

From Library Portability to Para-rehosting: Natively Executing Microcontroller Software on Commodity Hardware

^{†‡§}Wenqiang Li*, [‡]Le Guan, [¶]Jingqiang Lin, [‡]Jiameng Shi, ^{||}Fengjun Li

[†]State Key Laboratory of Information Security, Institute of Information Engineering, Chinese Academy of Sciences

[‡]Department of Computer Science, the University of Georgia, USA

[§]School of Cyber Security, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

[¶]School of Cyber Security, University of Science and Technology of China

^{||}Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, the University of Kansas, USA

liwenqiang@iie.ac.cn, {leguan, jiameng}@uga.edu, linjq@ustc.edu.cn, fli@ku.edu

Abstract—Finding bugs in microcontroller (MCU) firmware is challenging, even for device manufacturers who own the source code. The MCU runs different instruction sets than x86 and exposes a very different development environment. This invalidates many existing sophisticated software testing tools on x86. To maintain a unified developing and testing environment, a straightforward way is to re-compile the source code into the native executable for a commodity machine (called rehosting). However, ad-hoc re-hosting is a daunting and tedious task and subject to many issues (library-dependence, kernel-dependence and hardware-dependence). In this work, we systematically explore the portability problem of MCU software and propose para-rehosting to ease the porting process. Specifically, we abstract and implement a portable MCU (PMCU) using the POSIX interface. It models common functions of the MCU cores. For peripheral specific logic, we propose HAL-based peripheral function replacement, in which high-level hardware functions are replaced with an equivalent backend driver on the host. These backend drivers are invoked by well-designed para-APIs and can be reused across many MCU OSs. We categorize common HAL functions into four types and implement templates for quick backend development. Using the proposed approach, we have successfully rehosted nine MCU OSs including the widely deployed Amazon FreeRTOS, ARM Mbed OS, Zephyr and LiteOS. To demonstrate the superiority of our approach in terms of security testing, we used off-the-shelf dynamic analysis tools (AFL and ASAN) against the rehosted programs and discovered 28 previously-unknown bugs, among which 5 were confirmed by CVE and the other 19 were confirmed by vendors at the time of writing.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is commonly believed that the Internet of Things (IoT) is emerging as the third wave in the development of the Internet. By the year 2020, the world will have 50 billion connected devices [23]. Among them, microcontroller units (MCUs) make up the majority. It is projected that by 2020,

there will be more than 35 billion MCU shipments [6]. These small, resource-constraint devices are enabling ubiquitous connections and have changed virtually every aspect of our lives. However, all of these benefits and conveniences come with broader and acute security concerns. IoT devices are connected into the Internet, which directly exposes them to attackers. Since these devices process and contain confidential data such as people's health data, home surveillance video, company secrets, etc., once compromised, devastating consequences can happen. For example, FreeRTOS [5], the leading operating system (OS) for MCUs, was reported that its 13 critical vulnerabilities put a wide range of devices at risk of compromise [33]. In July 2019, *urgent11*, a set of 11 vulnerabilities hit VxWorks, another popular MCU OS. Once exploited, these bugs allow for remote code execution [51].

In-house software testing is crucial for the security of the MCU software ecosystem. However, the development and test environment for MCU devices is very different from that for commodity hardware. Notably, the programs are cross-compiled and downloaded to the target device by flashing the on-chip ROM. To debug a program, a hardware dongle called in-circuit emulator (ICE) is used to bridge the target device with the host via the JTAG interface. The host machine then starts a GDBServer daemon that interprets the ICE-specific control commands to the commands understandable by GDB. Software testing of MCU software highly depends on the debugging features integrated in the chip. For example, in ARM Cortex-M based MCUs, the Data Watch and Trace (DWT) unit [7] can be used to profile the firmware execution, and the Embedded Trace Macrocell (ETM) unit [9] can be used to collect the execution trace. However, it is clear that standard software testing tools such as Valgrind [44], AddressSanitizer (ASAN) [50] cannot be supported due to the very different run-time environment. We argue that the tools designed for x86 programs are more sophisticated and superior to those designed for MCU firmware; indeed, binary rewriting and instrumentation provide us with unprecedented insights to the program execution, which enables us to find software problems more efficiently.

Based on this observation, this work explores the idea of re-hosting MCU software and running them natively on commod-

*Work was primarily done while visiting the University of Georgia.

ity hardware. There are at least three benefits of this approach. First, off-the-shelf dynamic analysis tools for x86 can be readily used out-of-the-box. Second, compared with running on real MCU devices, multiple instances can be launched simultaneously, allowing for a scalable and paralleled analysis. Third, the commodity hardware is much more powerful than MCU devices. We can execute more testcases within a time period.

Intuitively, with some manual efforts, we could possibly port a particular library for MCU to the host machine and efficiently analyze its security. However, this is ad-hoc, inaccurate, and sometimes extremely difficult. In particular, 1) the libc used in MCU toolchains (such as newlib and redlib) has different designs compared with a full fledged libc implementation such as the GNU libc. For example, the ARM Mbed OS makes use of the function `software_init_hook()` to perform some target-specific early initialization, which is not defined in the GNU libc; 2) More importantly, a single library is sometimes mingled with a set of supporting OS routines, which must also be ported; 3) To make things worse, these routines are subject to scheduling. Without considering the invocation sequence, the intended logic can be easily violated; 4) If the rehosted code needs to access real hardware on MCU, the behavior on the host becomes unpredictable. All of these make ad-hoc porting a daunting task.

We propose *para-rehosting*, a new technique aiming at making re-hosting of MCU software to commodity hardware smoother. Different from ad-hoc library porting, we support porting the MCU OS core entirely and allow for incremental plug-and-play library porting. Specifically, we abstract the whole machine model that most MCU OSs follow and implement it (named *PMCU*) with the *Portable Operating System Interface* (POSIX). Through a thin OS-specific glue layer, *PMCU* can be compiled with upper-layer source code (including libraries and tasks) into a normal user-space program on the host. *PMCU* accurately models the common behaviors of real MCUs. As such, basic OS primitives including scheduling, preemption, atomicity, etc. can be supported automatically.

PMCU also models the memory layout of a real firmware image. An MCU often has a fixed memory map. MCU OSs correspondingly provide a linker script to control how a memory region should be mapped into the physical address space. To model the memory layout, we developed a template linker script based on a popular MCU. It essentially squeezes the whole run-time memory into a continuous memory region in the address space of a host process.

To support hardware-specific peripherals, such as UART, Ethernet, SD card and CRC, we propose HAL-based peripheral function replacement. An HAL layer allows upper-layer OS libraries to interact with the hardware device at an abstract level rather than at the hardware level. We identify high-level HAL functions and replace them with equivalent handlers on the host. This simplifies the porting effort as well as improves I/O performance. Per HAL function, a set of para-APIs are defined for the HAL library to invoke. Correspondingly, backend drivers are implemented on the host. It can be shared among multiple HALs from different vendors. In this sense, our design follows the spirit of para-virtualization in which the guest OS has to be explicitly modified to benefit from optimized I/O implementation in the backend (thus the

name para-rehosting). To speedup backend development for new peripherals, we categorize common HAL functions into four types (IO, storage, computing accelerator, and dummy) and implement the corresponding templates. Developers only need to figure out the appropriate peripheral categorization and quickly customize the implementation.

We have evaluated our approach against nine MCU OSs including the widely deployed Amazon FreeRTOS, ARM Mbed OS, Zephyr, LiteOS, etc. We successfully compiled and executed 84.21%, 76.47%, 89.47% and 63.64% of all the libraries shipped with FreeRTOS, ARM Mbed OS, Zephyr and LiteOS respectively. Moreover, our HAL backends support most peripherals in the SDKs of the NXP and STMicroelectronics devices. To demonstrate the superiority of our approach in terms of security testing, we further leveraged AFL [61] and ASAN [50] to test several popular libraries in the ecosystems of Amazon FreeRTOS, ARM Mbed OS, Zephyr and LiteOS. Our tool has helped us find 28 previously-unknown bugs. We have responsibly reported all of them to the influenced vendors. At the time of writing, 5 were confirmed by CVE and the other 19 were confirmed by vendors.

In summary, we made the following contributions.

- We proposed para-rehosting to natively port MCU software on commodity hardware. It accurately models common MCU behaviors and depends on para-APIs to support HAL-enabled hardware logic.
- We implemented the idea of para-rehosting by prototyping a portable MCU based on POSIX and a set of para-APIs (and the backends). Our prototype supports nine MCU OSs, including FreeRTOS, ARM Mbed OS, Zephyr, and LiteOS currently.
- We used fuzz testing to analyze several popular libraries used in MCU and identified 28 previously-unknown bugs. Our tool is open source available at <https://github.com/MCUSEc/para-rehosting>.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Microcontroller Units

Until recent years, MCUs were considered as specialized computer systems that are embedded into some other devices, as contrary to general-purpose commodity computing systems such as personal computers (PCs) or mobile devices. With the emergence of IoT, now MCUs have been tasked with more diverse missions and are at the center of many of the innovations in the cost- and power-efficient IoT space. Examples include home automation, wearable devices, smart city, smart manufacturing, etc. [11].

MCUs have evolved from 8-bit design to 16-bit design. Now, 32-bit MCUs have dominated the market, accounting for 55% of the total MCU sales [38]. In the MCU segment, the major players include the ARM Cortex-M family MCUs, MIPS MCUs, and Atmel AVR, etc. To keep energy-efficient, MCUs are equipped with limited computing and memory resources. For example, the state-of-the-art ARM Cortex-M4 processor often runs at a frequency of around 100 MHz and the size of SRAM is about 200 KB.




Figure 1: FreeRTOS software stack

From the viewpoint of a programmer, the most remarkable difference between PC/mobile processors and MCUs is that MCUs do not support MMU. As a result, the application code and the OS kernel code have to be mingled together in a flat memory address space. We call the resulting executable binary as a firmware image. Without virtual memory support, the Linux kernel cannot run on top of MCUs. Another characteristic of MCUs is that they are highly heterogeneous. Each MCU could support a distinct set of peripherals. The peripherals could be custom-made and thus have different specifications.

B. Software Ecosystem for MCUs

Due to the lack of the MMU support, traditional OSs such as Linux cannot run atop MCUs. Instead, since MCUs have a long history of being used in safety-critical real-time applications, many *real-time operating systems* (RTOSs) have been developed for them. Given that MCUs have become the driving hardware for the emerging IoT technology, big companies have quickly begun to invest on building their ecosystems for MCU devices. FreeRTOS [5], arguably the most widely deployed RTOS for MCUs, has been acquired by Amazon in 2017. As an essential part of the Amazon Web Service (AWS), FreeRTOS has been extended with libraries that enable local and cloud connectivity, security, and over-the-air (OTA) updates. ARM Mbed OS [8], backed by ARM, is another IoT RTOS dedicated for ARM MCU devices. It includes all the needed features to develop a connected product, including security, connectivity, an RTOS, and drivers for sensors and I/O devices. Zephyr [57], backed by the Linux Foundation, is an IoT RTOS that integrates all the necessary components and libraries required to develop a full application. Finally, LiteOS [30], backed by Huawei, is a lightweight IoT RTOS that receives wide adoption in China. Based on a recent IoT developer survey [20], FreeRTOS continues to be the dominating RTOS for constrained IoT devices, while ARM Mbed OS, Zephyr and LiteOS are creating successful open source communities.

Software Stack. It is quite clear from the aforementioned facts that big companies are developing their own IoT ecosystems. They aim to create a smooth and pleasant experience for developers by providing a comprehensive software stack and an active community. Eventually, the developers would stick to their ecosystem. In what follows, we briefly introduce the

software stack of the FreeRTOS as shown in Figure 1. Other RTOS ecosystems follow a very similar design.

