converse added to their results: $p :: \ell$.

The semantics of the language (Section 3.6) is extended to record in the schedule σ the address of each pointer that is loaded from and stored to, effectively making these outputs of the program. The security property then imposes the extra requirement that in the two executions, these addresses are identical.

Soundness then follows from a similar argument as that for the existing output rules.

4 Symbolic Execution

We claimed earlier that INECSL’s careful design to resemble a traditional separation logic enables its reasoning to be automated. We now validate that claim by formalising a bi-abduction [6] based symbolic execution method for automatically deriving INECSL judgements.

Our symbolic execution method is heavily inspired by the bi-abduction-based method for the under-approximate logic ISL [26]. However, unlike [26], ours attempts to infer as many judgements as possible. Ours is also the first bi-abduction-based symbolic execution method to enjoy a mechanised proof of soundness.

To define our symbolic execution, it helps to introduce an extra program command **assume**(e). This command is not a “real” command in the sense that it cannot appear in program text. Instead, it is used to remember, during symbolic

execution, which conditional branches have been followed along the current execution path. As we will see, our symbolic execution maintains a *trace* that records the execution path followed so far, in which assume commands $\mathbf{assume}(e)$ can appear. Their semantics is to evaluate the condition e and, if e holds to act as a no-op but otherwise execution gets stuck.

Our symbolic execution method stores the path followed so far. Doing so allows it to provide detailed information to the user when a vulnerability is detected (e.g. to tell precisely along which path the vulnerability arises). Doing so is also necessary to prove the soundness of our method, as explained later. The current path is stored as a *trace*, which is a list of pairs (c, P) where c is a program command and P an INSECSL assertion. For convenience, traces are stored in *reverse* order. Each element (c, P) is understood to mean that command c was executed from symbolic state P , i.e. P represents the state before c was executed. We write the empty trace \square (which represents that there has been no preceding symbolic execution), and the trace whose head is x and whose tail is xs as $x : xs$.

When a new spatial assertion F is inferred to make forward progress in symbolic execution, it is then *back-propagated* along the trace tr , causing F to be added into each of the assertions P in each element (c, P) of F . Given an assertion F , back-propagating it over trace tr produces the transformed trace tr' , and operates in the expected way by successively appealing to the FRAME rule. We define the procedure $\mathbf{backprop}_\ell(F, tr, tr')$ for doing this.

Definition 5 (Backprop). *For any assertion F , any security level ℓ , and any traces tr and tr' where each of them is a list of command-assertion pairs, $\mathbf{backprop}_\ell(F, tr, tr')$ holds if and only if: $tr = tr' = \square \vee (\exists c P F F' tr_2 tr'_2. tr = (c, P) : tr' \wedge tr' = (c, P * F) : tr'_2 \wedge \text{mod}(c) \cap \text{fv}(F) = \emptyset \wedge \mathbf{backprop}_\ell(F', tr_2, tr'_2))$*

Symbolic execution is then defined as follows. We define a judgement $\text{symex}_\ell(tr, JQ, c, tr', JQ')$. Here c is a command, tr and tr' are traces, while JQ and JQ' are judgement *post assertions*, i.e. have one of the following forms each for some assertion Q : *ok*: Q , *err*: Q , or *insec*: Q . Trace tr and JQ represent the current state of symbolic execution before command c is executed, in the sense that tr is the trace followed up to this point and JQ represents the symbolic state immediately before c is executed. Executing c necessarily extends the trace (possibly also transforming it via back-propagation), yielding an updated trace tr' and a new post assertion JQ' .

The symbolic execution rules appear in Fig. 7.

Before explaining these rules, we first state the top-level soundness theorem for symbolic execution. Put simply, this theorem says that symbolic execution derives valid INSECSL judgements.

