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- Natalie Silvanovich AKA natashenka
- Project Zero member
- Reported 100+ vulnerabilities in JavaScript and Flash over the past 5 years
Ambiguity of message/protocol specification is insecurity; ad hoc parsing is an engine of exploitation; overly complex syntax can make judging security properties of input impractical or even undecidable.
The State of JavaScript

● In 2020, there have been:
  ○ 7 serious vulnerabilities in V8, one used in the wild
  ○ 3 serious vulnerabilities in SpiderMonkey, 2 exploited in the wild
  ○ 4 serious vulnerabilities in JSC
  ○ Does not include internally discovered bugs, or bugs in other features where JavaScript contributed
  ○ It is currently May
The State of JavaScript

● Also
  ○ JavaScript engines have millions of lines of code
  ○ Dozens of commits per day
  ○ Performance is a challenge
Why are there so many bugs in JavaScript?
What went wrong?
How can we do better?
“The story so far: In the beginning the JavaScript was created. This has made a lot of people very angry and been widely regarded as a bad move.”

-- Douglas Adams
'smash the stack' [c programming] a. on many c implementations it is possible to corrupt the execution stack by writing past the end of an array declared auto in a routine. code that does this is said to smash the stack, and can cause return from the routine to jump to a random address. this can produce some of the most insidious data-dependent bugs known to mankind. variants include trash the stack, scribble the stack, manage the stack; the term nging the stack is not used, as this is never done intentionally. see spam; see also alias bug, tandem on core, memory leak, precedence lessage, overrun screw.
JavaScript History

1995 -- Brendan Eich creates JavaScript (originally Mocha and then LiveScript) and it is released in Netscape

1996 -- IE implements JScript, an implementation of JavaScript

1997 -- ECMAScript 1 released

1998 -- ECMAScript 2 released

1999 -- ECMAScript 3 released
ECMAScript History

2008 -- ECMAScript 4 abandoned
2009 -- ECMAScript 5 released
2011 -- ECMAScript 5.1 released
2015 -- ECMAScript 6 released
2016 -- ECMAScript 7 released
Weak Typing

● Strong typing was rejected in ECMA 4
  ○ Consequences for security and performance
Weak Typing

JavaScript

```javascript
var a = "hello";
var s = a.concat(b);
```

C++

```cpp
void str_concat(Obj this, Obj a){
    IsString(this);
    IsString(obj);
    ... 
}
```
Weak Typing

- Type confusion occurs when a type is not checked correctly
  - Highly exploitable bug type
- For vulnerabilities reported in 2020:
  - 3/7 V8 bugs are type confusion
  - 2/3 SpiderMonkey bugs are type confusion
  - 2/4 JSC bugs are type confusion
- ~5% of Flash vulnerabilities were in ES4 engine
Weak Typing

- Affects performance and maintainability
  - Fundamentally, weak typing requires extra checks
  - Browser JIT engines reduce checks at the cost of development time, code complexity and risk of introducing bugs
ECMAScript 6

- ES6 introduced features that caused a disproportionate number of bugs
Array.species

“But what if I subclass an array and slice it, and I want the thing I get back to be a regular Array and not the subclass?”

class MyArray extends Array {
    static get [Symbol.species]() {
        return Array;
    }
}

- Easily implemented by inserting a call to script into *every single* Array native call
Array[@@species] Vulnerabilities

- **CVE-2017-5030**: Out-of-bounds read in V8 Array.concat (Chrome)
- **CVE-2017-8634**: Overflow in Array.concat (Edge)
- **CVE-2017-7064**: appendMemcpy uninitialized memory copy (Safari)
- **CVE-2016-7190**: Heap Overflow in Array.map (Edge)
- **CVE-2016-7200**: Heap Overflow in Array.filter (Edge)
- **CVE-2017-0134**: Overflow in Array.concat (Edge)
- **Bug 725865**: Array Species Optimization Issue (Chrome)
Array[@@species] modification rate

Percentage of page views that use this feature

Date

var t = [1, 2, 3];

Object.defineProperty(t, '2', {
    get: function() {
        return 7;
    }
});
Array Index Accessor Bugs

- **Bug 386988**: Out-of-bounds access vulnerability in Array.concat() (Chrome)
- **CVE-2016-5129**: V8 OOB Read in GC with Array Object (Chrome)
- **CVE-2016-3386**: Stack Overflow in Spread Operator (Edge)
- **CVE-2016-7202**: Overflow in Array.reverse (Edge)
- **CVE-2016-7194**: Info Leak in Function.apply (Edge)
- **CVE-2016-7194**: Proxy Memory Corruption (Edge)
- **CVE-2016-7189**: Info Leak in Array.join (Edge)
- **PZ 1230**: Uninitialized memory reference in arrayProtoFuncSplice (Safari)
- **CVE-2016-7203**: Heap Overflow in Array.splice (Edge)
Array Index Accessor Bugs requiring Array Inheritance

- **PZ 1230**: uninitialized memory reference in arrayProtoFuncSplice (Safari)
- **CVE-2016-1646**: v8 Array.concat OOB access (Chrome)
- **CVE-2016-1677**: type confusion lead to information leak in decodeURI (Chrome)
- **CVE-2017-0141**: memory corruption in Array.reverse (Edge)
- **CVE-2017-2447**: Out-of-bounds read when calling bound function (Safari)
- **CVE-2017-6980**: arrayProtoFuncSplice doesn't initialize all indices (Safari)
- **CVE-2017-7005**: JSGlobalObject::haveABadTime causes type confusion (Safari)
- **CVE-2017-6984**: heap buffer overflow in Intl.getCanonicalLocales (Safari)
Array Index Accessor usage

- ~10% of webpages use array index accessors, the majority due to jQuery
What makes JSC have a bad time?

```cpp
void JSGlobalObject::haveABadTime(VM& vm)
{
    ASSERT(&vm == &this->vm());

    if (isHavingABadTime())
        return;
```
What makes JSC have a bad time?

```javascript
var t = Array.prototype;
Object.defineProperty(t, '2', {
    get: function() {
        return 7;
    }
});

var a = [];
```
Why did these features cause so many bugs?

- Violates developer expectations by adding call to user code in new location
- Affects methods without code changes
- Requires a lot of code to implement
- Vastly increases the code’s range of behavior
I guess we created these features without thinking of how we were going to implement these features

-- ES Committee member
Conclusions

- JavaScript is an excellent example of how failing to design with implementation in mind leads to security and other problems.
- It is probably too late to fix JavaScript, but ...
  - What ‘JavaScripts’ are we creating today?
  - How can we make incremental progress on software that is already implemented?
Questions and Discussion

http://googleprojectzero.blogspot.com/
@natashenka
natashenka@google.com