Common Web Vulnerabilities

Common Web application vulnerabilities to discuss

- Buffer overflow
- SQL/command injection
- Client state manipulation
- Cross-site scripting (XSS)
- Cross-site request forgery (XSRF)

Buffer Overflow

• Example

```
int main() {
    if (login()) {
        start_session();
    }
    return 0;
}

int login() {
    char passwd[10];
    gets(passwd);
    return (strcmp(passwd, "mypasswd") == 0);
}

int start_session() {
    ...
}
```

- Q: main() -> login() -> start_session(). How does the system remember where to return after a function call?
 - * Structure of stack after call main() -> login()

- * Stack typically grows bottom up
- Q: What will happen if the user-input is longer than 10 characters?
 - * By making a local variable "overflow", a malicious user may jump to any part of the program
 - * Attack string: carefully constructed user input for attack
- Modern languages like Java, C#, JavaScript, etc., are mostly safe from buffer overflow attack
 - Java runtime engine actively checks for incorrect address, buffer overflow, array-bound checking, . . .
 - C++ STL string class actively checks for overflow
 - But of course, every code is bound to have a bug that may be exploited
 - NEVER use C str functions: gets, strcpy, strcat, sprintf,...

• Q: Any general solution?

- *Stackguard*: inserts random "canary" before return addr and checks corruption before return.
 - * Not a complete protection against buffer overflow, but covers most common attack
 - * -fstack-protector-all for gcc
- Most of all, NEVER trust user input!!!

SQL/command injection attack

• Q: Is there any problem with the following code?

```
SELECT price FROM Product WHERE prod_id = " + user_input + ";"
```

- Q: What if user_input is "1002 OR TRUE""?
- Q: What if user_input is "0; SELECT * from CreditCard"?
- CardSystems lost 263,000 card numbers through SQL injection vulnerability and was acquired by another company
- Q: Any problem?

```
system("cp file1.dat $user_input");
```

- Protection
 - Never trust user input! Reject unless absolutely safe
 - For SQL: prepared statements and bind variables
 - * Example

- * Invalid input cannot make it into SQL. It is filtered out during parsing
- Java Runtime.exec(command_string) executes the first word in the string as the command and the rest as the parameters.
 - * Not as vulnerable as C/C++/php/...
- JavaScript eval() is dangerous. Do NOT use it
- *Taint propagation* in Perl/Ruby
 - User supplied strings are marked "tainted"
 - If tainted string is used inside sensitive commands (SQL, shell,...) system generates error
 - Tainted string must be explicitly "untainted" by programmer
- To contain damage even after a successful attack
 - Give *only necessary privileges* to your application
 - Encrypt sensitive data in DBMS
 - * Never store user passwords in plain text!

Client state manipulation

• Q: Any problem?

```
<form>
<input type="hidden" name="price" value="5.50">
...
</form>
```

- Similar problems with cookies
- NEVER trust user's input!!!

• Q: How can we avoid the problem?

- 1. Authoritative state stays at the server
 - Idea: store values only at the server and send a session ID only
 - Session ID: random number generated by the server
 - To avoid stolen session id attack
 - * Pick a random session id from a large pool
 - * Make session id short lived
- 2. Send signed-states to client
 - Detect tempering by checking the signature
 - Make the state short-lived
 - * e.g., price fluctuation over time

Cross site scripting (XSS)

• Q: Any problem?

```
Welcome to $user_name$'s page!
```

- Q: What will happend if \$user_name is <script>hack()</script>?
- Note: If a page includes user input string, users may execute any JavaScript code!
- Q: How to protect?
 - Q: Do not allow any HTML tag?
 - * At the minimum, escape &, <, >, ", '

- Q: What if HTML tags must be allowed (like HTML email)?
- Q: What about ? \$user_url can be "javascript:attack-code;"!
- Note
 - Complete protection against all XSS attack is VERY difficult
 - Important to use white list as opposed to black list
 - Use both input validation and output sanitization

Cross site request forgery (XSRF)

- HTTP cookie
 - Arbitrary name/value pair set by the server and stored by client
 - Server -> client: Set-Cookie: foo=bar; path=/; domain=cs144.edu;
 - Client -> server: Cookie: foo=bar
 - Frequently used to track a user's login session
 - * Session cookies are "valid" only during a browser session
 - Q: Can a malicious page "see" cookie from another site?
 - Same-origin policy
 - * A script can access only the documents and cookies that are from the same site
 - * Cookies are sent back only to the same site
 - * Same-origin policy gives minimal data protection from malicious web sites
- Example
 - 1. A user visits http://victim.com and does not logged out
 - 2. The user visits the following page at http://evilsite.com

```
<form action="http://victim.com/transfer" onload="submit()
   ">
   <input type="hidden" name="amount" value="$1M">
   </form>
```

– Q: What will happen? Will http://victim.com reject the request?

• Note

- Due to same-origin policy, an attacker cannot "see" a session cookie from another site
- But XSRF still allows the attacker to "use" the cookie to send a request!
- Q: How to prevent it?
 - S1: Check Referrer header?
 - * Note: Referrer header may be missing for legitimate reasons
 - S2: Ask user password for every request?

• Action token

- Basic idea: make sure that a valid request from our page includes a "secret" that a malicious page cannot get
- Embed action token
 - 1. Generate an action token:
 - * Action token: secret-key signed signature of session ID
 - * We assume session ID is random, unique per session, short lived, and hard to guess
 - 2. Embed the action token as a hidden field in a form
- Verify action token
 - 1. Compute the action token of the request
 - 2. Take action only if it matches with the session ID
- Q: Can a malicious page obtain the action token from our page?