# **Getting gooey with GULOADER: deobfuscating the downloader**

**elastic.co**[/security-labs/getting-gooey-with-guloader-downloader](https://www.elastic.co/security-labs/getting-gooey-with-guloader-downloader)





# **Overview**

Elastic Security Labs continues to monitor active threats such as GULOADER, also known as  $CloudEye -$  an evasive shellcode downloader that has been highly active for years while under constant development. One of these recent changes is the addition of exceptions to its Vectored Exception Handler (VEH) in a fresh campaign, adding more complexity to its already long list of anti-analysis tricks.

While GULOADER's core functionality hasn't changed drastically over the past few years, these constant updates in their obfuscation techniques make analyzing GULOADER a time-consuming and resource-intensive process. In this post, we will touch on the following topics when triaging GULOADER:

- Reviewing the initial shellcode and unpacking process
- Finding the entrypoint of the decrypted shellcode
- Discuss update to GULOADER's VEH that obfuscates control flow
- Provide a methodology to patch out VEH

#### **Initial Shellcode**

In our [sample](https://www.virustotal.com/gui/file/6ae7089aa6beaa09b1c3aa3ecf28a884d8ca84f780aab39902223721493b1f99), GULOADER comes pre-packaged inside an NSIS (Nullsoft Scriptable Install System) installer. When the installer is extracted, the main components are:

**NSIS Script** - This script file outlines all the various configuration and installation aspects.



**System.dll** - Located under the  $p\text{-}$ LUGINSDir. This file is dropped in a temporary folder to allocate/execute the GULOADER shellcode.



**Shellcode** - The encrypted shellcode is buried into a nested folder.

One quick methodology to pinpoint the file hosting the shellcode can be done by monitoring ReadFile events from SysInternal's Process Monitor after executing GULOADER. In this case, we can see that the shellcode is read in from a file (Fibroms. Hag).



GULOADER executes shellcode through callbacks using different Windows API functions. The main reasoning behind this is to avoid detections centered around traditional Windows APIs used for process injection, such as CreateRemoteThread or

WriteProcessMemory. We have observed EnumResourceTypesA and CallWindowProcW used by GULOADER.



*EnumResourceTypesA Function Call inside GULOADER*

By reviewing the MSDN documentation for **[EnumResourceTypesA](https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/api/winbase/nf-winbase-enumresourcetypesa)**, we can see the second parameter expects a pointer to the callback function. From the screenshot above, we can see that the newly allocated shellcode is placed into this argument.

```
C++心 Copy
BOOL EnumResourceTypesA(
  [in, optional] HMODULE
                                             hModule,
                      ENUMRESTYPEPROCA lpEnumFunc,
   \lceil \text{in} \rceil\lceil \text{in} \rceilLONG_PTR
                                             lParam
);
```


*Shellcode from second parameter*

*EnumResourceTypesA call*

#### **Finding Main Shellcode Entrypoint**

In recent samples, GULOADER has increased the complexity at the start of the initial shellcode by including many different junk instructions and jumps. Reverse engineering of the downloader can require dealing with a long process of unwinding code obfuscation designed to break disassembly and control flow in some tooling, making it frustrating to find the actual start of the core GULOADER shellcode.

One methodology for finding the initial call can be leveraging graph view inside x64dbg and using a bottom-to-top approach to look for the call eax instruction.



Another technique to trace the initial control flow involves leveraging the reversing engineering framework [Miasm](https://github.com/cea-sec/miasm)**.** Below is a quick example where we can pass in the shellcode and disassemble the instructions to follow the flow:

from miasm.core.locationdb import LocationDB from miasm.analysis.binary import Container from miasm.analysis.machine import Machine

```
with open("proctoring_06BF0000.bin", "rb") as f:
    code = f.read()
```

```
loc_db = LocationDB()
c = Container.from_string(code, loc_db)
```

```
machine = Machine('x86_32')
mdis = machine.dis_engine(c.bin_stream, loc_db=loc_db)
mdis.follow_call = True
mdis.dontdis_retcall = True
asm_cfg = mdis.dis_multiblock(offset=0x1400)
```
Miasm cuts through the 142 jmp instructions and navigates through the junk instructions where we have configured it to stop on the call instruction to EAX (address: 0x3bde).