Theorem 5. *For all commands c , security levels ℓ , post-assertions JQ and JQ' and all traces tr , such that $\text{symex}_\ell(\square, JQ, c, tr, JQ')$ holds, we have tr is not empty. Furthermore, letting (c, P) denote the last element of tr , we have $\vdash_\ell [P] c [JQ']$.*

The structural rules like SEIFTRUE mirror their counterparts from prior symbolic execution methods for automating separation logics. The exceptions are the additional rules like SEIFINSEC (and its counterpart for while loops) to detect leaks due to branching on secrets.

Of the rules for atomic commands in Fig. 7, the most interesting are those that infer new spatial predicates. A good example is the SELoad rule. Given the presumption P , to symbolically execute the load $x := [p]$, we need to know that, for some e and some frame assertion $Frame$, $p \mapsto e * Frame$ entails P . (Recall that the entailment is the reverse of the usual direction from over-approximate reasoning due to the reversed nature of the consequence rule in under-approximate logics.) However P might not say anything about the part of the heap to which p points. In this case, the rule infers an appropriate assertion M , by solving the *biabduction* [6] problem: $p \mapsto e * ?Frame \xrightarrow{\ell} P * ?M$, which yields assertions $Frame$ and M to make this entailment hold. M must then be back-propagated through the trace tr , yielding the updated trace tr' . The presumption recorded in the trace, at the point before this load is executed, is therefore $P * M$. After executing the load, the frame $Frame$ is preserved, plus we know that x is now equal to e 's original value, while for the original values of p and e , $p \mapsto e$ still holds. The fresh variable x' is introduced to represent the initial value of x before the load, and we obtain the original values of the expressions p and e via substitution in the usual way.

The SELoad rule has a counterpart SELoadErr that infers when the pointer being loaded from is invalid. Fig. 7 also shows analogous rules for pointer stores (writes). Applying both of these rules causes symbolic execution to branch on each load/store to consider the two possibilities: either the pointer being loaded from (stored through) is valid or invalid. A similar argument applies to information leakage and the structural rules for if-statements and while-loops, plus the rules for the output command.

Considering all of these possibilities means that our symbolic execution attempts to infer as many summaries as possible, in order to be able to say as much as possible about when an individual function might exhibit a vulnerability (depending on the context in which it is called as expressed in the summary).

As mentioned earlier, the trace tr is not merely a user convenience but is also a necessary ingredient to prove soundness of the structural rules, like SEIFTRUE (Fig. 7). Proving soundness of this rule for instance requires deducing a judgement $\vdash_{\ell} [P] c0; c' [\epsilon: Q]$ given the premises $\vdash_{\ell} [P] c0; c [\epsilon: Q]$ and $\forall P Q. \vdash_{\ell} [P] c [\epsilon: Q] \implies \vdash_{\ell} [P] c' [\epsilon: Q]$. Unfortunately the first premise is not strong enough to deduce some intermediate assertion R for which $\vdash_{\ell} [P] c0 [\epsilon: R]$ and $\vdash_{\ell} [R] c [\epsilon: Q]$, which is needed to make use of the second premise. Including the trace tr is necessary to strengthen the theorem statement to yield a sufficiently strong induction hypothesis that yields the required intermediate assertion. This neatly highlights the value of mechanising the soundness proof.

4.1 External Summaries

Our symbolic execution as described can be applied to the body of a function to infer summaries that describe its internal behaviour. We briefly describe how to transform such summaries to have them describe the function’s external behaviour. The soundness of this transformation follows the same argument of Le et al. [15].