Amazon FreeRTOS provides both a RTOS kernel as well as many libraries/middleware that make it easy to securely connect to the cloud or other devices. At the core is a RTOS kernel which is responsible for task management, scheduling, memory management, interrupt management, message delivery, etc. Task is the basic scheduling unit in a RTOS, similar to a thread in the Linux OS. Different from Linux threads, all tasks in the RTOS share the same address space with kernel. There are several built-in tasks that are automatically started by the kernel. They are mainly used for system-level event management.

There are three types of libraries, namely common libraries, application libraries and portable layer libraries. Common libraries extend the kernel functionality with additional data structures and functions, such as atomic operations. Application libraries are standalone libraries for connectivity and remote management, such as MQTT and device shadow. Typically, an application library also acts as a dedicated system task, serving for other tasks. Lastly, the portable layer libraries handle device specifics. They serve as an adaptor layer for processors (e.g., ARM and MIPS) and peripherals (e.g., network). Many ports for different hardware have been provided officially or unofficially. In developing a port, developers are only responsible for implementing a number of downstream APIs that the upper-layer libraries rely on. Conversely, these downstream APIs have to invoke certain upstream APIs provided by the RTOS kernel to fulfill their functionality.

Hardware Abstraction Layer. Another important piece of software in MCU firmware is provided chip vendors. For example, STM32 provides each kind of chip with an SDK that includes low-level hardware drivers as well as a *hardware abstraction layer* (HAL) [55]. An HAL layer acts as a bridge between software and hardware. It allows upper-layer libraries to interact with a hardware device at a general and abstract level rather than at the hardware level. Therefore, it is invoked by the portable layer to interact with the peripherals.

III. OVERVIEW

Our work explores the portability problem of open-source MCU OSs for the purpose of finding software bugs in them. We first present a motivating example. Then we give an overview of the proposed para-rehosting technique.

A. Motivating Example

There has been a bunch of advanced *dynamic* analysis techniques to test the security of software, such as fuzz testing [61], memory checker [50], and dynamic instrumentation [36]. In practice, a prerequisite of using these tools is that the target binary must be executable on a PC. If we attempt to port a particular MCU library, taking the MQTT library of FreeRTOS as an example, many problems arise.

```
void IotMqtt_ReceiveCallback( ... )
{
    ...
    _getIncomingPacket( pNetworkConnection, ..., &
        incomingPacket );
}
```





Figure 2: Para-rehosting overview

This function is invoked whenever the MQTT task receives data from the network (recall that MQTT is an application library). The function `_getIncomingPacket` actually fetches the data from the network connection maintained in `pMqttConnection->pNetworkInterface`. More specifically, the `NetworkInterface` is also manipulated by another task called `IP-task`. The MQTT task and the `IP-task` synchronize with each other through the `Queue` mechanism defined by the FreeRTOS kernel. To port the MQTT library, it becomes essential to also port the `IP-task` (**library-dependence**) and the kernel (**kernel-dependence**). In the `IP-task`, if we continue to track down the source code, it will eventually call the MAC driver level function `SPI_WIFI_ReceiveData()` (on the STM32f756 chip), which in turn uses the SPI protocol to transfer data. Under the hook, it receives an amount of data in no-blocking mode with interrupt. To enable interrupt, the following statement is invoked.

```
__HAL_SPI_ENABLE_IT(hspi, (SPI_IT_RXNE | SPI_IT_ERR));
```

The macros is actually defined as

```
#define __HAL_SPI_ENABLE_IT(__HANDLE__, __INTERRUPT__)  
    SET_BIT((__HANDLE__->Instance->CR2, (__INTERRUPT__)))
```

It sets certain bits of a hardware register at a fix address to enable interrupt. Naïvely compiling this code will lead to unpredictable behaviors or even crash the program (**hardware-dependence**). Due to the aforementioned **library-dependence**, **kernel-dependence** and **hardware-dependence** issues, porting an MCU library to another host is regarded as a very daunting and tedious task.

B. Para-rehosting

We propose para-rehosting to ease the complexity of porting MCU software. In para-rehosting, we provide common backend implementations in the host machine that simulate processor and peripheral behaviors. The upper-layer software only needs slight modifications to accommodate the backend. With para-rehosting, we can compile the whole RTOS logic, including the kernel, built-in tasks, normal tasks altogether into a single host program. They share the same virtual address space of a process on the host, just as they share the same flat physical address space on a real MCU.

As shown in Figure 2, the proposed system is comprised of two major components. The portable MCU (*PMCU*) is a host backend that models the common functions of an MCU and the available memory resources on it. It can be easily ported to different MCU OSs. Specifically, *PMCU*




Figure 3: MCU OS execution with two tasks

simulates task scheduling and the system tick. It also provides basic synchronization primitives to MCU OSs. All of these functions are essential for an MCU OS. Our implementation is modularized. Each abstract module is placed in a separate C source file and included in the project during compilation on demand. For each supported MCU OS, there is a thin glue layer to accommodate specific OS requirements. Moreover, we use a linker script to manage the layout of the resulting program so that it resembles that on a real device. With *PMCU*, we can accurately re-host an MCU firmware that does not rely on any hardware-specific peripherals.

The other component, called HAL-based peripheral function replacement, handles hardware-specific peripheral logic. As such, it addresses the hardware-dependence issue. Since HALs abstract away low-level hardware details from the programmer, we can easily replace its high-level function with an equivalent handler. Note that the HALs for devices from different vendors are typically different. We cannot simply implement a high-level replacement and use it for all the devices. We solve this problem by implementing the HAL function's semantics as a common backend, and require some manual work for each HAL library to invoke the backend drivers. Correspondingly, the parameters need to be adjusted and return values need to be captured properly.

IV. PORTABLE MCU

Portable MCU (*PMCU*) models the common functions of an MCU and the available memory resources on it. Our prototype uses the widely adopted POSIX interface to simulate the abstract common functions. In this way, the rehosted firmware can be executed and analyzed in all UNIX-like systems (including Linux). In Table VII, we summarize the needed changes to port *PMCU* to popular MCU OSs. It includes the upstream functions that portable layer libraries rely on, the downstream functions that they provide, and the common backend functions that they invoke to actually simulate the abstract MCU.

A. Abstracting Machine Functions

1) *Task Management*: Different from traditional MCU systems in which a single task monopolizes the processor, in the IoT era, a variety of tasks run simultaneously. This necessitates a multi-programming environment. Multi-task support has become a standard feature in major MCU OSs, which *PMCU* needs to simulate correspondingly.

We use a process in Linux to simulate the entire MCU firmware, and a thread to simulate a task. The thread-process

model of Linux provides the basis for simulating the task-firmware model of MCU. In particular, in Linux, all threads share the same virtual memory space of a process, and have their own stacks. In MCU firmware, all tasks share the same physical memory space of a MCU, and have their own stacks. In *PMCU*, when a task is created by the MCU OS, a `pthread` is created, with the `start_routine` initialized to be the starting function of the task. Task switch is also supported transparently because the `pthread` library is responsible for saving and restoring the context. In most MCU OSs, at a particular time, only one thread can be executed due to the immature multi-core support [41], [48]. As a result, we need to ensure that a thread exclusively occupies the current process. That is, although conceptually there are multiple threads, only one is runnable. This is achieved by using a combination of the signal and mutex mechanisms in POSIX. Only the thread holding the mutex is allowed to execute. When the current thread yields or is preempted, it unlocks the mutex to allow others to execute and suspends itself by calling `sig_wait()`. To resume, it must receive a signal `SIGUSR1` and grab the same mutex in the corresponding signal handler.

By default, when creating a thread, the `pthread` library allocates a memory region used for stack, which is out of the control. In Section IV-B, we explain how to make sure the location of a task stack is within the memory map of a real MCU.

2) *System Tick*: The MCU's time is shared among multiple tasks simultaneously. A timer, called system tick is usually used to invoke the scheduler to switch tasks periodically. To support preemption, the RTOS kernel is periodically awakened by a system timer, which is often implemented by a counter hardware in a real MCU. Naturally, we leverage the system timer in POSIX to periodically raise a timer signal to simulate this process. In particular, we use `setitimer()` to deliver a `SIGVTALRM` signal of type `ITIMER_VIRTUAL` periodically. `ITIMER_VIRTUAL` timer counts down against the user-mode CPU time consumed by all threads in the process. As such, it avoids issues caused by unpredictable time allocated to a process. Inside the `SIGVTALRM` signal handler, *PMCU* invokes the scheduler to resume the next task. Note that the scheduling algorithm and task priority are totally transparent to *PMCU*. Note that due to the unpredictable behavior of the timer on the Linux machine, we cannot guarantee that each simulation yields exactly the same execution path. This is also the case on a real device. We demonstrate that this nondeterministic behavior does not influence bugs finding in practice later.

3) *Synchronization Primitive*: Synchronization is a basic OS primitive. Once violated, the execution is subject to crashes. For example, when a task enters the critical section, some RTOSs need to disable interrupts (including the system tick). If *PMCU* allows system tick (and thus task scheduling) in a critical section, race condition may happen. *PMCU* simulates disabling interrupt by keeping track of the current interrupt status in a global variable `PMCU_INT_ENABLED`. When a `SIGVTALRM` signal occurs, if `PMCU_INT_ENABLED` is cleared, the handler returns immediately with the `PMCU_`-pending variable set which indicates the scheduler should be called after exiting the critical section. Otherwise, the handler performs a normal scheduling process. Additionally, *PMCU*

ensures that it does not interfere with the RTOS kernel itself, since *PMCU* also needs to access critical RTOS data structures.

4) *A Running Example*: In Figure 3, we showcase a running example for an MCU OS execution with two task. `Task1` is executing until `t0` when a `SIGVTALRM` signal occurs requesting for a potential task switch. The handler then kicks in (represented by *PMCU*) to invoke the systick handler in the kernel (`t0-t1`). The handler in the kernel selects the next task and sends a signal `SIGUSR1` (`t1-t2`). The signal handler simply schedules the thread corresponding to the selected task (`Task2`) to be runnable (`t2-t3`). As a result, `Task2` begins to execute starting from `t3`. The execution sequence from `t4` to `t7` is self-explanatory.

B. Memory Layout Enforcement

As mentioned before, the memory layout of the rehosted program (including code, data, stack, bss, etc.) is different from that in a real device. For example, the default linker on a Linux machine places the code segments starting from `0x08048000` on x86-32 and from `0x400000` on x86-64 (if PIE is not enabled), while the linker for an MCU compiler typically places the code segment starting from zero. This is controlled by a file called linker script. Typically, an MCU has a flash memory starting from zero and an separate SRAM at another offset. To be able to more accurately capture the program misbehavior caused by memory errors, we need to place the code and data segments following the memory map in the MCU. We could simply reuse the linker script available for an MCU firmware, however, three problems arise.

First, the stack of a Linux program is allocated by the kernel rather than based on the linker script. Specifically, the stack grows downwards from `0x7FFFFFFF` on x86-32 and `0x7fbFFFFFFF` on x86-64 (without regard to randomization). Moreover, the default stack size of a thread is limited to 2 MB. This number is even beyond the total SRAM size on many MCUs. To solve this problem, we implemented a trampoline function called `stack_switching(void *newSP, void *newFun)` in assembly that explicitly manipulates the SP register so that the thread uses a newly specified stack. It then jumps to the function `newFun()`. We wrapped the start routine of new tasks (say `start_routine()`) into `stack_switching(newSP, start_routine)`, so that the function switches the stack to the one allocated based on the MCU linker script and then jumps to the real start function `start_routine()`. We note that similar results can be achieved by using the `makecontext/setcontext` APIs.

Second, the heap management in MCU OSs conflicts with that in Linux. The MCU libc allocator does not implement the underlying `_sbrk()` but relies on the developer to provide a device-specific implementation according to the heap range specified in the linker script. Therefore, the provided `_sbrk()` conflicts with that in the Linux libc allocator. We have two choices here. First, we could suppress the Linux allocator. In this way, we can precisely simulate the heap layout as specified in the linker script. Second, we could suppress the firmware-provided `_sbrk()` and use the Linux version. In this way, we sacrifice the accurate emulation of memory layout. This might cause problems in bug re-production and exploitation.

