Static Analysis for Multilingual Android Apps

2021. 02. 01. Sungho Lee @ KCSE'21

Profile

- Education ●
	- B.S. @ Ajou Univ. ○○
	- M.S. and Ph.D. @ KAIST
		- Majoring in Programming Language (especially, static analysis) ■
- Working experience
	- Visiting faculty researcher @ Google \circ
		- 1st Visiting Faculty Researcher in APAC \blacksquare
		- Deep-learning compiler validation \blacksquare
		- ■■■ Hypervisor verification for Android system \blacksquare
	- Assistant professor @ CNU (present) ○
- Software Analysis and Testing Laboratory (SW@)
	- https://sites.google.com/view/sat-lab/home \circ

Google

HUNGNAM NATIONAL UNIVERSIT

"By 2016, more than 50% of mobile apps deployed will be hybrid"

Gartner

source: http://www.gartner.com/newsroom/i d/2324917

"32.7% of developers surveyed expect to completely abandon native development in favor of hybrid."

Ionic Developer Survey 2017

source: https://ionicframework.com/survey/2017#trends

Hybrid Apps

JNI Apps

"there is substantial usage (39.7%) of native code"

JN-SAF: Precise and Efficient NDK/JNI-aware Inter-language Static Analysis Framework for Security Vetting of Android **Applications with Native Code**

 $(CCS'18)$

"446,562 apps (37.0%) used at least one of the previously mentioned ways of executing native code"

Going Native: Using a Large-Scale Analysis of Android Apps to Create a Practical Native-Code Sandboxing Policy (NDSS'16)

Bug and Security Vulnerability Detection in **Multilingual Android apps**

Composing Static Analyzers for **Bug and Security Vulnerability** Detection in **Multilingual Android apps**

Android hybrid app analysis

- 1) **HybriDroid: Static Analysis Framework for Android Hybrid Applications** (ASE'16)
- Towards understanding and reasoning about Android interoperations $2)$ $(ICSE'19)$
- $3)$ Adlib: Analyzer for Mobile Ad Platform Libraries (ISSTA'19)

Composing Static Analyzers for Bug and Security Vulnerability Detection in Multilingual Android apps

Android JNI app analysis

- JNI program analysis with automatically extracted C semantic 4) summary (ISSTA'19 DS)
- **Broadening Horizons of Multilingual Program Analysis: Semantic** $5)$ **Summary Extraction for JNI Program Analysis (ASE'20)**
- **JUSTGen: Effective Test Generation for Unspecified JNI Behaviors on** $6)$ JVMs (ICSE'21)

Static Analysis for Android Hybrid Applications ASE'16 & ICSE'19

Android Hybrid Apps

Interoperation: Java - JavaScript

Interoperation: Java - JavaScript

Differences between Java and JavaScript

Android Java

Chapter 4. Types, Values, and Variables

The Java programming language is a statically typed language, which means that every variable and every expression has a type that is known at compile time.

The Java programming language is also a strongly typed language, because types limit the values that a variable $(§4.12)$ can hold or that an expression can produce,

The types of the Java programming language are divided into two categories: primitive types and reference types. The primitive types ($\S4.2$) are the boolean type and special null type. An object (§4.3.1) is a dynamically created instance of a class type or a dynamically created array. The values of a reference type are references to c

JavaScript

6 ECMAScript Data Types and Values

Algorithms within this specification manipulate values each of which has an associated type. The possible value types are exactly those defined in this clause. Types are further subclassified into ECN

Within this specification, the notation "Type(x)" is used as shorthand for "the type of x" where "type" refers to the ECMAScript language and specification types defined in this clause. When the term equivalent to saying "no value of any type".