Consider the trivial function `void func(int x) x = x + 1;` that uselessly increments its argument `x`. Its internal behaviour is captured by the judgement $\vdash_{\ell} [x = v] \ x = x + 1 \ [ok: v' = v * x = v' + 1]$. Here the logical variable v captures the initial value of `x` while SEASSIGN rule has introduced the second logical variable v' . In summaries that describe a function’s external behaviour, mentions of its formal parameters in the result assertion refer to the *initial values* of those variables. Thus to transform the summary above so that it talks about `func()`’s external behaviour, UNDERFLOW remembers the first logical variable v that was introduced to represent the initial value of each formal parameter `x`. It introduces fresh logical variables v_2 to capture the final values of each formal parameter `x`. It then renames all occurrences of each formal parameter `x` in the result to v_2 . For each logical variable v introduced to capture the initial value of a formal parameter `x`, it renames in the result all occurrences of v back to `x`. Finally, it existentially quantifies over all variables that are not formal parameters. Doing so yields the external summary: $\vdash_{\ell} [\exists v. x = v] \ \text{func}(x) \ [ok: \exists v_2, v'. v' = x * v_2 = v' + 1]$ which can of course be simplified to the logically equivalent $\vdash_{\ell} [\mathbf{emp}] \ \text{func}(x) \ [ok: \mathbf{emp}]$.

5 Inter-Procedural Analysis

Having inferred a set of summaries for a function, how can we use those summaries in the analysis of its callers? In particular, suppose function $f()$ calls function $g()$ and we have the summary $[P_g] \ g() \ [Q_g]$. (For simplicity, we ignore parameter passing which is an orthogonal concern easily handled by substitution as usual.) Suppose we are symbolically executing $f()$ and that we encounter a call to $g()$ and that, without loss of generality, symbolic execution has derived the INSECSL assertion S that describes the internal state of $f()$ at the call-site to $g()$. In traditional over-approximate reasoning we would need to prove that S entails P_g . However in under-approximate logics like INSECSL, recall that the consequence rule is reversed and, hence, in general the entailment must be proved in the *opposite* direction, i.e. one must prove that P_g entails S .

Fortunately, since INSECSL is a separation logic it inherits the frame rule. This rule allows parts of S not relevant to P_g to be factored out. Specifically, rather than proving that P_g entails the entirety of S , the frame rule allows us to break up S into two parts R and F such that $S = R * F$, for which we can prove that P_g entails just R . Symbolic execution then proceeds by replacing R in S with Q_g , yielding the updated symbolic state $Q_g * F$ in which the frame F has been preserved.

However, it turns out we don't even need to prove the (reversed from usual) entailment that P_g entails some R . To see why, first observe that via the consequence rule, any pure assertions in P_g can simply be conjoined with S ; if the resulting state is satisfiable, the pure part of the entailment must hold. Then, the remaining spatial part of P_g necessarily contains only two kinds of spatial assertions, $_ \mapsto _$ and $_ \not\mapsto$, because (observe) our symbolic execution ensures that inferred presumptions P_g are always a conjunction of $_ \mapsto _$ and $_ \not\mapsto$ assertions. It also ensures that S is a conjunction of these same two kinds of assertions, plus additional pure assertions only. Thus we can split S into an R and F for which the spatial part of P_g entails R simply by looking only at the spatial assertions in S and finding that subset R for which each assertion in P_g entails a corresponding assertion in R (F is then the remainder of S).

Even better, the two kinds of spatial assertions $e_p \mapsto e_v$ and $e_p \not\mapsto$ have the property that if P_i and P_j are each a single assertion of one of these kinds, and if P_i entails P_j , then they are both of the same kind (both are of the form $_ \mapsto _$ or both are of the form $_ \not\mapsto$) and, moreover, P_j also entails P_i . Therefore we can reverse the direction of the entailment check for each spatial assertion in S , i.e. find that subset R of the spatial assertions in S for which each assertion in R entails a corresponding spatial assertion in P_g , to cover all such assertions in P_g . (Indeed our symbolic execution makes use of this same trick when implementing the entailment checks of e.g. the SELOAD rule.)

If S lacks a spatial assertion needed to entail some part of P_g we can simply infer and back-propagate extra spatial assertions to augment S , e.g. as for the SELOAD rule of symbolic execution.