However, using the Linux allocator allows us to harvest the bug-finding capability of ASAN out-of-the-box.

Some MCU OSs (such as FreeRTOS and LiteOS) provide their own allocators. For them, we also have two strategies; 1) we can replace their heap implementation with that on Linux, but sacrifice the coverage of customized allocators; 2) we can keep their implementations, but sacrifice ASAN in finding memory errors in heap.

Finally, the entry point of an MCU program is the function `Reset_Handler()`, rather than `__start()` in a regular Linux program. `__start()` performs necessary initialization of the execution environment and jumps to the main function, while the `Reset_Handler()` initializes the simulated memory on the memory map of the real device, such as coping the data sections from the “flash” to the “SRAM”. We keep the entry point of the rehosted program as `__start()` but explicitly invoke the modified `Reset_Handler()` before the main function is executed.

V. HAL-BASED PERIPHERAL FUNCTION REPLACEMENT

Some peripheral functions (e.g., networking) are indefensible for IoT applications. If not supported, many MCU firmware cannot be rehosted. To avoid handling low-level hardware details, we leverage HALs supported by major MCU vendors. Specifically, we replace the high-level HAL routines with equivalent handlers on the host. These handlers are implemented per peripheral function. We call them HAL backends in this paper and they are exposed to HAL libraries as para-APIs. Inside the HAL library, we only need to identify the corresponding routines and make minor modifications to invoke these para-APIs. As such, a backend which corresponds to a peripheral function, can be shared by multiple HALs. To ease the process of developing backends for new peripheral functions, we further categorize common peripheral HAL functions into four types (IO, storage, computing accelerator, and dummy) and implement templates for quick backend development. In Table VIII, we summarize the categorization and the supported peripherals in each categorization. For each peripheral function, we also list the function names of frontends for two HALs (STMicroelectronics and NXP) and function names of the backend.

A. I/O Peripherals

I/O peripherals are generally used to communicate with the real-world. This includes UART, I2C, SPI, Ethernet, etc. In this work, we first develop a generic I/O backend which transparently bridges the peripheral I/O to host-side standard I/O. As such, the re-hosted firmware has the host console as its I/O interface. This approach works well for simple peripherals such as UART, which is typically used for debugging output. Another benefit of this approach is that `STDIN` can be readily overridden by a fuzzer like AFL to feed testcases to the firmware execution.

Network. We observe that the network function is one of the most widely used I/O, but redirecting network traffic to the `STDIO` as is done in the generic backend rarely fulfils our re-hosting purposes, because the libraries using network would block due to the missing protocol simulation in the generic

backend. To simulate a network interface, we also developed a high-fidelity network backend based on the *Packet Capture* (PCAP) library [31]. It enables re-hosted firmware to actually access the Internet. The most essential tasks of a network driver are to initialize the *network interface card* (NIC), send outgoing messages and receive in-going messages through the NIC. The PCAP library enables easy access to all packets on a host and thus fulfills our requirements.

Specifically, we provide three para-APIs `HAL_BE_NetworkInit()`, `HAL_BE_NetworkSend()` and `HAL_BE_NetworkReceive()`. They are to be invoked by the relevant frontend routines in the IP layer of the HAL libraries. The function `HAL_BE_NetworkInit()` opens a live physical Ethernet interface on the host machine using the PCAP API `pcap_open_live()`, which returns a handler associated with this NIC. To send out a data packet, the para-API, `HAL_BE_NetworkSend()` extracts the packet buffer pointer and packet length from the provided data structure and then directly invokes the PCAP API `pcap_sendpacket()` to output the packet to Ethernet. To receive a message, the para-API `HAL_BE_NetworkReceive()` is used to call the blocking PCAP API `pcap_dispatch()` to receive a packet. The packet is reconstructed and transmitted to the upper layers of the MCU OS stack by calling the corresponding callback functions.

B. Storage Peripherals

Storage peripherals are generally used as hardware medium for file systems such as FAT or littlefs. Popular storage medium used in IoT devices includes MMC, NAND, NOR and SD. For the HAL of these four types of storage devices, we develop a generic storage backend which operate on the host file system. We can safely abstract away the details of medium access characteristics. Specifically, we use a file to store the whole file system of the firmware. To mount the medium, the para-API `HAL_BE_Storage_Init()` is invoked. It maps the the whole file contents into the memory as the raw medium data. Then, storage read/write operations are conducted by invoking `HAL_BE_Storage_read()` and `HAL_BE_Storage_write()`, which simulate medium access by reading/writing the memory.

C. Computing Accelerator Peripherals

Computing accelerator peripherals provide hardware-assisted implementation of popular algorithms, including many cryptography algorithms and the random number generator. We mainly used the OpenSSL library to simulate these algorithms and feed the results to the frontend functions.

D. Dummy Peripherals

Dummy peripherals generally do not perform actions that may affect the execution of the firmware. Therefore, we can safely return a success code to the HAL frontend, or just a `void` if the function does not expect a return value. This includes PWR (Power Controller), RCC (Reset and Clock Control), ICACHE (Instruction Cache) and so on.

VI. EVALUATION

We have developed a para-rehosting prototype on a x86-based PC running the Ubuntu 16.04 OS. Our prototype supports nine MCU OSs, including Amazon FreeRTOS [3], ARM Mbed OS [8], Zephyr [57], Huawei LiteOS [30], Atomoshier [35], brtos [24], f9-kernel [52], FunkOS [1], and TNeo [19]. For HAL functions, our prototype covers most peripherals supported in the SDK of NXP and STMicroelectronics. In total, *PMCU* is comprised of 497 LoC, including 294 for task management, 165 for system tick and 38 for synchronization primitive, which are OS-agnostic. Less than 50 LoC are needed for the glue layer of each supported MCU OS. Dozens to hundreds of LoCs were developed for each HAL backend. Modifications made to HAL libraries that invoke HAL backend are negligible (less than 30 LoC for each). All the details have been reported in Table VII for MCU OSs and Table VIII for HALs.

We evaluated para-rehosting from four aspects. First, we evaluated the rehosting capability of para-rehosting. This was conducted from two dimensions – library support for MCU ecosystems and peripheral support in HAL. Second, since the ultimate goal of this work is to enable security testing for MCU firmware, we used an off-the-shelf fuzzing tool AFL [61] to test the firmware logic compiled by para-rehosting, and compared the results with other solutions. Third, we demonstrated its bug finding capability and explained some vulnerabilities disclosed with the help of the proposed system. Finally, due to the architectural difference and re-compilation, we designed an experiment to identify the gap of running the same firmware logic on a real device and with para-rehosting. Unless stated otherwise, all our experiments were conducted on a PC with an Intel Core i7-8700 CPU and 8 GB DRAM.

A. Rehosting Capability

This section describe the rehosting capability of the proposed system. As mentioned before, an MCU ecosystem often offers a comprehensive software stack to attract developers and manufacturers. We obtained the library information for four representative MCU OSs including Amazon FreeRTOS, ARM Mbed OS, Zephyr and LiteOS from the corresponding official documentation pages or Github repositories, and counted the libraries supported by our prototype. The results are summarized in Table VI. Our prototype supports 84.21%, 76.47%, 89.47% and 63.64% of all the libraries shipped with FreeRTOS, ARM Mbed OS, Zephyr and LiteOS respectively.

We also summarized the supported HAL functions for two popular MCU chip vendors, STMicroelectronics and NXP. This statistic indicates how many peripherals can be supported by our prototype. The results are summarized in Table VIII. In the table, we also list the relevant frontend and backend functions for each peripheral. It is worth mentioning that after gluing the source code with *PMCU* and HAL backends, we did not found any failed compilation. Particularly, no architecture-specific assembly code was found in MCU libraries. This is partially because hardware-neutral MCU libraries have been widely adopted in the MCU ecosystem.

Table I: Results of persistent mode fuzzing with ASAN enabled

RTOS	Library	Speed (#/sec)	Crashes	Real Bugs	Total Paths
FreeRTOS	TCP/IP	4,568.33	78	3	230
	MQTTv1	5,622.56	32	1	536
	MQTTv2	2,754.39	18	1	387
	FATFS	1,516.95	1	1	1,502
	Tinyccor	7,975.00	0	0	272
	Jsmn	21,828.81	0	0	198
	uTasker Modbus	664.90	26	5	79
	lwip (latest)	1,294.56	9	2	158
	lwip (2.1.2)	1,063.47	7	2	139
MbedOS	MQTT	814.18	57	1	104
	CoAP Parser	15,025.01	95	1	522
	CoAP Builder	1,553.65	15	1	502
	Client-Cli	1,131.15	103	2	435
Zephyr	MQTT	1,311.56	0	0	174
LiteOS	MQTT	667.13	4	2	42
	LWM2M	10,352.67	23	2	243
Baremetal	STM-PLC	2,552.81	41	9	323

B. Fuzzing Performance

The ultimate purpose of our tool is to enable software testing and help find vulnerabilities in MCU firmware. We used AFL [61] plus ASAN [50], one of the most efficient dynamic analysis combinations to test several libraries for each ported RTOS. These tools can be used out-of-the-box. In what follows, we show the fuzzing performance against the firmware logic compiled with our tool. Then we compare its performance with existing solutions.

1) *Fuzzing Popular Libs with para-rehosting*: We fuzzed 17 popular libraries for MCU across different OS ecosystems. Three criteria were considered in selecting libraries. First, the core logic of the library should not have been replaced by para-APIs. Otherwise, we would have been fuzzing the para-APIs. Second, the code needs to be easy to tame. Otherwise, tremendous efforts are needed to understand and accommodate the code to AFL. Third, the library is popular. With modest taming efforts, we tested these libraries across the four RTOSs shown in Table I. FreeRTOS+TCP is a TCP/IP implementation officially supported by FreeRTOS [27]. In 2018, there were 13 critical vulnerabilities reported in this library by Zlab [33]. MQTT protocol is one of the most popular connection protocol used in IoT devices. It has been widely used in many commercial smart home solutions. FATFS is an embedded FAT file system that has already been used in commercial products [49]. CBOR (Concise Binary Object Representation) is a binary data serialization format. Jsmn is a world fastest JSON parser/tokenizer. Modbus is a de facto standard communication protocol and is now a commonly available means of connecting industrial electronic devices. lwIP (lightweight IP) is a widely used open-source TCP/IP stack designed for embedded systems. CoAP is another popular IoT protocol which focuses on one-to-one communication. Client-Cli is a command line library, mainly used by the Mbed OS to parse the remote commands sent to the device. LWM2M (LightWeight Machine-to-Machine) is a lightweight protocol suitable for M2M or IoT device management and service enablement. Finally, STM-PLC (STM Programmable Logic Controller) is a PLC SDK that turns an STM32 MCU into an industrial PLC. We built these libraries with ASAN enabled for improving bugs visibility. All the results were obtained within

one hour and with AFL’s persistent mode on.

In Table I, we present the results. Generally speaking, the fuzzing throughput is in line with the commonly perceived number, although variations were observed depending on the libraries. First, the throughputs of fuzzing the CoAP parser, Jsmn and LWM2M libraries are substantially faster than others. This is because these libraries only involve a single independent task that analyzes data packets provided by the fuzzer. For the CoAP builder library, although it also has only one task, it constructs the message based on the data structure `sn_coap_hdr_s`, which contains many pointers. The library needs to dynamically allocate and free buffers for each pointer. Due to the way ASAN handles allocation, heavy overhead was observed. For other libraries, more than one tasks are involved and these tasks extensively use message queues to pass packets. This leads to multiple threads waiting for each other.

