

Products

What's new

Sarvicas

Publications

Resources

Follow @Openwall on Twitter for new release announcements and other news [prev] [next>] [thread-next>] [day] [month] [year] [list]

Date: Thu, 30 Jun 2022 02:18:33 -0400

From: Demi Marie Obenour <demi@...isiblethingslab.com>

To: Open Source Software Security <oss-security@...ts.openwall.com>

Subject: GnuPG signature spoofing via status line injection

Background

After discovering that gpgv does not support
--exit-on-status-write-error, I decided to check if it handles write
errors on the status file descriptor properly. I ultimately found that
while such errors are *not* handled properly, exploiting this flaw in
practice would likely be very difficult and unreliable. However, in the
course of this research (and entirely accidentally), I found that if a
signature has a notation with a value of 8192 spaces, gpg will crash
while writing the notation's value to the status FD. This turned out to
be a far more severe flaw, with consequences including the ability to
make a signature that will appear to be ultimately valid and made by a
key with any fingerprint one wishes.

Prerequisites for exploitation

For an attack to be possible, the attacker must control the secret part of at least one key in the victim's keyring. The key does *not* need to be trusted, however. Depending on the calling code, the attack may work even if the key is revoked or the signature is expired. However, if the program requires that *all* signatures be valid (instead of merely *any* signature being valid), then a revoked or expired key cannot be used.

Additionally the code calling GnuPG must either not read status data until end of file, or satisfy both of the following:

- It uses a lax parser that is tolerant of invalid status lines.
- It does not treat a non-zero exit code from GnuPG as an error.

It turns out that gpgme satisfies both requirements, so programs using gpgme are vulnerable. Since gpgme is the recommended way to use GnuPG from a program, I believe that the number of applications that are vulnerable is very large.

Impact

If the attacker controls the secret part of any signing-capable key or subkey in the victim's keyring, they can provide a correctly-formed signature that some software, including gpgme, will believe to have a validity and signer fingerprint of the attacker's choosing. The consequences of this are highly application-dependent, but are likely to be serious. In an email client, this could allow spoofing emails, while in a system using key fingerprints for access control, this could allow for an access control bypass.

Solution

I recommend cherry-picking upstream commit 34c649b3601383cd11dbc76221747ec16fd68elb, which can be found at https://dev.gnupg.org/rG34c649b3601383cd11dbc76221747ec16fd68elb. Afterwards, it will be necessary to rebuild and reinstall GnuPG. No security advisory has been issued by upstream, no patch release is planned, and no CVE has (to my knowledge) been requested. Distributions will need to carry this as an out-of-tree patch until the next upstream release is made. For those using GnuPG on Windows, the only solution will be to build from source.

This does not fix the handling of write errors on the status file descriptor. However, I believe that exploiting the mishandling of such errors is not feasable in general. On the other hand, the out of bounds

read can be reliably exploited.

Proof of concept

I have attached a public key, a revoked version of that key, and two signatures made by the key. Both signatures are of the empty string; you can pass /dev/null if the program takes a file instead. simple-exploit-sig.asc will not work if the key is revoked or expired, while revoked-exploit-sig.asc *may* work even if the key is revoked or expired.

Details

The bug

GnuPG does not provide an OpenPGP or S/MIME library. Instead, gpg, gpgv, and gpgsm all support writing machine-readable text to a user-provided file descriptor, which is set via the --status-fd command-line argument. Other programs and libraries then parse this output to extract information about what GnuPG has done.

In the case of gpg and gpgv, all status output goes through one of the functions in g10/cpr.c. The one of interest here is write_status_text_and_buffer(), of which the relevant part is reproduced below.

```
356 do
357
358
         if (dowrap)
359
             es fprintf (statusfp, "[GNUPG:] %s ", text);
360
             count = dowrap = 0;
361
             if (first && string)
362
363
364
                 es fputs (string, statusfp);
                 count += strlen (string);
365
366
                  /* Make sure that there is a space after the string. */
                 if (*string && string[strlen (string)-1] != ' ')
367
368
369
                     es putc (' ', statusfp);
370
                     count++;
371
372
               }
373
             first = 0;
374
375
         for (esc=0, s=buffer, n=len; n && !esc; s++, n--)
376
             if (*s == '%' || *(const byte*)s <= lower limit
377
378
                 || *(const byte*)s == 127 )
379
               esc = 1;
380
             if (wrap && ++count > wrap)
381
               {
382
                 dowrap=1;
383
                 break;
384
               }
385
           }
386
         if (esc)
387
388
             s--; n++;
389
390
         if (s != buffer)
391
           es fwrite (buffer, s-buffer, 1, statusfp);
392
         if (esc)
393
             es fprintf (statusfp, "%%%02X", *(const byte*)s);
394
395
             s++; n--;
396
          }
397
         buffer = s;
398
         len = n;
399
         if (dowrap && len)
400
           es putc ('\n', statusfp);
401
402
    while (len);
```

When writing the data of a notation subpacket, GnuPG requests that

write_status_text_and_buffer() wrap the output at 50 bytes if the notation is marked as human-readable, or 250 bytes otherwise. 'buffer' points to the (unsanitized) notation data, and 'length' is the length of that data. For the subsequent discussion, I will only consider human-readable notations. Adapting the exploit to use binary notations is easy and is left as an exercise for the reader.