6 Implementation

This design is implemented in the proof-of-concept tool UNDERFLOW, which we built by modifying an existing verifier for the over-approximate security separation logic SECCSL [12]. Specifically, UNDERFLOW implements the top-down inter-procedural analysis described in Section 2.7 and Section 5, via symbolic execution as described in Section 2.6 and Section 4.

When analysing a function $f()$ that calls another $g()$ UNDERFLOW attempts to apply all summaries known about $g()$. If none of them are applicable (i.e. applying them yields an inconsistent state), UNDERFLOW performs a contextual analysis of $g()$ to compute new summaries applicable at this callsite.

To perform a contextual analysis of callee $g()$ from caller $f()$ we take the current symbolic state R and filter it to produce a state R' that describes only those parts of R relevant to the call. UNDERFLOW's present implementation does so using a fixed-point computation that identifies all pure formulae from R that mention arguments passed to $g()$ and values (transitively) related to those arguments by such pure formulae. It also identifies all spatial assertions in R that describe parts of the heap reachable from those values. Everything else is filtered as irrelevant.

In contrast to prior work [26], UNDERFLOW does not unrol loops to a fixed bound. Instead it controls symbolic execution using two mechanisms. Firstly, for each program point it counts the number of paths that have so far passed through that point during analysis. When that number exceeds a configurable bound, additional paths are discarded. Additionally it monitors the latency of symbolically executing each program statement. When this latency gets too high (exceeds a configurable threshold), the current path is discarded. The former bound is reached only when unfolding relatively tight loops, while the latter attempts to maintain reasonable symbolic execution throughput.

When analysing a function UNDERFLOW will avoid generating multiple summaries that report the same problem for a single program point.

name	sloc	#funs	#summs	time
auction	172	5 (1)	74 (64; 9 ok; 55 <i>insec</i> ; 0 <i>err</i>)	233 (109)
ctselect	27	7 (5)	8 (6; 5 ok; 1 <i>insec</i> ; 0 <i>err</i>)	1.5 (0.3)
ctsort	57	6 (3)	107 (83; 13 ok; 16 <i>insec</i> ; 54 <i>err</i>)	11 (7)
cttkinner	77	6 (3)	6 (3; 3 ok; 0 <i>insec</i> ; 0 <i>err</i>)	14 (5)
seccdb	74	4 (4)	395 (330; 164 ok; 158 <i>insec</i> ; 8 <i>err</i>)	576 (391)
kremlib	68	11 (10)	11 (10; 10 ok; 0 <i>insec</i> ; 0 <i>err</i>)	1.7 (0.3)
libsodium	96	3 (3)	715 (715; 159 ok; 180 <i>insec</i> ; 376 <i>err</i>)	287 (120)
opensslutil	84	14 (7)	14 (7; 7 ok; 0 <i>insec</i> ; 0 <i>err</i>)	1.8 (0.5)
ssl3cbcrem	111	15 (7)	22 (14; 8 ok; 1 <i>insec</i> ; 5 <i>err</i>)	2.5 (0.9)
tls1lucky13	122	2 (1)	131 (24; 8 ok; 8 <i>insec</i> ; 8 <i>err</i>)	69 (52)
tls1patched	229	19 (7)	195 (10; 8 ok; 0 <i>insec</i> ; 2 <i>err</i>)	312 (202)

Table 1. Benchmark Results. We report the benchmark **name**, its size in number of source lines **sloc**, the number of functions it contains **#funs**, the number of summaries inferred **#summs**, and the time in seconds spent inferring these summaries in total **time**. Numbers in brackets indicate top-level counts (functions and summaries) or, for the **time** column, the time spent running the solver in seconds.

We applied UNDERFLOW to 11 benchmarks, summarised in Table 1. Eight of these samples (ctselect, ctsort, kremlib, libsodium, opensslutil, ssl3cbcrem, tls1lucky13, tls1patch) were taken from the benchmark set of Binsec/Rel [9], a recent (whole-program) information leakage analyser. The “auction” sample is the case study from Section 2.1; “cttkinner” comes from the Constant-Time Toolkit library <https://github.com/pornin/CTTK>. Experiments were run on a mid-2015 MacBook Pro (2.2GHz quad core Intel Core i7, 16GB RAM). Times are reported in seconds.