In most libraries, we could find the first crash almost instantly. But we have not found any bugs in the MQTT library of Zephyr and Tinycc and Jsmn library of FreeRTOS. For Tinycc and Jsmn, since these libraries are quite simple, porting them without our approach is still manageable. We suspect they have been heavily fuzzed. For the MQTT library of Zephyr, this may be partially attributed to the fact that this library has also been intensively tested because Zephyr officially supports a simulator that helps developers to quickly prototype their products [47]. But note that their simulator is specifically designed for Zephyr. We discuss more in Section VIII-A.

Last but not least, we were able to discover 9 bugs out of the 13 bugs reported by Zlab [33] in the FreeRTOS+TCP library. To reproduce this result, we enabled the macro `ipconfigUSE_NBNS` and `ipconfigSUPPORT_OUTGOING_PINGS`, and ran fuzzing for 48 hours. For the remaining four CVEs, we have studied their behaviors. CVE-2018-16598 is not crashable. CVE-2018-16526, CVE-2018-16528 and CVE-2018-16522 can only be triggered with proper context which we did not support in our taming.

2) *Comparison with Other Solutions:* We conducted experiments to compare our approach with related work.

Comparison with Emulation-based Solutions. We compared our approach with emulation-based solutions in general, including a head-to-head comparison with HALucinator [16] on the same set of firmware samples.

We used a ready-to-use QEMU provided by Zephyr that emulates the TI LM3S6965 platform [62]. Then, we applied the patch from TriforceAFL [46] to this QEMU. TriforceAFL is an AFL fuzzing tool with support for full-system emulation. Finally we ran and fuzzed the MQTT library for Zephyr using TriforceAFL. The fuzzing lasted for 1 hour and on average the fuzzing throughput was 23 test-cases per second. This confirms the tremendous performance advantage of our approach over emulation-based solutions. Similar performance measurement can be observed in relevant papers [25], [16].

We had a chance to compare HALucinator with ours head-to-head. We compiled and tested the same set of firmware used in HALucinator from the GitHub repo [15]. However, the HALucinator authors did not disclose the HAL versions in their experiments except the lwip version used in Atmel

firmware (1.4.1). For others, we used the latest SDK releases. We did not test the two Atmel firmware images that use the 6LoWPAN interface, because we have not ported *PMCU* to the Contiki OS. All the other samples are baremetal. Moreover, since HALucinator targets binary firmware, it feeds the test-cases in a non-standard way. We had to tame the source code correspondingly to make sure both treat the test-cases in exactly the same way. Between each test-case, we used the AFL’s built-in fork-server to reset the firmware state. Table II shows the results of the comparison, in which the data of HALucinator were directly extracted from the original paper [16]. For all the samples, our approach overwhelms HALucinator in terms of execution speed, which is one of the most important factors in fuzzing. We found that the total paths found in HALucinator were generally higher than those found in para-rehosting, even though we eventually triggered more crashes. This is because HALucinator runs on top of QEMU. When a random external interrupt occurs, the corresponding basic block transition is regarded as a new path. We acknowledge that HALucinator minimizes this randomness by designing a deterministic timer. That is, a timer interrupt is raised based on the number of executed basic blocks. However, slightly different test-cases may cause a small change in execution path, which further causes the timer to occur randomly. As a result, AFL may mistakenly mark a path as new. This problem is avoided in our approach because we model an MCU task as a POSIX thread, which is oblivious of the emulated timer.

In the above-mentioned experiment, we compared the absolute values of certain important factors such as the number of total paths. However, due to the architecture differences, these absolute numbers cannot sufficiently manifest the effectiveness of our solution. To more convincingly illustrate the benefit of our approach, we need to smooth the architecture differences. To achieve this goal, we re-ran fuzz testing on all the firmware images with both solutions and collected more insightful details, in particular, the accumulated basic block coverage rate. By using rates instead of absolute values, we ensure a fair comparison on a best-effort basis. Our experiments lasted for about 12 hours for each. After fuzzing, we replayed the generated test-case queues and counted the accumulated basic block coverage rates. When counting the basic block hit numbers, we excluded the code for libc and HALs. In other words, only the code for application and MCU libraries is considered. As shown in Table III, we achieved higher basic block coverage rate in all the tested samples. This is explained by the tremendous speedup brought by our approach. Combined with the support of full-fledged ASAN, our tool found more real bugs than HALucinator on the same set of samples. As an example, for the STM ST-PLC firmware, we identified nine bugs while HALucinator only identified one, which is included in ours. We have reported the eight new bugs to STMicroelectronics and all of them have been confirmed and patched in the later release.

Comparison with On-device Analysis. No AFL-based fuzzing tool is available for real devices. As a rough estimation, we only tested the overhead of fuzzing a real device. We assume there is already some mechanisms to collect path coverage information on the device for the AFL, e.g., ETM [9].

The overhead of fuzzing real devices is roughly composed

Table II: Comparison with HALucinator at a glance

	HALucinator					Para-rehosting				
	Time	Executions	Paths	Crashes	Speed (#/sec)	Time	Executions	Paths	Crashes	Speed (#/sec)
WYCINWYC	1d:00h	1,548,582	612	5	17.92	11h:43m	27,326,874	3,166	909	647.86
Atmel lwIP HTTP (Ethernet)	19d:04h	37,948,954	8,081	273	22.92	12h:33m	40,795,301	1,107	219	902.95
Atmel lwIP HTTP (TCP)	0d:10h	2,645,393	1,090	38	73.48	12h:00m	56,950,867	69	15	1,318.31
STM UDP Server	3d:08h	19,214,779	3,261	0	66.72	12h:00m	38,979,912	621	16	902.31
STM UDP Client	3d:08h	12,703,448	3,794	0	44.11	12h:00m	53,785,098	599	65	1,245.03
STM TCP Server	3d:08h	16,356,129	4,848	0	56.79	12h:00m	63,361,923	1,013	129	1,466.71
STM TCP Client	3d:08h	16,723,950	5,012	0	58.07	12h:00m	47,192,271	1,222	58	1,092.41
STM ST-PLC	1d:10h	456,368	772	27	3.73	12h:15m	112,579,017	323	41	2,552.81
NXP TCP Server	14d:00h	218,214,107	5,164	0	180.40	12h:02m	38,316,493	448	0	884.50
NXP UDP Server	14d:00h	240,720,229	3,032	0	199.01	12h:00m	36,186,349	264	0	837.65
NXP HTTP Server	14d:00h	186,839,871	9,710	0	154.46	12h:39m	65,724,013	1,101	0	1,443.22

Table III: Accumulated coverage rate in comparison with HALucinator

Firmware	Halucinator	Para-rehosting
WYCINWYC	25.99%	27.91%
Atmel lwIP HTTP (Ethernet)	47.65%	70.51%
Atmel lwIP HTTP (TCP)	6.21%	6.26%
STM UDP Server	28.37%	32.82%
STM UDP Client	29.55%	38.22%
STM TCP Server	40.31%	48.60%
STM TCP Client	41.90%	56.88%
STM ST-PLC	3.19%	25.05%
NXP TCP Server	27.31%	40.66%
NXP UDP Server	24.35%	24.96%
NXP HTTP Server	45.83%	54.43%

of three parts, test-case generation, test-case feeding, and program execution. Here, we only estimated the overhead of test-case feeding and program execution, because test-case generation should be the same for all the approaches. We used the pyOCD [39] to control an NXP FRDM-K64F development board and simulated the feeding process. The python script writes a known test-case into a reserved memory region of the board 1,000 times. The program on the board terminates after the iteration is finished. When transferring a test-case of 1 KB, it takes about 0.23 seconds for one test-case to be transferred. We also compared the execution speed of the same workload with para-rehosting, Zephyr QEMU and the FRDM-K64F board. We found the execution speed of FRDM-K64F board is 14 times slower than that of the QEMU and 287 times slower than that of para-rehosting. In summary, the fuzzing speed on real devices is much lower than both our approach and emulation-based approaches.

C. CVE Analysis

We have found 28 previously-unknown bugs as shown in Table IV. Five of them were confirmed by CVE. For the rest, we have reported them to the manufacturers or vendors and 19 of them have been confirmed at the time of writing. All the bugs were caused by memory errors and captured by ASAN. Therefore, we argue that existing solutions without memory checker support, such as emulation-based or on-device analysis, are less effective in finding these bugs.

CVE-2019-13120. The MQTT library lacks length checking for the received publish message. Attackers can manipulate this field so that out-of-range memory access is triggered. The

Table IV: Previously-unknown bugs found

ID	RTOS	Library	Bug type	Number	Status
1	FreeRTOS	MQTTv1	Buffer Overflow	1	CVE-2019-13120
2	FreeRTOS	FATFS	Use After Free	1	CVE-2019-18178
3	FreeRTOS	uTasker Modbus	Buffer overflow	5	Confirmed
4	FreeRTOS/Mbed OS	lwip	Buffer overflow	3	Confirmed
5	Mbed OS	MQTT	Null Pointer Dereference	1	CVE-2019-17210
6	Mbed OS	CoAP Parser	Buffer Overflow	1	CVE-2019-17212
7	Mbed OS	CoAP Builder	Integer overflow	1	CVE-2019-17211
8	Mbed OS	Client-Cli	Buffer Overflow	2	Confirmed
9	Mbed OS	Client-Cli	Off by one	1	Confirmed
10	LiteOS	MQTT	Buffer Overflow	2	submitted
11	LiteOS	LWM2M	Use after free	1	submitted
12	LiteOS	LWM2M	Buffer Overflow	1	submitted
13	Bare-metal	STM-PLC	Buffer Overflow	8	Confirmed

authorized memory is later sent out through the acknowledge packet, leading to a two-byte information leakage.

CVE-2019-18178. The file handler freed by the function `ffconfigFREE()` is reused by the function `FF_FlushCache()`. This bug can be immediately discovered using any test-case with the help of ASAN. However, this library has never been executed against ASAN before and thus the bug had not been identified for long. This highlights the importance of the memory checker in analyzing firmware.

CVE-2019-17210. The MQTT message can be manipulated so that an `if` statement is invalidated, leaving the default value of `mqttstring->lenstring.data (NULL)` unchanged. Later, this pointer is used.

CVE-2019-17212. The CoAP message is linearly parsed by the function `sn_coap_parser_options_parse()` inside a while loop. However, inside the loop, the boundary of the message is not properly checked.

CVE-2019-17211. Two variables of type `uint16_t` are added. The result is used to allocate a buffer. When the addition wraps around the maximum, less memory is allocated than expected.

Others. Three bugs exist in the Client-Cli library of the Mbed OS. This library parses the commands sent to the device. If the command is manipulated, e.g., by removing the NULL character or adding too many delimiters, buffer overflow or off-by-one bugs may occur. The library uTasker Modbus has defined several global arrays with a length defined by the macro `MSG_TIMER_EVENT`. However, there is no offset

check against the maximum length. The library lwip copies the data from the data structure *pbuf* which is implemented as a linked list. It only copies from one sub payload with the length of the whole payload. The MQTT library of LiteOS has an incorrect definition of an array and does not check the validity of a pointer to the MQTT topic before accessing it. The library LWM2M accesses a deallocated memory when closing the LWM2M session and does not perform boundary check when traversing the received CoAP packet. The STM-PLC application does not check the value of an increased or decreased array index, leading to buffer overflows.

D. Identifying the Gap

Due to the architectural gap, we cannot guarantee that our results obtained on the rehosted program can be reproducible on real MCU devices. To identify this gap, we developed a dataset comprised of vulnerable MCU OS libraries, and tested different behaviors when running them para-rehosted and on the real device. We want to know if the bugs identified by our approach are real bugs that can influence real devices. During this experiment, we found that triggering a bug on the real device rarely crashed the firmware immediately. This observation agrees with previous work [43]. Therefore, we revisited this problem and further measured the different levels of corruption observability on Linux machines and on real MCU devices.