If byte 50 needs escaping, esc will be set to 1 on line 379, causing the loop to exit. Line 388 will undo the effect of the s++, n-- on line 375, but this will in turn be undone by line 395. Therefore, line 397 will increase `buffer` by 50.

Now suppose the next byte also needs escaping. This time, line 380 will break out of the loop, so the s++, n-- on line 375 will be skipped. However, the s--; n++ on line 388 will still run, so s is now one *less* than buffer. Subtracting them will thus return -1, which becomes SIZE_MAX when converted to size_t. As a result, es_fwrite() will try to write the rest of the address space to the status stream, starting with byte 51 of the notation data.

Exploitation

The result of the bug is that es_fwrite() will write bytes to the status stream (with no escaping) until it hits unmapped memory and segfaults. The first bytes written, in particular, come from the notation data itself. Therefore, they are fully controlled by the attacker. The only restriction is that the first byte must be one that needs to be escaped, but this turns out to be no restriction at all.

Suppose that the the first byte injected is a newline. At this point, the status stream is at the start of a line, and the attacker can append any bytes of their choice to it. A good choice for the attacker would be:

[GNUPG:] VALIDSIG \$subkey_fpr \$date \$timestamp 0 4 0 22 10 00 \$primary_key_fpr [GNUPG:] TRUST ULTIMATE 0 pgp

Following the notation data, gpg will write a bunch more garbage from its heap before it eventually segfaults. This garbage is not valid status data, but it turns out that many programs do not care. Git stops at the first NUL byte and gpgme ignores any line that does not start with "[GNUPG:] ". Hence, this does not prevent exploitation.

Timeline

- 2022-06-10: Message sent to security@...pg.org requesting encryption keys for subsequent communication.
- 2022-06-10 through 2022-06-11: Message with encrypted subjects sent to GnuPG Security Team. These messages are automatically discarded by Werner Koch's email account.
- 2022-06-12: Message with unencrypted subject sent and received.
- 2022-06-13: Response asking for a specific case where a transient I/O error can happen, and acknowledging that the out-of-bounds read is real. Bug is not considered critical and so no immediate security release is planned.
- 2022-06-13: I respond mentioning ENOMEM and socket errors as potential transient write errors.
- 2022-06-14: Werner Koch commits 34c649b3601383cd1ldbc76221747ec16fd68e1b to the GnuPG git repository. From this commit, ticket T6027, and the test signature attached to T6027, it is easy to reverse-engineer the bug and create an exploit. There is no public mention that this is a security problem.

- 2022-06-15: I followed up stating that it may be possible to control the contents of the out-of-bounds memory and that this would make the bug much more severe.
- 2022-06-17: Werner responds stating that he has doubts as to whether this can be done easily, and noting that GPGME still needs to accept the injected data.
- 2022-06-17: I state that I am able to inject arbitrary data into the status output, and that the only reason Git is not vulnerable is because GnuPG eventually segfaults.
- 2022-06-18: I state that I can make GPGME mark a signature as "valid green" (the highest trust level) with whatever fingerprint I wish.
- 2022-06-19: Werner replies stating that he is not able to reproduce the injection of arbitrary data into the status output, though he can reproduce improper escaping.
- 2022-06-19: I state that the flaw is indeed less severe in git master.
- 2022-06-19: Via `git bisect`, I discover that 34c649b3601383cd11dbc76221747ec16fd68e1b is in fact the commit that fixed the vulnerability, and that arbitrary injection into the status line is possible on the immediately preceding commit 4dbef2addca8c76fb4953fd507bd800d2a19d3ec. I provide a reproducer.
- 2022-06-22: I request that this be marked as a security vulnerability and have a CVE assigned, and that an immediate security release be made. I note exactly what an attacker who exploits this vulnerability can do to a program relying on gpgme.
- 2022-06-29: As Werner Koch has stopped replyng to my emails, and since there is still no public indication that GnuPG has a security vulnerability (despite the patch already being public), I am publicly disclosing the issue.

Sincerely,
Demi Marie Obenour (she/her/hers)
Invisible Things Lab

Download attachment "key-without-revocation.asc" of type "application/octet-stream" (1209 bytes)

View attachment "revocation-certificate.asc" of type "text/plain" (1936 bytes)

View attachment "simple-exploit-sig.asc" of type "text/plain" (659 bytes)

View attachment "revoked-exploit-sig.asc" of type "text/plain" (704 bytes)

Download attachment "signature.asc" of type "application/pgp-signature" (834 bytes)

Powered by blists - more mailing lists

Please check out the Open Source Software Security Wiki, which is counterpart to this mailing list.

Confused about mailing lists and their use? Read about mailing lists on Wikipedia and check out these guidelines on proper formatting of your messages.