For the samples containing top-level functions that take pointer arguments (ctsort, seccdb, libsodium, ssl3cbcrem, tls1lucky13, tls1patch) UNDERFLOW generates many summaries because in effect it has to perform an unconstrained analysis. This explains why these samples also produce (sometimes many) error summaries. The insecurity summary in ctselect correctly detects a non-constant-time selection implementation, as do the insecurity summaries for ctsort (sorting). The insecurity summaries for seccdb and libsodium arise because these

samples contain top-level functions that take a length argument that controls a loop guard: there is no context to infer whether the length is secret or not. The insecurity summaries in `ssl3cbcrem` and `tls1lucky13` correctly detect leakage vulnerabilities in these samples: the latter is the infamous Lucky13 TLS vulnerability [1], which is patched in the `tls1patched` sample.

Note that while for certain benchmark samples UNDERFLOW appears to take an excessive amount of time (e.g. `auction`, `seccdb`, `libsodium`), this happens because UNDERFLOW unrolls loops many more times than is necessary to detect vulnerabilities: for example in the “`auction`” case study, once UNDERFLOW has detected the leakage vulnerability on the second loop iteration, it continues to unroll this loop discovering similar summaries on subsequent loop iterations as evidenced by the 55 insecurity summaries it generates. A similar pattern arises for `seccdb` and `libsodium`.

UNDERFLOW’s current implementation does not make any attempt to simplify (pure) separation logic formulae during symbolic execution, leading in many cases to massive summaries being generated and manipulated by the tool, which accounts for why it spends so much time on symbolic execution (as opposed to satisfiability checking via its backend solver Z3). We expect its performance can be improved significantly by implementing formulae simplification, as well as other simple optimisations like avoiding applying an insecure or error function summary on the second iteration of a loop if that summary was already successfully used on the first iteration, etc. We leave such investigations for future work.

7 Related Work

The ideas that we present draw on many sources.

As a static leak detection tool employing a form of symbolic execution to carry out relational reasoning, our approach resembles recent work based on relational symbolic execution [13] (RSE).

Like RSE, our method automates relational reasoning via symbolic execution. RSE was defined for a deterministic, imperative IMP-like language relative to *over-approximate* relational reasoning, whereas ours automates *under-approximate* reasoning for a language with pointers, dynamic memory allocation and nondeterministic input. RSE’s soundness theorem states that judgements $\vdash \{R\} c \{S\}$ derived via RSE are valid over-approximations $\models \{R\} c \{S\}$ of program behaviours. Hence RSE is applicable for automatically proving relational properties, to which our method is less suited. Nonetheless RSE was also shown applicable to detecting violations of relational properties $\models \{R\} c \{S\}$ for deterministic programs by proving judgements $\vdash \{R\} c \{S'\}$ where S' is consistent with $\neg S$.

However, as we mentioned in Section 2.2, over-approximate reasoning works for detecting vulnerabilities only for deterministic programs. To handle non-determinism and under-approximate approach is required, which our method implements.

Subsequent RSE based leak detection methods [9,10] are likewise defined for non-interactive (so deterministic) programming languages, without support for dynamic memory allocation and user input. Existing RSE implementations [9,10] also do not handle non-trivial security policies like value-dependent classification, unlike our approach. Finally, they are whole-program analyses whereas ours is compositional analysing a program one-function-at-a-time and inter-procedural, and so lends itself to incremental application unlike prior RSE-based approaches.