JMP loc\_3afd -> c\_to:loc\_3afd loc\_3afd MOV EBX, EAX FADDP ST(3), ST PANDN XMM7, XMM2 JMP loc\_3b3e -> c\_to:loc\_3b3e loc\_3b3e SHL CL, 0x0 PSRAW MM1, MM0 PSRLD XMM1, 0xF1 JMP loc\_3b97 -> c\_to:loc\_3b97 loc\_3b97 CMP DL, 0x3A PADDW XMM3, XMM5 PXOR MM3, MM3 JMP loc\_3bde -> c\_to:loc\_3bde loc\_3bde CALL EAX

*Tail end of Miasm*

# **GULOADER's VEH Update**

One of GULOADER's hallmark techniques is centered around its [Vectored Exception Handling](https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/debug/vectored-exception-handling) (VEH) capability. This feature gives Windows applications the ability to intercept and handle exceptions before they are routed through the standard exception process. Malware families and software protection applications use this technique to make it challenging for analysts and tooling to follow the malicious code.

GULOADER starts this process by adding the VEH using RtlAddVectoredExceptionHandler. Throughout the execution of the GULOADER shellcode, there is code purposely placed to trigger these different exceptions. When these exceptions are triggered, the VEH will check for hardware breakpoints. If not found, GULOADER will modify the EIP directly through the [CONTEXT structure](https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/api/winnt/ns-winnt-context) using a one-byte XOR key (changes per sample) with a one-byte offset from where the exception occurred. We will review a specific example of this technique in the subsequent section. Below is the decompilation of our sample's VEH:

```
if (ExceptionInfo->ExceptionRecord->ExceptionCode != EXCEPTION_ACCESS_VIOLATION )
  \{ExceptionCode = ExceptionInfo->ExceptionRecord->ExceptionCode;
    exception code = EXCEPTION ILLEGAL INSTRUCTION:
    if (ExceptionCode != EXCEPTION ILLEGAL INSTRUCTION )
    €
      exception code = EXCEPTION PRIV INSTRUCTION;
      if (ExceptionCode != EXCEPTION PRIV INSTRUCTION )
        exception_code = EXCEPTION_SINGLE_STEP;
        if (ExceptionCode != EXCEPTION SINGLE STEP )
        ₹.
          exception code = EXCEPTION BREAKPOINT;
          if (ExceptionCode != EXCEPTION BREAKPOINT )
                                                                                            Decompilation of VEH
            return sub 76B3FA5(ExceptionInfo);
        <sup>}</sup>
      \mathcal{E}<sup>1</sup>
LABEL 8:
    cxt record = des MonitorHardwareBreakpoints(exception code);
    des::modify_EIP(&cxt_record->_Eip, (cxt_record->_Eip + 7), v4);
    return -1;P
  exception code = 0x10000;
  if ( SLODWORD(ExceptionInfo->ExceptionRecord->ExceptionInformation[0]) <= 0x10000 )
    goto LABEL_8;
  return sub_76B3FA5(ExceptionInfo);
₹
```
Although this technique is not new, GULOADER continues to add new exceptions over time; we have recently observed these two exceptions added in the last few months:

- **EXCEPTION PRIV INSTRUCTION**
- EXCEPTION\_ILLEGAL\_INSTRUCTION

As new exceptions get added to GULOADER, it can end up breaking tooling used to expedite the analysis process for researchers.

#### **EXCEPTION\_PRIV\_INSTRUCTION**

Let's walk through the two recently added exceptions to follow the VEH workflow. The first exception

(EXCEPTION\_PRIV\_INSTRUCTION), occurs when an attempt is made to execute a privileged instruction in a processor's instruction set at a privilege level where it's not allowed. Certain instructions, like the example below with [WRSMR](https://www.felixcloutier.com/x86/wrmsr) expect privileges from the kernel level, so when the program is run from user mode, it will trigger the exception due to incorrect permissions.



*triggered by wrmsr instruction*

#### **EXCEPTION\_ILLEGAL\_INSTRUCTION**

This exception is invoked when a program attempts to execute an invalid or undefined CPU instruction. In our sample, when we run into Intel virtualization instructions such as vmclear or vmxon, this will trigger an exception.