Differences between Java and JavaScript

Android Java

8.4.9. Overloading

If two methods of a class (whether both declared in the same class, or both inherited by a class, or one declared and one inherited) have the same name

This fact causes no difficulty and never of itself results in a compile-time error. There is no required relationship between the return types or between the

When a method is invoked (§15.12), the number of actual arguments (and any explicit type arguments) and the compile-time types of the arguments are

Buggy Interoperation (1)

Android Java JavaScript class JSApp{ @JavascriptInterface public int divide(int x, int y){ var list = $[0, 1, 2, 3, 4]$; return x/y ; var $a = list[3];$ var $b = list[?];$ $\}$ Divide by zero? $\}$ $if(b != 0)$ $app.divide(a, b);$ \cdots addJavascriptInterface(new JSApp(), "app");

Buggy Interoperation (1)

Buggy Interoperation (2)

```
Android Java
class JSBridge{
  @JavascriptInterface
  public void sendName(String a){
  \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}@JavascriptInterface
  public void sendName(int a){
     \cdots\mathcal{F}}
addJavascriptInterface(
           new JSBridge(), "app");
```
JavaScript

app.sendName("Sungho");

Buggy Interoperation (2)

Buggy Interoperation (3)

```
Android Java
class JSBridge1{
  @JavascriptInterface
  public void getName(){
    return "Sungho";
  \mathcal{F}class JSBridge2{
  @JavascriptInterface
  public void getName(){
    return "Sora";
  \mathcal{F}\mathcal{F}addJavascriptInterface(
          new JSBridge1(), "app1");
addJavascriptInterface(
          new JSBridge2(), "app2");
```
JavaScript

 $app2.f = app1.getName;$ $app2.f()$;

Buggy Interoperation (3)

Operational Semantics for Multi-Language Programs

JACOB MATTHEWS and ROBERT BRUCE FINDLER University of Chicago

Interoperability is big business, a fact to which .NET, the JVM, and COM can attest. Language designers are well aware of this, and they are designing programming languages that reflect it-for instance, SML.NET, F#, Mondrian, and Scala all treat interoperability as a central design feature. Still, current multi-language research tends not to focus on the semantics of these features, but only on how to implement them efficiently. In this article, we attempt to rectify that by giving a technique for specifying the operational semantics of a multi-language system as a composition of the models of its constituent languages. Our technique abstracts away the low-level details of interoperability like garbage collection and representation coherence, and lets us focus on semantic properties like type-safety, equivalence, and termination behavior. In doing so it allows us to adapt standard theoretical techniques such as subject-reduction, logical relations, and operational equivalence for use on multi-language systems. Generally speaking, our proofs of properties in a multi-language context are mutually referential versions of their single language counterparts.

We demonstrate our technique with a series of strategies for embedding a Scheme-like language into an ML-like language. We start by connecting very simple languages with a very simple strategy, and work our way up to languages that interact in sophisticated ways and have sophisticated features such as polymorphism and effects. Along the way, we prove relevant results such as typesoundness and termination for each system we present using adaptations of standard techniques.

Bevond giving simple expressive models, our studies have uncovered several interesting facts about interoperability. For example, higher-order function contracts naturally emerge as the glue to ensure that interoperating languages respect each other's type systems. Our models also predict that the embedding strategy where foreign values are opaque is as expressive as the embedding strategy where foreign values are translated to corresponding values in the other language, and we were able to experimentally verify this behavior using PLT Scheme's foreign function interface.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: D.3.1 [Programming Languages]: Formal Definitions and Theory-Semantics; D.2.12 [Software Engineering]: Interoperability

General Terms: Languages

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Operational semantics, interoperability

This work was funded in part by the National Science Foundation.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies show this notice on the first page or initial screen of a display along with the full citation. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, to redistribute to lists, or to use any component of this work in other works requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Permissions may be requested from Publications Dept., ACM, Inc., 2 Penn Plaza, Suite 701, New York, NY 10121-0701 USA, fax +1 (212) 869-0481, or permissions@acm.org. © 2009 ACM 0164-0925/2009/04-ART12 \$5.00

DOI 10.1145/1498926.1498930 http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1498926.1498930

ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems, Vol. 31, No. 3, Article 12, Pub, date: April 2009

Operational Semantics for Multi-Language Programs (TOPLAS'09)

• Formalization for interoperations with explicit language boundaries between ML-like and Scheme-like languages

$$
\mathbf{e} = \cdots |(^{\tau}MS \ e)
$$

$$
e = \cdots |(SM^{\tau} \ \mathbf{e})
$$

J. Matthews is currently at Google Irvine and R. B. Findler is currently at Northwestern University. Authors' address: J. Matthews; email: jcobm@cs.chicago.edu.

$$
\mathcal{B} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{E}[\mathbf{e}] \rightarrow ... \rightarrow \mathcal{B}' \mathcal{O}' \mathcal{E}[\text{SV}^{\tau^{v}}(\mathbf{e}')] \rightarrow ... \rightarrow \mathcal{B}'' \mathcal{O}'' \mathcal{E}[v]
$$
\nExplicit Language Boundary

\n
$$
O = \text{JavaScript Object}
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{B} = O \mapsto \mathbf{O}
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{O} = O \times F \mapsto (V \cup \mathbf{M})
$$
\n
$$
F = \text{JavaScript Field}
$$
\n
$$
V = \text{JavaScript Value}
$$
\n
$$
\mathbf{M} = \text{Java Method}
$$

HybriDroid: Overview

HybriDroid: Analysis Model

HybriDroid: Client Analyses

Bug Detection: MethodNotFound

Bug Detection: MethodNotFound

Bug Detection: Results

Contract Contract Contract Contract

Bug Detection: Results

Static Analysis for JNI Programs ISSTA'19 DS & ASE'20

Multilingual programs

Advantages: performance and reusability

Improving performance

Disadvantage: absence of static checking

Limitation of static analyzers

Our approach

JNI Program: Java Native Interoperation

Bidirectional Interop.

Explicit Boundary

Dynamic Binding

Overall structure of JNI program analysis

JNI program

```
Java
 package com.example;
 class CApp{
   static { System.loadLibrary("lib"); }
   void exec(){ callJava(this); \}
                                        native function call
   void foo() { /* do something *\sqrt{?}void bar() { /* do something * }
   native void callJava(CApp app);
                 native method
                                                                                                      \mathbf Cvoid Java com exmaple App callJava(JNIEnv* env, jobject /* this */, jobject app) {
  iclass klass = (*env)->GetObjectClass(env, app);
  jmethodID mid = (*env)->GetMethodID(env, klass, "foo", "()V");
  (*env)->CallVoidMethod(env, app, mid);
\mathcal{F}
```


Java

 $\mathbf C$

```
package com.example;
```

```
class CApp{
 static { System.loadLibrary("lib"); }
 void exec() { callJava(this); }void foo() { /* do something */ }
 void bar() { /* do something */ }
 native void callJava(CApp app);
}
```

```
void Java com exmaple App callJava(JNIEnv* env, jobject /* this */, jobject app) {
  jclass klass = (*env)->GetObjectClass(env, app);
  jmethodID mid = (*env)->GetMethodID(env, klass, "foo", ("()V");
  (*env)->CallVoidMethod(env, app, mid);
                                                                JNI function calls\mathcal{F}
```

```
Java
 package com.example;
 class CApp{
    static { System.loadLibrary("lib"); }
    void exec() { callJava(this); }void foo() { /* do something */ }
    void bar() { /* do something */ }
    native void callJava(CApp app);
                                                                                                                 v_1\mapstoarg_1@1 GetObjectClass(v_1, v_2)
                                                                                                                 v_2\mapstoarg_3v<sub>1</sub>\mapstoarg_1v_2\mapstoret_{@1}@2 GetMethodID(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)
                                                                                                                           "foo"
                                                                                                                 v<sub>3</sub>\mapsto"()V"v_4\mapstov<sub>1</sub>\mapstoarg_12ct /*
void Java com exmaple App callJava(JNIEnv
                                                                               @3 CallVoidMethod(v_1, v_2, v_3)
                                                                                                                           arg_3v_{2}\mapstoiclass klass = (*env)->GetObjectClass(\epsilonKA
                                                                                                                           ret_{@2}v_3\mapsto4
  jmethodID mid = (*env)->GetMethodID(env
                                                                         \epsilon\epsilon(*env)->CallVoidMethod(env, app, mid);
                                                                              JNI function calls
```
Guest Lang, Analyzer