INSECSL can be seen as the first practical *insecurity logic* [18], i.e. an under-approximate relational logic for reasoning about the presence of security vulnerabilities. Murray [18] recently postulated the existence of such logics, while defining a general under-approximate relational logic for the simple language IMP. However, IMP is entirely deterministic and therefore (following Theorem 1), does not gain a real benefit from under-approximate reasoning since any judgement derived from such reasoning can also be derived from (sound and complete) over-approximate reasoning.

INSECSL’s design borrows ideas from the Incorrectness Separation Logic (ISL) of Raad et al. [26] as well as the Security Concurrent Separation Logic (SECCSL) of Ernst and Murray [12]. ISL is an under-approximate separation logic for reasoning about the presence of (memory-) safety bugs. SECCSL is an over-approximate concurrent separation logic for proving the absence of (memory-) safety and information flow vulnerabilities. Our INSECSL can be seen as the *security analogue* of ISL, in a similar manner as [12]’s Security Concurrent Separation Logic might be called the security analogue of traditional (over-approximate) Concurrent Separation Logic [24]. Like we did for INSECSL, [26] proved ISL sound but did not consider completeness.

An important issue that INSECSL had to resolve with regards to information leakage that SECCSL avoided, however, was nondeterminism. The language over which SECCSL is defined eschews environment interaction (e.g. through an input command) and even assumes deterministic concurrent thread scheduling. INSECSL tackles nondeterminism head-on, in contrast, leading to its novel and elegant input rule. A key innovation of INSECSL is the addition of the insecurity assertion $e;/e_\ell$ which no prior security logic enjoys.

While developed independently, our symbolic execution method is essentially identical to the very recent work of Le et al. [15]; however theirs treats ISL only whereas ours also produces insecurity summaries. They implement the unconstrained bottom-up analysis we eschewed in Section 2.7, whereas we instead designed a top-down, compositional analysis to take advantage of contextual information to help prune symbolic execution while remaining incremental. Ours is also the first to enjoy mechanised proofs of soundness.

References

1. Al Fardan, N.J., Paterson, K.G.: Lucky thirteen: Breaking the tls and dtls record protocols. In: 2013 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 526–540. IEEE (2013)

2. Amtoft, T., Bandhakavi, S., Banerjee, A.: A logic for information flow in object-oriented programs. In: *Thirty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*. pp. 91–102 (2006)
3. Barthe, G., Blazy, S., Grégoire, B., Hutin, R., Laporte, V., Pichardie, D., Trieu, A.: Formal verification of a constant-time preserving c compiler. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 4(POPL), 1–30 (2020)
4. Benton, N.: Simple relational correctness proofs for static analyses and program transformations. In: *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*. pp. 14–25. ACM (2004)
5. Calcagno, C., Distefano, D., Dubreil, J., Gabi, D., Hooimeijer, P., Luca, M., O’Hearn, P., Papakonstantinou, I., Purbrick, J., Rodriguez, D.: Moving fast with software verification. In: *NASA Formal Methods Symposium*. pp. 3–11. Springer (2015)
6. Calcagno, C., Distefano, D., O’Hearn, P., Yang, H.: Compositional shape analysis by means of bi-abduction. In: *Proceedings of the 36th annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*. pp. 289–300 (2009)
7. Cifuentes, C., Bierman, G.: What is a secure programming language? In: *3rd Summit on Advances in Programming Languages (SNAPL 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik (2019)
8. Clarkson, M.R., Schneider, F.B.: Hyperproperties. *Journal of Computer Security* 18(6), 1157–1210 (2010)
9. Daniel, L.A., Bardin, S., Rezk, T.: BINSEC/REL: Efficient relational symbolic execution for constant-time at binary-level. In: *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. pp. 1021–1038. IEEE (2020)
10. Daniel, L.A., Bardin, S., Rezk, T., de Ruiter, J., Poll, E.: Hunting the hunter—efficient relational symbolic execution for spectre with haunted RelSE. In: *Network and Distributed Systems Security Symposium (NDSS)* (2021)
11. De Vries, E., Koutavas, V.: Reverse hoare logic. In: *International Conference on Software Engineering and Formal Methods (SEFM)*. pp. 155–171. Springer (2011)
12. Ernst, G., Murray, T.: SecCSL: Security concurrent separation logic. In: *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV)*. pp. 208–230 (2019)
13. Farina, G.P., Chong, S., Gaboardi, M.: Relational symbolic execution. In: *Proceedings of the 21st International Symposium on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming*. pp. 1–14 (2019)
14. Jacob, J.: Security specifications. In: *IEEE Symposium on Security & Privacy*. pp. 14–23 (1988)
15. Le, Q.L., Raad, A., Villard, J., Berdine, J., Dreyer, D., O’Hearn, P.W.: Finding real bugs in big programs with incorrectness logic. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 6(OOPSLA1), 1–27 (2022)
16. Lourenço, L., Caires, L.: Dependent information flow types. In: *ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*. pp. 317–328. Mumbai, India (Jan 2015)
17. Murray, T.: An under-approximate relational logic. *Archive of Formal Proofs* (Mar 2020), <http://isa-afp.org/entries/Relational-Incorrectness-Logic.html>, Formal proof development
18. Murray, T.: An under-approximate relational logic: Heralding logics of insecurity, incorrect implementation & more (2020)
19. Murray, T., Matichuk, D., Brassil, M., Gammie, P., Bourke, T., Seefried, S., Lewis, C., Gao, X., Klein, G.: sel4: from general purpose to a proof of information flow enforcement. In: *2013 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. pp. 415–429. IEEE (2013)

