



NASA Goddard

How to use ks-nav for a feasible and meaningful test campaign in the Kernel

Alessandro Carminati, Luigi Pellecchia

Agenda

- Introduction to ks-nav
- Testing challenges in the Linux Kernel
- Complexities and challenges
 - Indirect call
 - ftrace
 - High interdependency between kernel functions
- Example of ks-nav usage
- Conclusions





Introduction to ks-nav

What is ks-nav?

• A toolset that analyzes the Linux kernel binary and produces diagrams to simplify and visualize kernel complexity.

Why Analyze the Binary?

- Avoids challenges of source code analysis (macros, build process, compiler quirks).
- Provides accurate insights directly from the compiled artifact.

Core Features:

- Subsystem-aware diagrams.
- Static call trees.
- Global data usage visualization.







The Testing Problem

Limitations of Coverage-Based Testing

- Coverage Without Context:
 - Coverage tools indicate which parts of the kernel were executed but lack details about the source.
- Test Suites and kcov Compatibility:
 - Test frameworks like LTP and kselftest were not initially designed to work with kcov, complicating the process of extracting coverage data.
- Critical Path Uncertainty:
 - High code coverage can be misleading, as it may omit safety-critical paths in the context of a specific functionality due to their inclusion while testing other functionalities.
- Need for Test-Specific Tracing:
 - Tools like ftrace enable a fine-grained view of test-only paths, allowing precise mapping of code exercised during a specific test campaign.







ks-nav Workflow

Highlighting Test Execution vs. Possible Execution Paths

- Static Call Tree Generation:
 - ks-nav performs static analysis, producing the call tree for a given top-level API.
 - This tree represents all theoretically reachable paths in the code.
- Analysis of Static Call tree and definition of Critical Path
 - > Ks-nav provides simplified views of the code.
 - Expert driven activity aimed to provide a list of critical path that need to be tested.
- Dynamic Matching with Test Data:
 - ftrace collects execution data during tests, creating a runtime call tree.
- Ensuring Coverage of Critical Paths:
 - Runtime tree is matched against the static call tree for granular function-level coverage.
 - Critical paths identified and explicitly verified against the runtime data.







Indirect Calls' Challenge

Challenge of Analyzing Indirect Calls in ks-nav

- Nature of Indirect Calls:
 - Indirect calls are extensively used in driver-based architectures like the Linux kernel.
 - These calls delegate execution to functions resolved only at runtime.
 - Some architectures may implement these calls with additional obfuscation to mitigate vulnerabilities (e.g., Spectre).
- Binary Analysis Limitation:
 - Enumeration of possible targets from the binary image alone is impractical due to complexity.

		indirect1
		indirect2
0xffffffc08001e068 0xffffffc08001e06c	010080d2 80023fd6	mov x1, 0 blr x20 cmp k0 1
0X111111000015010	11040071	Cirip we, 1 ≯indirect5
		indirect?





Indirect Calls' Impact

Effect of Indirect Calls on ks-nav Diagrams

- Interruption of Call Tree Exploration:
 - Indirect calls halt the static exploration of code paths.
 - The resulting ks-nav diagram ends at the indirect call, leaving the downstream paths unexplored.
- Impact on Diagram Completeness:
 - Critical execution paths may remain unrepresented in the call tree.
 - This incompleteness can obscure potential issues and hinder coverage assessment.