EIP.	$\bullet$ 07697630	66:0FC730	mclear qword ptr ds [eax]		
	$\bullet$ 07697634	0000	add byte ptr ds: [eax] al		
	$\bullet$ 07697636	008A BB88BAE2	add byte ptr ds: [edx-1D457745].cl		
	$\bullet$ 0769763C	09B0 7FEF8B13	or dword ptr ds: [eax+138BEF7F] esi		
	$\bullet$ 07697642	88FD	mov ch.bh		
	$\bullet$ 07697644	2953 3D	sub dword ptr ds: [ebx+3D], edx		
	$\bullet$ 07697647	DD <sub>08</sub>	fisttp qword ptr ds: [eax].st(0)		
	$\bullet$ 07697649	46	inc esi		
	<b>00769764A</b>	8A45 E7	mov al byte ptr ss: ebp-19		
<b>Command:</b> Commands are comma separated (like assembly instructions): mov eax, ebx					
First chance exception on 07697630 (C000001D, EXCEPTION, ILLEGAL, INSTRUCTION) Pauser					

*EXCEPTION\_ILLEGAL\_INSTRUCTION triggered by vmclear instruction*

Once an exception occurs, the GULOADER VEH code will first determine which exception code was responsible for the exception. In our sample, if the exception matches any of the five below, the code will take the same path regardless.

- EXCEPTION\_ACCESS\_VIOLATION
- EXCEPTION\_ILLEGAL\_INSTRUCTION
- **EXCEPTION PRIV INSTRUCTION**
- EXCEPTION\_SINGLE\_STEP
- EXCEPTION\_BREAKPOINT

GULOADER will then check for any hardware breakpoints by walking the CONTEXT record found inside the **[EXCEPTION\\_POINTERS](https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/api/winnt/ns-winnt-exception_pointers)** structure. If hardware breakpoints are found in the different debug registers, GULOADER will return a 0 into the CONTEXT record, which will end up causing the shellcode to crash.



*GULOADER monitoring hardware breakpoints*

If there are no hardware breakpoints, GULOADER will retrieve a single byte which is 7 bytes away from the address that caused the exception. When using the last example with  $vmclear$ , it would retrieve byte (0x8A).

seg000:07697630 66 0F C7 30		vmclear gword ptr [eax]	
seg000:07697630			
seg000:07697634 00		db	
seg000:07697635 00		db	GULOADER retrieves a single byte.
seg000:07697636			
seg000:07697636 00 8A BB 88 BA E2		[edx-1D457745h], cl add	
seg000:0769763C			

*7 bytes away from the instruction, causing an exception*

Then, using that byte, it will perform an XOR operation with a different hard-coded byte. In our case (0xB8), this is unique per sample. Now, with a derived offset 0x32 (0xB8 ^ 0x8A), GULOADER will modify the EIP address directly from the CONTEXT record by adding 0x32 to the previous address (0x7697630) that caused the exception resulting in the next code to execute from address (0x7697662).

seg000:07697630 66 0F C7 30 vmclear qword ptr [eax] seg000:07697630 segg00:07697634 00 db  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ 000:07697635 00  $\theta$ Se db seg000:07697636 -----g000:07697636 00 8A BB 88 BA E2 add [edx-1D457745h], cl eg000:0769763C eg000:0769763C loc 769763C: ; CODE XREF: sub 76826A3+14FB9↓j  $[ear+138BEF7Fh]$ , esi eg000:0769763C 09 B0 7F EF 8B 13 on ch, bh g000:07697642 88 FD mov stg000:07697644 29 53 3D sub [ebx+3Dh], edx se 000:07697647 DD 08 fisttp qword ptr [eax] seg 000:07697649 46 inc. esi seg 00:0769764A 8A 45 E7 al, [ebp-19h] mov seg0 0:0769764D CC ; Trap to Debugger int В. seg000:0769764E 29 BC A4 A3 C6 B4 sub [esp+var\_4C4B395D], edi seg00 :0769764E B3 seg000 07697655 83 BE 49 E5 1B 9E dword ptr [esi-61E41AB7h], 0FFFFFF96h  $CMD$ seg000:07697655 96 seg000:0769765C 79 DE jns short loc 769763C seg000:0169765E 94 xchg eax, esp seg000:07 9765F 4F dec edi short near ptr loc\_7697692+2 inz seg000:07697662 81 AD E2 01 00 00 dword ptr [ebp+1E2h], 0EEB913B3h sub ; CODE XREF: seg000:076976D34j seg000:07697662 B3 13 B9 EE seg000:0769766C 0F 01 1B lidt fword ptr [ebx] seg000:0769766F C9 leave

*Junk instructions in between exceptions*

With different junk instructions in between, and repeatedly hitting exceptions (we counted 229 unique exceptions in our sample), it's not hard to see why this can break different tooling and increase analyst time.