20. Murray, T., Matichuk, D., Brassil, M., Gammie, P., Klein, G.: Noninterference for operating system kernels. In: International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs (CPP). pp. 126–142. Springer (Dec 2012)
21. Murray, T., Sison, R., Engelhardt, K.: COVERN: A logic for compositional verification of information flow control. In: IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P). London, United Kingdom (Apr 2018)
22. Murray, T., Sison, R., Pierzchalski, E., Rizkallah, C.: Compositional verification and refinement of concurrent value-dependent noninterference. In: 2016 IEEE 29th Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF). pp. 417–431. IEEE (2016)
23. Nanevski, A., Banerjee, A., Garg, D.: Verification of information flow and access control policies with dependent types. In: IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 165–179 (May 2011)
24. O’Hearn, P.W.: Resources, concurrency and local reasoning. In: International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR). pp. 49–67. Springer (2004)
25. O’Hearn, P.W.: Incorrectness logic. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* **4**(POPL), 1–32 (2019)
26. Raad, A., Berdine, J., Dang, H.H., Dreyer, D., O’Hearn, P., Villard, J.: Local reasoning about the presence of bugs: Incorrectness separation logic. In: International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV) (2020)
27. Schoepe, D., Murray, T., Sabelfeld, A.: Veronica: expressive and precise concurrent information flow security. In: 2020 IEEE 33rd Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF). pp. 79–94. IEEE (2020)
28. Swamy, N., Chen, J., Chugh, R.: Enforcing stateful authorization and information flow policies in Fine. In: European Symposium on Programming (ESOP) (March 2010)
29. Swamy, N., Chen, J., Fournet, C., Strub, P.Y., Bhargavan, K., Yang, J.: Secure distributed programming with value-dependent types. In: 16th ACM SIGPLAN international conference on Functional Programming (ICFP). pp. 266–278 (2011)
30. Veracode, Inc: State of software security: Volume 12 (2022), available online: <https://info.veracode.com/report-state-of-software-security-volume-12.html>
31. Yang, H.: Relational separation logic. *Theoretical Computer Science* **375**(1-3), 308–334 (2007)
32. Zhang, D., Wang, Y., Suh, G.E., Myers, A.C.: A hardware design language for timing-sensitive information-flow security. In: ASPLOS (2015)
33. Zheng, L., Myers, A.C.: Dynamic security labels and noninterference. In: Formal Aspects in Security and Trust (FAST). pp. 27–40 (2004)
34. Zheng, L., Myers, A.C.: Dynamic security labels and static information flow control. *International Journal of Information Security* **6**(2–3) (Mar 2007)