Indirect Calls: a Solution

Indirect Calls on ks-nav possible solution

- Unique Opportunity in Kernel Context:
 - Unlike generic software, the kernel includes all possible code paths in a given build.
 - This makes it possible to statically enumerate possible targets, even if the exact runtime call remains unknown.
- Potential for Recovery via ftrace:
 - ftrace logs provide the actual runtime resolution of indirect calls.
 - These logs enable amendment of the ks-nav diagram by re-running ks-nav with ftrace-informed APIs.







ftrace Limitations' challenge

Root Cause Investigation

- Instrumentation Assumption:
 - Assumed available_filter_functions = kallsyms noinstr.
 - Reality: Not all functions in kallsyms are included in available_filter_functions.
- Compiler Behavior:
 - > Functions must be instrumented for ftrace to log them.
 - Apparently static linkage functions can miss instrumentation code due to compiler optimization.
- Complexity of Mechanism:
 - Not a straightforward not in log relationship.
 - Compiler optimizations and directives impact instrumentation unpredictably.





ftrace Limitations' impact

Impacts on Graph Generation

- Gap in Instrumentation:
 - Some functions are excluded from ftrace logging, leading to incomplete execution data.
- Graph Inaccuracy:
 - Missing log entries cause root nodes for new, disconnected graphs.
 - Key relationships and execution paths are misrepresented.
- Impact on the analysis:
 - Critical execution paths cannot be fully traced.
 - Results in unreliable testing
 - completeness assessments.









ftrace Limitations: a Solution

What can be done for this?

- Change Compilers flags to make this event more unlikely
- Enhance ftrace produced graphs by integrating information from the ks-nav database in the post processing phase.







High interdependency

The Challenge of Visualizing Kernel Call Trees

- **Observation:** Analysis of the call tree reveals a significant subset of functions with a high and identical number of reachable arches.
- Implication: These functions form a tightly interconnected core, where each function can potentially reach the others.
- **Challenge:** Simplifying such a dense graph by collapsing subgraphs into single nodes is not feasible due to the pervasive interdependencies.
- **Consequence:** Efforts to reduce complexity for visualization and analysis are hindered by this inherent structural characteristic.
- **Solution:** Use subsystem to have the graph partitioned, or use a different strategy, like interrupt graph exploration. graph_tool supports both strategies.

arm64_sys_execve

.....







Example: ks-nav in Action







Future Work

- Indirect Call Handling in ks-nav
 - Current Challenge: Indirect calls interrupt call tree exploration in static analysis.
 - Planned Approach:
 - Extract indirect call positions from the binary.
 - Use debug info and **libclang** to identify the object type and resolve potential targets from source code.
 - Introduce support for architectures with unique binary-level indirect call mechanisms.
- ftrace Log Translation Improvements
 - Current Challenge: Some log entries lack clear parent-child relationships, leaving certain functions unlinked.
 - Possible Solution:
 - Leverage the ks-nav database to identify and connect seemingly unlinked functions.
 - Explore automated heuristics to establish missing connections.
- General Enhancements to ks-nav
 - > Improve scalability for larger kernels and architectures.
 - Promote ks-nav from commandline tool and add a web based interface to navigate the code while analyzing graphs. I prefer graphviz layout, but for speed's sake, I'm also considering other javascript based libraries like viz.js





Thanks Q&A





Problems: Duplicate Symbols - Causes

Duplicate Symbol Causes

- Static Symbols in Separate Compilation Units:
 - The linker ignores static symbols, allowing multiple functions with identical names across different object files.
- Header File Inlines:
 - Functions or data defined in headers and compiled in multiple units can result in multiple identical symbols.
 - Inline directives are suggestions, not guarantees... non-inlined functions become duplicates.
- Macro-Based Function Variations:
 - C files that include other C files (e.g., compat_binfmt_elf.c) generate symbols with slight variations due to macros, but retain the same name.
- Compiler Optimizations:
 - Compiler heuristics for inlining and static linkage introduce unpredictable symbol duplication.







Problem: Duplicate Symbols - Consequences

Impact on ks-nav and Analysis

- Ambiguous Node Mapping:
 - Duplicate symbols can map same function to multiple nodes, causing misinterpretations.
- Ambiguous names:
 - In cases of same-named but distinct functions, can generate confusion when diagrams are read.
- Testing Challenges:
 - Duplicate symbols complicate identifying critical execution paths, skewing coverage and safety verification.



Same function defined in headers