Guest Lang. Analyzer

Guest Lang. Analyzer

Evaluation: call graph construction

For real-world 50 JNI apps on F-Droid,

- Resolved 585 / 805 (73%) foreign function calls from C to Java \bullet
	- CallMethod: 286 / 372 (77%), GetField: 198 / 299 (66%), SetField: 101 / 134 (75%) \circ
	- 417 out of 585 (71%) resolved foreign function calls are precise \circ
- Analyzed over 400,000 lines of C code in about 35 minutes ●

Evaluation: interoperation bug detection

For real-world 50 JNI apps on F-Droid,

- Found 74 interoperation bugs in 10 apps \bullet
	- 18 wrong foreing function call bugs in 8 apps \circ
	- 56 exception mishandling bugs in 4 apps \circ

Case: wrong foreing function call (1)

```
11 Java
native Channel inheritedChannelImpl
11C/jobject Java_org_sipdroid_net_impl_OSNetworkSystem_inheritedChannelImpl
*/
```
Missing C function

Case: wrong foreing function call (2)

 $//$ Java synchronized private native int parseFile

 $1/ C$ void Java_cx_hell_android_lib_pdf_PDF_parseFile

Declared Type Mismatching

Case: wrong foreing function call (3)

 $1/ C$ jmethodID method = (*DbusJNIenv)->GetStaticMethodID(DbugJNIenv, class, "ReceiveFile", "(Ljava/lang/String;Ljava/lang/String;)V"); … (*DbusJNIenv)->CallStaticIntMethod(DbusJNIenv, class, method, jSrc, jDst);

Wrong Descriptor

Exception mishandling?

There are two ways to handle an exception in native code:

- The native method can choose to return immediately, causing the exception to be thrown in the Java code that initiated the native method call.
- The native code can clear the exception by calling $\text{ExceptionClear}()$, and then execute its own exception-handling code.

After an exception has been raised, the native code must first clear the exception before making other JNI calls.

source: <https://docs.oracle.com/javase/7/docs/technotes/guides/jni/spec/design.html#wp9502>

Case: missing exception handling (1)

```
1/ Cint jniThrowException (...) {
  jclass ec = env->FindClass(className); // Unsafe JNI function call
  …
}
void oneTimeInitializationImpl(...) {
  jmethodID m = env->GetStaticMethodID(...);if (m == NULL) jniThrowException(...); // Exception occured
  …
}
```
Case: missing exception handling (2)

```
// Java
public void run() { droidzebra json get int(0, null); }
11Cjint droidzebra json get int(jobject json) {
  iclass cls = env->GetObjectClass(ison);…
  value = env->CallIntMethod(json, mid, ...);
  if ( env->ExceptionCheck() ) return -1; // Exception is checked, but not cleared
  return value ;
\mathcal{F}
```
Case: missing exception handling (3)

```
1/ Cjobject jniNewObject(...) {
  jobject obj = env->NewObject(...);
  if ( object == NULL ) log\_android(...);else jniCheckException(env); // Check exceptions only when no exception occurs
  return object ;
\mathcal{F}
```
Inapposite exception handling

Composing Static Analyzers for **Bug and Security Vulnerability** Detection in **Multilingual Android apps**

WALA_{Java} & WALA_{JavaScript} and FlowDroid & Infer

Composing Static Analyzers for

Bug and Security Vulnerability Detection

in **Multilingual Android apps**

Hybrid apps and JNI apps