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], \text{skip}, (\text{skip}, P) : tr, [ok: P])} \text{SESKIP} \\
 \\
 \frac{}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], \text{assume}(b), (\text{assume}(b), P) : tr, [ok: P * b])} \text{SEASM} \\
 \\
 \frac{}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], \text{output}(el, e), (\text{output}(el, e), P) : tr, [ok: P * e :: el])} \text{SEOUT} \\
 \\
 \frac{c = (\text{output}(el, e))}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], L: c, (L: c, P) : tr, [insec(L): P * e; el])} \text{SEOUTINSEC} \\
 \\
 \frac{x' \notin fv(P)}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], x := e, (x := e, P) : tr, [ok: P[x'/x] * x = e[x'/x]])} \text{SEASSIGN} \\
 \\
 \frac{x' \notin fv(P)}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], x := \text{input}(e), (x := \text{input}(e), P) : tr, [ok: P[x'/x] * x :: e[x'/x]])} \text{SEINPUT} \\
 \\
 \frac{x' \notin fv(P)}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], x := \text{alloc}(e), (x := \text{alloc}(e), P) : tr, [ok: P[x'/x] * x \mapsto e[x'/x]])} \text{SEALLOC} \\
 \\
 \frac{\text{backprop}_\ell(M, tr, tr') \quad x' \notin fv(\text{Frame}) \quad p \mapsto e * \text{Frame} \xRightarrow{\ell} P * M}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], x := [p], (x := [p], P * M) : tr', [ok: x = e[x'/x] * (p \mapsto e * \text{Frame})[x'/x]])} \text{SELOAD} \\
 \\
 \frac{\text{backprop}_\ell(M, tr, tr') \quad p \not\mapsto * \text{Frame} \xRightarrow{\ell} P * M}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], L: x := [p], (L: x := [p], P * M) : tr', [err(L): p \not\mapsto * \text{Frame}])} \text{SELOADERR} \\
 \\
 \frac{\text{backprop}_\ell(M, tr, tr') \quad p \mapsto e * \text{Frame} \xRightarrow{\ell} P * M}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], [p] := e', ([p] := e', P * M) : tr', [ok: p \mapsto e' * \text{Frame}])} \text{SESTORE} \\
 \\
 \frac{\text{backprop}_\ell(M, tr, tr') \quad p \not\mapsto * \text{Frame} \xRightarrow{\ell} P * M}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], L: [p] := e', (L: [p] := e', P * M) : tr', [err(L): p \not\mapsto * \text{Frame}])} \text{SESTOREERR} \\
 \\
 \frac{\text{backprop}_\ell(M, tr, tr') \quad p \mapsto e * \text{Frame} \xRightarrow{\ell} P * M}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], \text{free}(p), (\text{free}(p), P * M) : tr', [ok: p \not\mapsto * \text{Frame}])} \text{SEFREE} \\
 \\
 \frac{\text{backprop}_\ell(M, tr, tr') \quad p \not\mapsto * \text{Frame} \xRightarrow{\ell} P * M}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], L: \text{free}(p), (L: \text{free}(p), P * M) : tr', [err(L): p \not\mapsto * \text{Frame}])} \text{SEFREEERR} \\
 \\
 \frac{c = (\text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \text{ endif}) \quad c_1 \neq c_2}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], L: c, (L: c, P * b = \text{true}; \ell) : tr, [insec(L): P * b = \text{true}; \ell])} \text{SEIFINSEC} \\
 \\
 \frac{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], \text{assume}(b); c_1, tr', Q)}{\text{symex}_\ell(tr, [ok: P], \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \text{ endif, } tr', Q)} \text{SEIFTRUE}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 7. Symbolic execution rules.