1) *Dataset*: We crafted a corpus of code snippets with both the real bugs and artificial bugs. For real bugs, we included the nine re-producible bugs in the FreeRTOS+TCP library originally reported by Zlab [26] (part 1), plus the 28 new bugs discovered in this work (part 2). For artificial bugs, we manually inserted eight types classic bugs in an empty RTOS task (part 3). Note that running code in part 3 should directly trigger the bugs without inputting any test-case. The dataset is listed in Table V.

2) *Bug Re-reproducibility*: We manually fed the test-cases that can trigger bugs on rehosted programs to the NXP FRDM-K64F board, and observed if the bug can be triggered. We used the on-board CMSIS-DAP debug interface to track the execution and manually verified that all the 28 bugs in part 2 of our dataset can influence the real device. This indicates that the buggy source code can be easily manifested on any architecture. However, the firmware did not crash immediately. This is because the injected memory errors were not critical enough to trigger observable hard faults. For these bugs, the firmware would crash non-deterministically in a long run, depending on the execution context. This behavior imposes negative influences to bug hunting on real devices. Specifically, during fuzzing, since the execution terminates immediately at exit points, these memory corruptions usually cannot cause observable crashes.

Regarding exploitability, due to the architecture differences (e.g., different ISA and stack layout), a working proof of exploitation (PoE) on the rehosted firmware might not work on real devices. Typically, PoE construction is conducted case-by-case and bug exploitation is orthogonal to this work.

3) *Understanding the Bug Observability Gap*: The bug observability issue on embedded systems was firstly explained by Muench et. al. [43]. It imposes a huge challenge in fuzzing

Table V: Dataset and bug observability

ID	RTOS	Library	Bug type	Observability	
				Para-rehosting	Real Board
1	FreeRTOS	FreeRTOS+TCP	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
2	FreeRTOS	FreeRTOS+TCP	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
3	FreeRTOS	FreeRTOS+TCP	Integer Underflow	Y	N
4	FreeRTOS	FreeRTOS+TCP	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
5	FreeRTOS	FreeRTOS+TCP	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
6	FreeRTOS	FreeRTOS+TCP	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
7	FreeRTOS	FreeRTOS+TCP	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
8	FreeRTOS	FreeRTOS+TCP	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
9	FreeRTOS	FreeRTOS+TCP	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
10	FreeRTOS	MQTT	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
11	FreeRTOS	FATFS	Use After Free	Y	N
12	FreeRTOS	uTasker Modbus	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
13	FreeRTOS	uTasker Modbus	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
14	FreeRTOS	uTasker Modbus	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
15	FreeRTOS	uTasker Modbus	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
16	FreeRTOS	uTasker Modbus	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
17	FreeRTOS	lwip	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
18	FreeRTOS	lwip	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
19	FreeRTOS	lwip	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
20	MbedOS	MQTT	Null Pointer	Y	N
21	MbedOS	CoAP Parser	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
22	MbedOS	CoAP Builder	Integer Overflow	Y	N
23	MbedOS	Client-Cli	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
24	MbedOS	Client-Cli	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
25	MbedOS	Client-Cli	Off By One	Y	N
26	LiteOS	MQTT	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
27	LiteOS	MQTT	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
28	LiteOS	LWM2M	Use after free	Y	N
29	LiteOS	LWM2M	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
30	Baremetal	STM-PLC	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
31	Baremetal	STM-PLC	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
32	Baremetal	STM-PLC	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
33	Baremetal	STM-PLC	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
34	Baremetal	STM-PLC	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
35	Baremetal	STM-PLC	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
36	Baremetal	STM-PLC	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
37	Baremetal	STM-PLC	Buffer Overflow	Y	N
38	FreeRTOS	n/a	Div By Zero	Y	Config
39	MbedOS	n/a	Div By Zero	Y	Config
40	FreeRTOS	n/a	Integer Overflow	Late	N
41	MbedOS	n/a	Integer Overflow	Late	N
42	FreeRTOS	n/a	Stack Overflow	Y	N
43	MbedOS	n/a	Stack Overflow	Y	N
44	FreeRTOS	n/a	Heap Overflow	Partially	Partially
45	MbedOS	n/a	Heap Overflow	Y	N
46	FreeRTOS	n/a	NULL Pointer	Y	Partially
47	MbedOS	n/a	NULL Pointer	Y	Partially
48	FreeRTOS	n/a	Double Free	Y	heap4 only
49	MbedOS	n/a	Double Free	Y	Y
50	FreeRTOS	n/a	Use After Free	heap3 only	N
51	MbedOS	n/a	Use After Free	Y	N
52	FreeRTOS	n/a	Format String	N	N
53	MbedOS	n/a	Format String	N	N

Config means certain hardware feature needs to be enabled to observe the crash. **Late** means the crash is not immediately observable but can be observed later. **Partially** means the observability depends on the concrete context. **heap4** and **heap3** are FreeRTOS specific. They are two different heap implementations.

firmware on real devices. As mentioned before, we observed the same phenomenon. In this section, we try to conduct experiments to better understand the bug observability gap on Linux machines and real MCU devices.

Our approach is to feed the same test-cases that trigger bugs on the rehosted programs to the real device. This only applies for part 1 and 2 of the dataset because part 3 does not need any input. For bug ID 11 and 28, any test-case can trigger the UAF vulnerability. As shown in Table V, most bugs can be observed immediately on the rehosted programs thanks to the ASAN support while most bugs cannot be observed on real devices. In that follows, we explain some interesting findings.

Div by Zero. By default, diving by zero yields zero on the FRDM-K64F board. As a result, the board will continue execution without crashing. We later found that ARM processor needs to explicitly enable div by zero detection by setting the

Configuration and Control Registers (CCR). After the register was set properly, we could observe this bug instantly.

Stack Overflow. On the rehosted programs, we could observe stack overflow with the help of ASAN easily. On the real board, with the default configuration, the firmware will continue execution. However, this problem can be mitigated by configuring stack overflow detection.

For FreeRTOS, it provides a macro called `configCHECK_FOR_STACK_OVERFLOW` to enable stack overflow detection [26]. When configured to 1, the FreeRTOS kernel will check if the processor stack pointer remains within the valid stack space when the task is swapped out. When configured to 2, the FreeRTOS kernel will initialize known values at the end of the stack. When the task is swapped out, the kernel checks whether the known values have been corrupted. Obviously, both mechanisms cannot guarantee to catch all stack overflows, and may delay the detection until the task is swapped out.

The Mbed OS provides stack overflow detection via stack stats tracking [40]. When enabled, stack overflow can be observed by monitoring stack usage.

Null Pointer Dereference. On rehosted programs, we could observe null pointer dereferences easily because accessing memory at zero always causes a segment fault – the OS maps the corresponding virtual pages as un-present. On a real board, in particular the ARM Cortex-m MCU devices, read and write to NULL address lead to different results. This is because address zero is typically where the ROM resides. Therefore, reading from it is allowed while writing to it causes an escalated hard fault. For example, when we fed the test-case triggering CVE-2019-17210 to the real device, the real device never crashed. However, the firmware execution had been in a false state.

VII. COMPARISON WITH OTHER WORK

To examine the security of MCU firmware, several approaches have been discussed. We categorize them into four classes.

- 1) **On-device Analysis:** This approach requires real devices to do the testing. It gets the most authentic results, but is less scalable and lack visibility. It is hard to collect execution information on a bare-metal machine.
- 2) **Full Emulation:** To overcome the performance and scalability issues on real hardware, researchers proposed using a full emulator, such as QEMU, to emulate firmware execution. The main challenge is to emulate different peripherals and there has been some efforts towards this goal [25], [28]. Theoretically, this approach achieves better visibility to the firmware execution. Unfortunately, as far as we know, no existing work is able to precisely support previously-unknown devices. Therefore, at the current state, this approach only exists in an idealistic setting.
- 3) **Peripheral Forwarding:** As a middle ground solution, a hybrid approach forwards peripheral accesses to real devices and runs the firmware inside an

emulator [60], [43], [34]. However, performance and scalability issues are still unsolved due to the dependence on real hardware.

- 4) **Semi-rehosting:** In semi-rehosting solutions like Halucinator [16], the main logic of the firmware is still executed inside an emulator. However, high-level HAL functions are identified and replaced with rehosted handlers on the host. As such, complex modeling of diverse peripherals is avoided.

Comparison. In Figure 4, we compare our approach (para-rehosting) with existing work from different dimensions. Note that a perfect full emulation solution that can precisely emulate arbitrary MCU devices *does not* exist so far.

In terms of performance, even high-end MCUs run at a lower frequency. Therefore, on-device testing could be less efficient. Moreover, parallelism is limited on real devices. To add a system under test (SUT), a new real device must be integrated and be coordinated with others properly. As for peripheral forwarding, frequent rebooting of the device and signal forwarding are both time-consuming. Emulation-based approaches (including semi-rehosting) can run multiple SUTs simultaneously on the host, but instruction translation incurs unavoidable overhead. Our approach enables native testing on the host, fully benefiting from the parallelism and high performance of modern hardware.

Regarding software testability, we mean the capability to observe the behavior of an SUT. For example, being able to observe a crash is vital for fuzzing. As another example, collecting the run-time execution path can aid fuzzing by generating high-quality test-cases. To improve testability, instrumentation is often used. Instrumentation allows for collecting more context-rich information. In fuzzing, instrumentation tools like ASAN [50] can improve the crash identification capability significantly. On a real device, it is nearly impossible to collect firmware execution information, unless non-intrusive hardware debugging features, such as ETM are in-place [9]. Peripheral forwarding, full emulation, and semi-rehosting all rely on an emulator such as QEMU. With an indirection layer, testability can be greatly improved. However, it is still incomparable with native rehosting. Specifically, in practice, emulation-based approaches can only extract information in the context of the emulated machine, whereas native rehosting enables information collection in the context of the program itself, e.g., by instrumentation. In our evaluation (section VI-C), we have demonstrated how ASAN could improve the bug finding capability. For all the bugs we identified using our tool except one (CVE-2019-17210), if ASAN was not enabled, the bugs became invisible.

In terms of hardware-independence, both on-device analysis and peripheral forwarding require a real device, whereas para-rehosting and emulation-based approaches do not depend on any real device. As such, they are more scalable.

As for code coverage, all the approaches could cover hardware-independent code, which is enclosed in red lines in Figure 1. However, because para-rehosting and semi-rehosting replace hardware-dependent code with native implementations, they cannot find problems with low-level hardware related code (e.g., drivers), which is enclosed in green lines in Figure 1.




Figure 4: Comparison of different approaches in terms of performance, software testability, hardware independence and covered code base.

Full emulation has the potential to cover the whole software stack. However, P²IM [25], a representative full emulation approach, only provides approximate emulation, which does not suffice for discovering driver bugs. On the other hand, peripheral forwarding and on-device analysis can capture hardware behaviors with high fidelity and therefore can support testing driver code.

Last but not least, due to the nature of cross-compilation and the need for instrumentation, our approach requires the source code, while others can work directly on the binary. As such, para-rehosting is most suitable for chip vendors or third-party MCU OS vendors to do in-house testing, rather than for hackers or researchers to find bugs in binaries. Note that even if these vendors have access to the source code, they often lack an efficient dynamic testing tool in their arsenal (e.g., ASAN for MCU code). Our tool bridges this gap.

VIII. RELATED WORK

A. MCU OS Simulator

To create a smooth and pleasant experience for MCU developers, some MCU OSs provide a simulator that enables developers to write, run, and debug code without acquiring real hardware. Typically, there are three methods adopted.

1) *Web-based Simulator*: Mbed OS 5 provides a cross-compile simulator based on Emscripten [21] and Node.js. In essence, C/C++ code is translated to WebAssembly that can run on browsers. This approach provides the most convenience since the developers do not need to install the simulator environment. However, it is incompatible with existing dynamic testing tools.