### **Control Flow Cleaning**

To make following the control flow easier, an analyst can bypass the VEH by tracing the execution, logging the exceptions, and patching the shellcode using the previously discussed EIP modification algorithm. For this procedure, we leveraged [TinyTracer](https://github.com/hasherezade/tiny_tracer), a tool written by [@hasherezade](https://twitter.com/hasherezade) that leverages [Pin](https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/developer/articles/tool/pin-a-dynamic-binary-instrumentation-tool.html), a dynamic binary instrumentation framework. This will allow us to catch the different addresses that triggered the exception, so using the example above with vmclear, we can see the address was 0x7697630, generated an exception calling KiUserExceptionDispatcher, a function responsible for handling user-mode exceptions.

Once all the exceptions are collected and filtered, these can be passed into an IDAPython script where we walk through each address, calculate the offset using the 7th byte over and XOR key (0xB8), then patch out all the instructions generating exceptions with short jumps.

The following image is an example of patching instructions that trigger exceptions at addresses 0x07697630 and 0x0769766C.





Below is a graphic representing the control flow graph before the patching is applied globally. Our basic block with the vmclear instruction is highlighted in orange. By implementing the VEH, GULOADER flattens the control flow graph, making it harder to trace the program logic.



*GULOADER's control flow flattening obfuscation*

After patching the VEH with jmp instructions, this transforms the basic blocks by connecting them together, reducing the complexity behind the flow of the shellcode.



Using this technique can accelerate the cleaning process, yet it's important to note that it isn't a bulletproof method. In this instance, there still ends up being a good amount of code/functionality that will still need to be analyzed, but this definitely goes a long way in simplifying the code by removing the VEH. The full POC script is located [here](https://github.com/elastic/labs-releases/tree/main/tools/guloader/guloader_FixCFG.py).

# **Conclusion**

GULOADER has many different features that can break disassembly, hinder control flow, and make analysis difficult for researchers. Despite this and the process being imperfect, we can counter these traits through different static or dynamic processes to help reduce the analysis time. For example, we observed that with new exceptions in the VEH, we can still trace through them and patch the shellcode. This process will set the analyst on the right path, closer to accessing the core functionality with GULOADER.

By sharing some of our workflow, we hope to provide multiple takeaways if you encounter GULOADER in the wild. Based on GULOADER's changes, it's highly likely that future behaviors will require new and different strategies. For detecting GULOADER, the following section includes YARA rules, and the IDAPython script from this post can be found [here](https://github.com/elastic/labs-releases/tree/main/tools/guloader/guloader_FixCFG.py). For new

updates on the latest threat research, check out our [malware analysis section](https://www.elastic.co/security-labs/topics/malware-analysis) by the Elastic Security Labs team.

# **YARA**

Elastic Security has created different YARA [rules](https://github.com/elastic/protections-artifacts/blob/main/yara/rules/Windows_Trojan_Guloader.yar) to identify this activity. Below is an example of one YARA rule to identify GULOADER.

```
rule Windows_Trojan_Guloader {
    meta:
       author = "Elastic Security"
       creation_date = "2023-10-30"
       last_modified = "2023-11-02"
       reference_sample = "6ae7089aa6beaa09b1c3aa3ecf28a884d8ca84f780aab39902223721493b1f99"
        severity = 100
        arch = "x86"threat_name = "Windows.Trojan.Guloader"
       license = "Elastic License v2"
        os = "windows"
    strings:
        $djb2_str_compare = { 83 C0 08 83 3C 04 00 0F 84 [4] 39 14 04 75 }
        $check_exception = { 8B 45 ?? 8B 00 38 EC 8B 58 ?? 84 FD 81 38 05 00 00 C0 }
        $parse_mem = { 18 00 10 00 00 83 C0 18 50 83 E8 04 81 00 00 10 00 00 50 }
        $hw_bp = { 39 48 0C 0F 85 [4] 39 48 10 0F 85 [4] 39 48 14 0F 85 [7] 39 48 18 }
        $scan_protection = { 39 ?? 14 8B [5] 0F 84 }
    condition:
        2 of them
}
```
# **Observations**

All observables are also available for **download** in both ECS and STIX format.

The following observables were discussed in this research.



#### **References**