New issue

## Filtering CSP entries to prevent bypassing rules #418



○ Closed mvgijssel opened this issue on Jan 21, 2020 · 8 comments

mvgijssel commented on Jan 21, 2020

Consider the following Rails controller action which overwrites the frame ancestors based on some user input:

user\_input\_domain1 = URI.parse "https://google.com;script-src" user\_input\_domain2 = URI.parse "https://\*;.;"
user\_input\_domains = [user\_input\_domain1, user\_input\_domain2] override\_content\_security\_policy\_directives(frame\_ancestors: whitelisted\_domains)

This results into the following response header:

frame-ancestors: https://google.com;script-src \*;

This shows unexpected output, because by setting the frame ancestors the user is able to change the script-src opening possibilities for XSS.

One solution to this would be to filter out the CSP rules inside of specific CSP rules:

frame\_ancestor = value.gsub('script-src','').gsub('img-src', '')

<u>4</u> 2

oreoshake commented on Jan 21, 2020

Contributor

Jump to bottom

Thanks for the report @mvgijssel. This is something @gregose had brought up a loooong time ago wrt to policy "injection" via semicolons.

I think the better approach would be to escape or raise errors upon seeing a semicolon mid-directive. I believe it would be better to raise an error but that could be breaking change, requiring a deprecation and major version bump

It's easy to say "don't do that" but what you appear to be doing is absolutely supported. Accepting user input into a policy seems to bypass the whole point of CSP, but sometimes a single nonperfect opt-out can help make the other 99% of the application safer until things can be rearchitected.

I should have fixed this a looooooong time ago, tech debt!

oreoshake commented on Jan 21, 2020

Contributor

This might be worth a security advisory as well.

bwillis commented on Jan 21, 2020

It's easy to say "don't do that" but what you appear to be doing is absolutely supported. Accepting user input into a policy seems to bypass the whole point of CSP, but sometimes a single non-perfect opt-out can help make the other 99% of the application safer until things can be rearchitected.

In the end your call, but it's surprising to me to be able to set a different CSP directive when you are explicitly stating frame\_ancestors. I would expect that the library would prevent you from abusing it in this way, regardless of where the input is coming from. Do you have any examples of a legitimate reason to use it in this way?

oreoshake commented on Jan 21, 2020

Contributor

I 199 agree that this behavior should be fixed. There's no legitimate reason that I can think of.

(<u>1</u> 4)

oreoshake added a commit that referenced this issue on Jan 21, 2020

escape semicolons by replacing them with spaces ...

3c4b86e

다소 This was referenced on Jan 21, 2020

Escape semi colons in directive source lists #419

( № Merged )

Escape semi colons in directive source lists in 3.x releases #420

**№** Merged

oreoshake added a commit that referenced this issue on Jan 21, 2020

escape semicolons by replacing them with spaces ...