2) *QEMU-based Emulator*: Typically, QEMU-based emulators only emulate a specific board. Supporting arbitrary boards requires more engineering efforts, which is unmanageable given the huge amount of MCU chips. As a result, to allow the developers to fully test the APIs of the RTOS, the provided emulation board should emulate a wide range of supported peripherals, which is not the case in practice. For example, we found that only a tiny portion of OS APIs can be tested on the RT-Thread emulator [58]. QEMU-based approach is compatible with (patched) AFL [46] with reduced speed. But ASAN cannot be fully supported. This approach is adopted by RT-Thread [58] and Zephyr [63].

3) *Native Simulator*: Sometimes, the MCU OS developers provide a simulator that when compiled with the application and the kernel, can generate a native application on the host OS. This kind of simulator typically accommodates specific characteristics of the target MCU OS and has certain optimizations to it. The introduced optimization may influence the intended behavior of the firmware. For example, to bring a deterministic environment for developing and debugging, the native simulator provided by Zephyr [47] models native execution to be infinitely fast. As a result, interrupts, including timers, cannot arbitrarily suspend a thread. The firmware has to explicitly unmask them if they were pending. This indicates this modeling cannot faithfully simulate the complex interactions between the firmware and hardware. Race condition issues caused by concurrency and scheduling cannot be discovered faithfully by this approach. On the contrary, our work faithfully simulates the non-deterministic nature of the hardware and allows interrupts to kick in at any time. Therefore, it can capture various real-world software issues.

Ad-hoc simulator development does not consider generalization and the developed simulator cannot work for another MCU OS. For example, we found that the Zephyr simulator has a hardware model adaptation layer that is deeply coupled with the Zephyr drivers and thus cannot be easily re-used to simulate other MCU OSs. Our work abstracts common behaviors of the hardware and correspondingly provides unified backends to simulate the firmware execution, minimizing the needed re-engineering effort to support other OSs. In addition, para-rehosting not only enables the simulation of the MCUs, but also peripherals. Finally, para-rehosting shares two key benefits with other native simulators: 1) improved execution speed for efficient testing, and 2) better instrumentation capability to disclose program issues. Native simulator is supported by NuttX [56], FreeRTOS [4], Zephyr [47], etc.

B. Generic Firmware Emulation

In P²IM [25], the authors propose to abstract a model for a class of MCUs based on device datasheets or processor documentation. Then P²IM instantiates the abstract model automatically with the firmware-specific information. As such, P²IM is oblivious to peripheral designs and generic to firmware implementations. Moreover, it channels inputs from the AFL to continuously fuzz the emulated firmware. PRETENDER [28] “learns” the interaction model between the original hardware and the firmware, and automatically creates models of

peripherals. Laelaps [13] addresses a similar problem using symbolic execution. HALucinator [16] avoids the problem of peripheral emulation by replacing the high-level HAL function with a host implementation. All these solutions rely QEMU for architectural emulation and therefore suffer from lower performance and bad testability. Since they directly test the binary-form firmware, no source code is needed.

Conceptually, both HALucinator and para-rehosting replace HAL functions with native implementations. However, the motivation and method are quite different. HALucinator directly matches and hooks HAL functions in binaries. It is helpful for third-party researchers to find bugs in binaries. To build the function matching database, it needs the HAL source code to calculate the signatures of the underlying HAL functions before-hand. The matching results are subject to inaccuracy caused by collision, missing functions, etc. Para-rehosting inherently needs the source code and relies on some human efforts to craft glue layers. However, we alleviate this problem by providing ready-to-use glue layers for popular HALs. For others, common para-APIs and templates are provided. In evaluation, we have demonstrated the tremendous performance advantage to HALucinator brought by native rehosting. Moreover, we found that all the tested sample in HALucinator are baremetal. It remains unknown whether HALucinator can handle more complex OS libraries. For example, the authors state that to support RIOT OS, they had to manually implement the context switching as a handler. To facilitate fuzzing, they also need to write additional modules to accommodate testcase input, monitor execution results, increase crash visibility (e.g., an ASAN-fashioned heap memory tracker), etc.

C. Peripheral Forwarding

Researchers also propose a hybrid emulation approach in which the real hardware is used to handle peripheral operations. Avatar [60] and Avatar2 [42] propose a dynamic analysis framework that executes the firmware in QEMU until an I/O request is encountered. In this case, the request is forwarded to the real hardware. PROSPECT [32] introduces a novel approach that involves the partial emulation of an embedded device's firmware during a fuzzing experiment. By forwarding system calls that are likely to access peripherals, this approach can emulate Linux-based embedded systems. SURROGATES [34] improves Avatar by using a custom, low-latency FPGA bridge between the host's PCI Express bus and the system under test. It also allows the emulator full access to the system's peripherals. These approaches still rely on real hardware and thus is not scalable. The performance cannot exceed those achieved by QEMU- or rehosting-based solutions.

D. Firmware Analysis

Symbolic execution is commonly used in analyzing MCU firmware. FIE [18] leverages the KLEE [12] symbolic execution engine to provide an extensible platform for detecting firmware bugs. FIE does not simulate hardware interaction. That is, writes to a peripheral are ignored and reads return unconstrained symbolic values. Moreover, it is specific to the MSP430 family microcontrollers. FirmUSB [29] analyzes embedded USB devices and uses domain knowledge to speed

up the symbolic execution of firmware. Compared to unconstrained symbolic execution, FirmUSB can improve the performance by a factor of seven. Inception [17] is another KLEE-based system aiming at testing a complete firmware image. It symbolically executes LLVM-IR merged from source code, assembly, and binary libraries. To handle peripherals, it either follows the approach of FIE or redirects the read operation to a real device. Both para-rehosting and Inception need the source code. Although we only used fuzzing to find bugs in this work, there is no technical obstacle of using symbolic execution tools such as angr [53] to analyze the rehosted program or even use hybrid fuzzing [59], [54] to improve efficiency.

Previous work has made tremendous progress in analyzing Linux-based firmware [14], [64]. The high-level idea is to design a generic kernel for all the devices. This approach leverages the abstract layer offered by the Linux kernel, but cannot work for the MCU firmware where the kernel and tasks are mingled together. Finally, for PLCs, Almgren et al. developed several mutation-based and generational-based fuzzers against various PLCs and smart meters [2]. They discovered several known and unknown denial of service vulnerabilities.

E. OS Customization

The need for better performance and security has pushed OS customization techniques in recent years [22], [37], [10], [45]. For example, Exokernel [22] provides a minimal set of hardware-level interfaces for multiplexing hardware resources among applications. On top of it, each application implements a library OS (libOS) that include a customized and optimized OS abstraction. Similarly, Unikernel [37] compiles a highly specialized libOS with the application, removing unnecessary functions in commodity OSs. The approach used in para-rehosting is aligned with this new trend in OS design. Specifically, we also abstract a common and minimal set of hardware interfaces for MCU OSs. Each MCU OS implements its designed functionality based on this common hardware interface in different ways.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

In-house security testing of MCU firmware is crucial for IoT security. However, due to the different testing environment, sophisticated tools in x86 are not available for MCU firmware. Re-compiling the firmware to the native x86 host can directly address this problem. However, ad-hoc porting is daunting, prone to errors and sometimes impossible. We therefore propose para-rehosting to ease this process. The portable MCU is able to model the common functions of an MCU while para-APIs facilitate HAL-based peripheral function replacement to deal with peripherals. Rehosting MCU OSs directly addresses fundamental issues (performance, scalability and visibility) faced by existing solutions. We have implemented our idea and rehosted nine OSs for MCU. We did security testing for libraries of Amazon FreeRTOS, ARM Mbed OS, Zephyr and LiteOS. Most libraries shipped with these OSs can be tested by off-the-shelf dynamic analysis tools, including AFL and ASAN. Our experiments suggested that the bugs in the real firmware are re-producible in rehosted firmware. And the bugs

are more observable on rehosted firmware. Running our tool with fuzzing, previously-unknown bugs have been discovered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and our shepherd Dave (Jing) Tian for constructive comments and feedback. The work reported in this paper was supported in part by JFSG from the University of Georgia Research Foundation, Inc., NSF IIS-2014552, DGE-1565570, NSA Science of Security Initiative H98230-18-D-0009 and the Ripple University Blockchain Research Initiative.

REFERENCES

- [1] “FunkOS,” <https://sourceforge.net/projects/funkos/>.
- [2] M. Almgren, D. Balzarotti, J. Stijohann, and E. Zambon, “D5. 3 report on automated vulnerability discovery techniques,” 2014.
- [3] Amazon, “amazon-freertos,” <https://github.com/aws/amazon-freertos>, 2020.
- [4] Amazon Web Service, “FreeRTOS Windows Port,” <https://www.freertos.org/FreeRTOS-Windows-Simulator-Emulator-for-Visual-Studio-and-Eclipse-MingW.html>, 2020.
- [5] Amazon Web Services, “The FreeRTOS Kernel,” <https://www.freertos.org/>, 2019.
- [6] AnySilicon, “MCUs (Microcontrollers) Sales History and Forecast 2016-2022,” <https://anysilicon.com/mcus-microcontrollers-sales-history-forecast-2016-2022/>, 2018.
- [7] arm Developer, “Data Watch Trace,” <https://developer.arm.com/documentation/ddi0439/b/Data-Watchpoint-and-Trace-Unit/DWT-functional-description?lang=en>, 2020.
- [8] Arm Holding, “Mbed OS 5,” <https://os.mbed.com/>, 2019.
- [9] Arm Holdings, “Embedded Trace Macrocell, ETMv1.0 to ETMv3.5,” http://infocenter.arm.com/help/topic/com.arm.doc.ih0014q/IHI0014Q_etm_architecture_spec.pdf, 2011.
- [10] A. Belay, G. Prekas, A. Klimovic, S. Grossman, C. Kozyrakis, and E. Bugnion, “IX: A protected dataplane operating system for high throughput and low latency,” in *11th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 14)*. Broomfield, CO: USENIX Association, Oct. 2014, pp. 49–65.
- [11] P. Burr, “Arm Cortex-M3 processor - the core of the Internet of Things (IoT),” Arm Community Processors Blog, February 2018.
- [12] Cadar, Cristian and Dunbar, Daniel and Engler, Dawson R and others, “Klee: Unassisted and automatic generation of high-coverage tests for complex systems programs,” in *OSDI*, vol. 8, 2008, pp. 209–224.
- [13] C. Cao, L. Guan, J. Ming, and P. Liu, *Device-Agnostic Firmware Execution is Possible: A Concolic Execution Approach for Peripheral Emulation*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, p. 746–759. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3427228.3427280>
- [14] D. D. Chen, M. Woo, D. Brumley, and M. Egele, “Towards automated dynamic analysis for linux-based embedded firmware,” in *NDSS*, vol. 16, 2016, pp. 1–16.
- [15] A. Clements, E. Gustafson, T. Scharnowski, P. Grosen, D. Fritz, C. Kruegel, G. Vigna, S. Bagchi, and M. Payer, “Halucinator - firmware rehosting through abstraction layer modeling,” <https://github.com/embedded-sec/halucinator>, 2019.
- [16] Clements, Abraham and Gustafson, Eric and Scharnowski, Tobias and Grosen, Paul and Fritz, David and Kruegel, Christopher and Vigna, Giovanni and Bagchi, Saurabh and Payer, Mathias, “Halucinator: Firmware re-hosting through abstraction layer emulation,” 2020.
- [17] N. Corteggiani, G. Camurati, and A. Francillon, “Inception: System-wide security testing of real-world embedded systems software,” in *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*, 2018, pp. 309–326.
- [18] D. Davidson, B. Moench, T. Ristenpart, and S. Jha, “Fie on firmware: Finding vulnerabilities in embedded systems using symbolic execution,” in *22nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 13)*, 2013, pp. 463–478.
- [19] Dmitry Frank, “TNeo,” <https://github.com/dimonomid/tneo>, 2019.
- [20] Eclipse Foundation, “IoT Developer Survey 2019 Results,” <https://iot.eclipse.org/community/resources/iot-surveys/assets/iot-developer-survey-2019.pdf>, 2019.
- [21] Emscripten Contributors, “Emscripten,” <https://emscripten.org/>, 2015.
- [22] D. R. Engler and M. F. Kaashoek, “The exokernel operating system architecture,” Ph.D. dissertation, USA, 1998.
- [23] D. Evans, “The internet of things: How the next evolution of the internet is changing everything,” *CISCO white paper*, vol. 1, no. 2011, pp. 1–11, 2011.
- [24] fabricio godoi, barriuello, gustavowd, “brtos,” <https://github.com/brtos/brtos>, 2016.
- [25] B. Feng, A. Mera, and L. Lu, “P2IM: Scalable and Hardware-independent Firmware Testing via Automatic Peripheral Interface Modeling,” in *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*. Boston, MA: USENIX Association, Aug. 2020.
- [26] FreeRTOS, “Stack Usage and Stack Overflow Checking,” <https://www.freertos.org/Stacks-and-stack-overflow-checking.html>, 2018.
- [27] FreeRTOS, “FreeRTOS+TCP Open source and thread safe TCP/IP stack for FreeRTOS,” https://www.freertos.org/FreeRTOS-Plus/FreeRTOS_Plus_TCP/index.html, 2019.
- [28] E. Gustafson, M. Muench, C. Spensky, N. Redini, A. Machiry, Y. Fratantonio, D. Balzarotti, A. Francillon, Y. R. Choe, C. Kruegel, and G. Vigna, “Toward the analysis of embedded firmware through automated re-hosting,” in *22nd International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses (RAID 2019)*. Chaoyang District, Beijing: USENIX Association, Sep. 2019, pp. 135–150.
- [29] G. Hernandez, F. Fowze, D. J. Tian, T. Yavuz, and K. R. Butler, “FirmUSB: Vetting USB Device Firmware Using Domain Informed Symbolic Execution,” in *2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS ’17)*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2017, pp. 2245–2262.
- [30] Huawei, “Huawei LiteOS,” <https://github.com/LiteOS/LiteOS>, 2020.
- [31] V. Jacobson, C. Leres, and S. McCanne, “The tcpdump manual page,” *Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, CA*, vol. 143, 1989.
- [32] M. Kammerstetter, C. Platzer, and W. Kastner, “Prospect: peripheral proxying supported embedded code testing,” in *9th ACM symposium on Information, computer and communications security*. ACM, 2014, pp. 329–340.
- [33] O. Karlner, “FreeRTOS TCP/IP Stack Vulnerabilities – The Details,” <https://blog.zimperium.com/freertos-tcpip-stack-vulnerabilities-details/>, December 2018.
- [34] K. Doscher, T. Kohno, and D. Molnar, “SURROGATES: Enabling near-real-time dynamic analyses of embedded systems,” in *9th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies (WOOT 15)*. Washington, D.C.: USENIX Association, Aug. 2015.
- [35] K. Lawson, “Atomoshier,” <http://atomthreads.com/>, 2020.
- [36] C.-K. Luk, R. Cohn, R. Muth, H. Patil, A. Klauser, G. Lowney, S. Wallace, V. J. Reddi, and K. Hazelwood, “Pin: Building Customized Program Analysis Tools with Dynamic Instrumentation,” in *2005 ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI’05)*, 2005.
- [37] A. Madhavapeddy, R. Mortier, C. Rotsos, D. Scott, B. Singh, T. Gagnea, S. Smith, S. Hand, and J. Crowcroft, “Unikernels: Library operating systems for the cloud.” New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2013, p. 461–472.
- [38] B. Matas, “Mcu market on migration path to 32-bit and arm-based devices,” *Research Bulletin*, pp. 32–35, 2013.
- [39] mbed, “Open source Python library for programming and debugging Arm Cortex-M microcontrollers using CMSIS-DAP,” <https://github.com/mbedmicro/pyOCD>, 2019.
- [40] mbed, “Tracking memory usage with Mbed OS,” <https://os.mbed.com/blog/entry/Tracking-memory-usage-with-Mbed-OS/>, 2019.
- [41] J. Mistry, M. Naylor, and J. Woodcock, “Adapting freertos for multicores: an experience report,” *Software: Practice and Experience*, vol. 44, no. 9, pp. 1129–1154, 2014.
- [42] M. Muench, A. Francillon, and D. Balzarotti, “Avatar²: A multi-target orchestration platform,” in *Workshop on Binary Analysis Research*, 2018.

- [43] M. Muench, J. Stijohann, F. Kargl, A. Francillon, and D. Balzarotti, "What You Corrupt Is Not What You Crash: Challenges in Fuzzing Embedded Devices," in *2018 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS'18)*, 2018.
- [44] N. Nethercote and J. Seward, "Valgrind: a framework for heavyweight dynamic binary instrumentation," *ACM Sigplan notices*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 89–100, 2007.
- [45] S. Peter, J. Li, I. Zhang, D. R. K. Ports, D. Woos, A. Krishnamurthy, T. Anderson, and T. Roscoe, "Arrakis: The operating system is the control plane," in *11th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 14)*. Broomfield, CO: USENIX Association, Oct. 2014, pp. 1–16.
- [46] N. G. Plc, "AFL/QEMU fuzzing with full-system emulation," <https://github.com/nccgroup/TriforceAFL>, 2017.
- [47] Z. Project, "Native POSIX execution (native_posix)," https://docs.zephyrproject.org/latest/boards/posix/native_posix/doc/index.html, 2019.
- [48] M. Ray, "Mbed OS Multicore Support," <https://os.mbed.com/question/s/79637/Multicore/>, 2017.
- [49] Real Time Engineers Ltd., "FreeRTOS+Fat," https://www.freertos.org/FreeRTOS-Plus/FreeRTOS_Plus_FAT/index.html, 2019.
- [50] K. Serebryany, D. Bruening, A. Potapenko, and D. Vyukov, "Address-Sanitizer: A Fast Address Sanity Checker," in *2012 USENIX Conference on Annual Technical Conference (ATC'12)*, 2012.
- [51] B. Seri, G. Vishnepolsky, and D. Zusman, "Critical vulnerabilities to remotely compromise VxWorks, the most popular RTOS," ARMIS, INC., Tech. Rep., 2019.
- [52] ShihPo Hung, gapry, georgekang, Jim Huang, "f9-kernel," <https://github.com/f9micro/f9-kernel>, 2020.
- [53] Y. Shoshitaishvili, R. Wang, C. Salls, N. Stephens, M. Polino, A. Dutcher, J. Grosen, S. Feng, C. Hauser, C. Kruegel, and G. Vigna, "SoK: (State of) The Art of War: Offensive Techniques in Binary Analysis," in *37th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P'16)*, 2016.
- [54] N. Stephens, J. Grosen, C. Salls, A. Dutcher, R. Wang, J. Corbetta, Y. Shoshitaishvili, C. Kruegel, and G. Vigna, "Driller: Augmenting fuzzing through selective symbolic execution," in *NDSS*, vol. 16, no. 2016, 2016, pp. 1–16.
- [55] STMicroelectronics, "STM32Cube MCU Package for STM32L5 series," https://www.st.com/content/st_com/en/products/embedded-software/mcu-mpu-embedded-software/stm32-embedded-software/stm32cube-mcu-mpu-packages/stm32cube15.html, 2020.
- [56] The Apache Software Foundation, "Apache NuttX," <https://nuttx.apache.org/>, 2020.
- [57] The Linux Foundation, "The Zephyr Project," <https://www.zephyrproject.org/>, 2019.
- [58] yangjie11, "Getting Started of QEMU (Windows)," https://github.com/RT-Thread/rthread-manual-doc/blob/master/documentation/quick_start_qemu/quick_start_qemu.md, 2019.
- [59] I. Yun, S. Lee, M. Xu, Y. Jang, and T. Kim, "QSYM : A practical concolic execution engine tailored for hybrid fuzzing," in *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*. Baltimore, MD: USENIX Association, Aug. 2018, pp. 745–761.
- [60] J. Zaddach, L. Bruno, A. Francillon, and D. Balzarotti, "AVATAR: A framework to support dynamic security analysis of embedded systems' firmwares," in *NDSS 2014, Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, 23-26 February 2014, San Diego, USA*, San Diego, UNITED STATES, 02 2014.
- [61] Zalewski, Michal, "American Fuzzy Lop," <http://lcamtuf.coredump.cx/afl/>, 2010.
- [62] Zephyr, "ARM Cortex-M3 Emulation (QEMU)n," https://docs.zephyrproject.org/latest/boards/arm/qemu_cortex_m3/doc/index.html, 2020.
- [63] Zephyr Project, "X86 Emulation (QEMU)," https://docs.zephyrproject.org/1.13.0/boards/x86/qemu_x86/doc/board.html, 2018.
- [64] Y. Zheng, A. Davanian, H. Yin, C. Song, H. Zhu, and L. Sun, "FIRM-AFL: High-Throughput Greybox Fuzzing of IoT Firmware via Augmented Process Emulation," in *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security'19)*, 2019.

Table VI: Library support

RTOS	Supported Libraries		Unsupported Libraries
FreeRTOS	TCP/IP, atomic operations, linear containers, logging, static memory, task pool, device defender, device shadow, greengrass, MQTTv2.0.0, MQTTv1.0.0, HTTPS, PKCS#11, secure sockets, TLS, FATFS	bluetooth low energy, over-the-air (OTA) agent, WiFi	
Mbed OS	mbed-crypto, mbedtls, mbed-edge, littlefs, tinycbor, mbed-trace, mbed-cloud-client, mbed-coap, mbed-client-cli, cose-c, lwip, sal, mbed-spiffs	mbed-bootloader, sal-stack-nanostack-eventloop, Arm Mbed uVisor, sw0	
Zephyr	file systems, logging, BSD sockets, DNS resolve, IPv4/IPv6 primitives and helpers, network management, network statistics, network timeout, SNTP, SOCKS5 proxy, trickle timer library, websocket client, CoAP, LWM2M, MQTT, gPTP, PTP time format	bluetooth, display interface	
LiteOS	MQTT, LWM2M, nb-iot, fs, cJSON, lwip, mbedtls	nnacl, gui, OTA, sensorhub	

Table VII: Porting details for selected RTOSs

	Module	Upstream	Downstream	Common Backend	Glue Layer (LOC)
FreeRTOS	Task Creation	vTaskSwitchContext	pxPortInitialiseStack	PMCU_BE_Task_Create	5
	SysTick		n/a	PMCU_BE_Systick_Handler	12
	Synchronization		portDISABLE_INTERRUPTS portENABLE_INTERRUPTS	PMCU_BE_Disable_Irq PMCU_BE_Enable_Irq	3 3
Mbed OS	Task Creation	osRtxTick_Handler	svcRtxThreadNew	PMCU_BE_Task_Create	5
	SysTick		n/a	PMCU_BE_Systick_Handler	22
	Synchronization		__disable_irq __enable_irq	PMCU_BE_Disable_Irq PMCU_BE_Enable_Irq	3 3
Zephyr	Task Creation	z_reschedule	z_arch_new_thread	PMCU_BE_Task_Create	10
	SysTick		n/a	PMCU_BE_Systick_Handler	25
	Synchronization		z_arch_irq_disable z_arch_irq_enable	PMCU_BE_Disable_Irq PMCU_BE_Enable_Irq	3 3
LiteOS	Task Creation	OsTaskSchedule	OsTaskStackInit	PMCU_BE_Task_Create	13
	SysTick		n/a	PMCU_BE_Systick_Handler	14
	Synchronization		LOS_HwiDisable LOS_HwiEnable	PMCU_BE_Disable_Irq PMCU_BE_Enable_Irq	3 3

The SysTick module does not have any downstream function because the hooks have been placed during task creation. The upstream functions are used for task scheduling.

Table VIII: Supported peripherals and the corresponding frontend/backend functions

Category	Peripheral	STM32 HAL (frontend)	NXP HAL (frontend)	Para-API (backend)
I/O	UART	HAL_UART_Init() HAL_HalfDuplex_Init() HAL_LIN_Init() HAL_MultiProcessor_Init() HAL_RS485Ex_Init() HAL_UART_DeInit()	UART_Init() UART_Deinit()	HAL_BE_IO_return_success()
		HAL_UART_Receive_DMA() HAL_UART_Receive_IT() HAL_UART_Receive()	UART_ReadBlocking() UART_ReadNonBlocking() UART_TransferReceiveNonBlocking()	HAL_BE_IO_read()
		HAL_UART_Transmit_DMA() HAL_UART_Transmit_IT() HAL_UART_Transmit()	UART_WriteBlocking() UART_WriteNonBlocking() UART_TransferSendNonBlocking()	HAL_BE_IO_write()
	I2C	HAL_I2C_Init() HAL_I2C_DeInit()	I2C_MasterInit() I2C_MasterDeinit() I2C_SlaveInit() I2C_SlaveDeinit()	HAL_BE_IO_return_success()
		HAL_I2C_Master_Receive_DMA() HAL_I2C_Master_Receive_IT() HAL_I2C_Master_Receive() HAL_I2C_Master_Seq_Receive_DMA() HAL_I2C_Master_Seq_Receive_IT() HAL_I2C_Mem_Read_DMA() HAL_I2C_Mem_Read_IT() HAL_I2C_Mem_Read() HAL_I2C_Slave_Receive_DMA() HAL_I2C_Slave_Receive_IT() HAL_I2C_Slave_Receive() HAL_I2C_Slave_Seq_Receive_DMA() HAL_I2C_Slave_Seq_Receive_IT()	I2C_MasterReadBlocking() I2C_SlaveReadBlocking()	HAL_BE_IO_read()
		HAL_I2C_Master_Transmit_DMA() HAL_I2C_Master_Transmit_IT() HAL_I2C_Master_Transmit() HAL_I2C_Master_Seq_Transmit_DMA() HAL_I2C_Master_Seq_Transmit_IT() HAL_I2C_Mem_Write_DMA() HAL_I2C_Mem_Write_IT() HAL_I2C_Mem_Write() HAL_I2C_Slave_Transmit_DMA() HAL_I2C_Slave_Transmit_IT() HAL_I2C_Slave_Transmit() HAL_I2C_Slave_Seq_Transmit_DMA() HAL_I2C_Slave_Seq_Transmit_IT()	I2C_MasterWriteBlocking() I2C_SlaveWriteBlocking()	HAL_BE_IO_write()
	SPI	HAL_SPI_Init() HAL_SPI_DeInit()	DSPI_MasterInit() DSPI_SlaveInit() DSPI_Deinit()	HAL_BE_IO_return_success()
		HAL_SPI_Receive_DMA() HAL_SPI_Receive_IT() HAL_SPI_Receive() HAL_SPI_TransmitReceive_DMA() HAL_SPI_TransmitReceive_IT() HAL_SPI_TransmitReceive()	DSPI_ReadData()	HAL_BE_IO_read()
		HAL_SPI_Transmit_DMA() HAL_SPI_Transmit_IT() HAL_SPI_Transmit() HAL_SPI_TransmitReceive_DMA() HAL_SPI_TransmitReceive_IT() HAL_SPI_TransmitReceive()	DSPI_MasterHalfDuplexTransferBlocking() DSPI_MasterHalfDuplexTransferNonBlocking() DSPI_MasterTransferBlocking() DSPI_MasterTransferNonBlocking() DSPI_MasterWriteData() DSPI_MasterWriteDataBlocking() DSPI_SlaveTransferNonBlocking() DSPI_SlaveWriteData() DSPI_SlaveWriteDataBlocking()	HAL_BE_IO_write()
	Ethernet	HAL_ETH_Init() HAL_ETH_DeInit()	ENET_Init() ENET_Deinit()	HAL_BE_NetworkInit()
		HAL_ETH_GetReceivedFrame_IT() HAL_ETH_GetReceivedFrame()	ENET_ReadFrame() ENET_ReadFrameMultiRing()	HAL_BE_NetworkReceive()
		HAL_ETH_TransmitFrame()	ENET_SendFrame() ENET_SendFrameMultiRing()	HAL_BE_NetworkSend()
Storage	ADC	HAL_ADC_Init() HAL_ADC_DeInit()	ADC16_Init() ADC16_Deinit()	HAL_BE_IO_return_success()
		HAL_ADC_GetValue() HAL_ADC_Start_DMA() HAL_ADC_Start_IT() HAL_ADC_Start()	ADC16_GetChannelConversionValue()	HAL_BE_IO_read()
		HAL_SAI_Init() HAL_SAI_DeInit()	SAI_Init() SAI_Deinit()	HAL_BE_IO_return_success()
	SAI	HAL_SAI_Receive_DMA() HAL_SAI_Receive_IT() HAL_SAI_Receive()	SAI_ReadBlocking() SAI_ReadData() SAI_ReadMultiChannelBlocking() SAI_TransferReceiveNonBlocking()	HAL_BE_IO_read()
		HAL_SAI_Transmit_DMA() HAL_SAI_Transmit_IT() HAL_SAI_Transmit()	SAI_TransferSendNonBlocking() SAI_WriteBlocking() SAI_WriteMultiChannelBlocking() SAI_WriteData()	HAL_BE_IO_write()
	MMC	HAL_MMC_Init() HAL_MMC_InitCard()	MMC_Init() MMC_CardInit()	HAL_BE_Storage_Init()
		HAL_MMC_ReadBlocks() HAL_MMC_ReadBlocks_IT() HAL_MMC_ReadBlocks_DMA()	MMC_ReadBlocks() MMC_ReadBootData()	HAL_BE_Storage_read()
		HAL_MMC_WriteBlocks() HAL_MMC_WriteBlocks_IT() HAL_MMC_WriteBlocks_DMA() HAL_MMC_Erase()	MMC_WriteBlocks() MMC_EraseGroups()	HAL_BE_Storage_write()
	NAND	HAL_NAND_Init()		HAL_BE_Storage_Init()
		HAL_NAND_Read_Page_8b()		HAL_BE_Storage_read()

Continued on next page

Table VIII: Supported peripherals and the corresponding frontend/backend functions

Category	Peripheral	STM32 HAL (frontend)	NXP HAL (frontend)	Para-API (backend)
Computing Accelerator		HAL_NAND_Read_SpareArea_8b() HAL_NAND_Read_Page_16b() HAL_NAND_Read_SpareArea_16b()		
		HAL_NAND_Write_Page_8b() HAL_NAND_Write_SpareArea_8b() HAL_NAND_Write_Page_16b() HAL_NAND_Write_SpareArea_16b() HAL_NAND_Erase_Block()		HAL_BE_Storage_write()
		HAL_NOR_Init()		HAL_BE_Storage_Init()
	NOR	HAL_NOR_Read() HAL_NOR_ReadBuffer()		HAL_BE_Storage_read()
		HAL_NOR_Program() HAL_NOR_ProgramBuffer() HAL_NOR_Erase_Block() HAL_NOR_Erase_Chip()		HAL_BE_Storage_write()
	SD	HAL_SD_Init() HAL_SD_InitCard()	SD_Init() SD_CardInit()	HAL_BE_Storage_Init()
		HAL_SD_ReadBlocks() HAL_SD_ReadBlocks_IT() HAL_SD_ReadBlocks_DMA()	SD_ReadBlocks()	HAL_BE_Storage_read()
		HAL_SD_WriteBlocks() HAL_SD_WriteBlocks_IT() HAL_SD_WriteBlocks_DMA() HAL_SD_Erase()	SD_WriteBlocks()	HAL_BE_Storage_write()
	CRC	HAL_CRC_Init()	CRC_Init() CRC_WriteData()	HAL_BE_CRC_config()
		HAL_CRC_Accumulate() HAL_CRC_Calculate()	CRC_Get16bitResult() CRC_Get32bitResult()	HAL_BE_CRC_cal_result():
	CRYP	HAL_CRYP_SetConfig()	MMCAU_AES_SetKey	HAL_BE_CRYP_config()
		HAL_CRYP_Encrypt() HAL_CRYP_Encrypt_IT() HAL_CRYP_Encrypt_DMA()	mmcau_AesCrypt() mmcau_DesCrypt()	HAL_BE_CRYP_Enc()
		HAL_CRYP_Decrypt() HAL_CRYP_Decrypt_IT() HAL_CRYP_Decrypt_DMA()	mmcau_AesCrypt() mmcau_DesCrypt()	HAL_BE_CRYP_Dec()
	HASH	HAL_HASH_SHA1_Accmlt() HAL_HASH_SHA1_Accmlt_IT() HAL_HASH_SHA1_Start_DMA()	MMCAU_SHA1_InitializeOutput()	HAL_BE_HASH_sha1_config()
		HAL_HASH_SHA1_Start() HAL_HASH_SHA1_Accmlt_End() HAL_HASH_SHA1_Start_IT() HAL_HASH_SHA1_Accmlt_End_IT() HAL_HASH_SHA1_Finish()	MMCAU_SHA1_HashN() MMCAU_SHA1_Update()	HAL_BE_HASH_sha1_get_result()
		HAL_HASH_MD5_Accmlt() HAL_HASH_MD5_Accmlt_IT() HAL_HASH_MD5_Start_DMA()	MMCAU_MD5_InitializeOutput()	HAL_BE_HASH_md5_config()
		HAL_HASH_MD5_Start() HAL_HASH_MD5_Accmlt_End() HAL_HASH_MD5_Start_IT() HAL_HASH_MD5_Accmlt_End_IT() HAL_HASH_MD5_Finish()	MMCAU_MD5_HashN() MMCAU_MD5_Update()	HAL_BE_HASH_md5_get_result()
			MMCAU_SHA256_InitializeOutput()	HAL_BE_HASH_sha256_config()
			MMCAU_SHA256_HashN() MMCAU_SHA256_Update()	HAL_BE_HASH_sha256_get_result()
	PKA	HAL_PKA_ModExp() HAL_PKA_ModExp_IT() HAL_PKA_ModExpFastMode() HAL_PKA_ModExpFastMode_IT()		HAL_BE_PKA_mod_config()
		HAL_PKA_ModExp_GetResult()		HAL_BE_PKA_mod_get_result()
		HAL_PKA_RSACRTExp() HAL_PKA_RSACRTExp_IT()		HAL_BE_PKA_crt_config()
		HAL_PKA_RSACRTExp_GetResult()		HAL_BE_PKA_crt_get_result()
		HAL_PKA_PointCheck() HAL_PKA_PointCheck_IT()		HAL_BE_PKA_ecc_check_config()
		HAL_PKA_PointCheck_IsOnCurve()		HAL_BE_PKA_ecc_check_get_result()
		HAL_PKA_ECDSASign() HAL_PKA_ECDSASign_IT()		HAL_BE_PKA_ecdsa_sign_config()
		HAL_PKA_ECDSASign_GetResult()		HAL_BE_PKA_ecdsa_sign_get_result()
		HAL_PKA_ECDSAVerify() HAL_PKA_ECDSAVerify_IT()		HAL_BE_PKA_ecdsa_verify_config()
		HAL_PKA_ECDSAVerify_IsValidSignature()		HAL_BE_PKA_ecdsa_verify_config()
		HAL_PKA_ECCMul() HAL_PKA_ECCMul_IT() HAL_PKA_ECCMulFastMode() HAL_PKA_ECCMulFastMode_IT()		HAL_BE_PKA_ecc_sm_config()
		HAL_PKA_ECCMul_GetResult()		HAL_BE_PKA_ecc_sm_get_result()
	RNG	HAL_RNG_GenerateRandomNumber() HAL_RNG_GenerateRandomNumber_IT() HAL_RNG_ReadLastRandomNumber()	RNGA_GetRandomData()	HAL_BE_RNG_get()