

Site Search

Full Disclosure mailing list archives







List Archive Search

## [RT-SA-2020-004] Inconsistent Behavior of Go's CGI and FastCGI Transport May Lead to Cross-Site Scripting

From: RedTeam Pentesting GmbH <release () redteam-pentesting de> Date: Wed, 2 Sep 2020 09:16:14  $\pm$ 0200

Advisory: Inconsistent Behavior of Go's CGI and FastCGI Transport May Lead to Cross-Site Scripting The CGI and FastCGI implementations in the Go standard library behave differently from the HTTP server implementation when serving content. In contrast to the documented behavior, they may return non-HTML data as HTML. This may lead to cross-site scripting vulnerabilities even if uploaded data has been validated during upload.

# Details

Product: Go
Affected Versions: <= 1.14.7, 1.15
Fixed Versions: 1.14.8, 1.15.1
Vulnerability Type: Cross-Site Scripting
Security Risk: medium
Vendor URL: https://golanq.org
Vendor Status: fixed version released
Advisory URL: https://www.redteam-pentesting.de/advisories/rt-sa-2020-004
Advisory Status: published
CVE: CVE-2020-24553
CVE URL: https://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2020-24553

The Go standard library defines the ResponseWriter[1] interface in the net/http package for HTTP services. It allows serving content via arbitrary transports so the handler functions can be written without a specific transport in mind. The standard library contains an HTTP server implementation as well as CGI and FastCGI protocol implementations. The library also contains a mock implementation called ResponseRecorder[2] in the net/http/httpst package for use in testing. There may even be more implementations outside the standard library.

In Go, the documentation of the interface describes the behavior all implementations should conform to. For the Write() method of the interface, the following paragraph describes what happens if Write() is called when the HTTP header Content-Type is not set (via WriteHeader()):

// If WriteHeader has not yet been called, Write calls
// WriteHeader(http.StatusOK) before writing the data. If the Header
// does not contain a Content-Type line, Write adds a Content-Type set
// to the result of passing the initial 512 bytes of written data to
// betectContentType. Additionally, if the total size of all written
// data is under a few KB and there are no Flush calls, the
// Content-Length header is added automatically.

If no Content-Type header is specified explicitly, all implementations of the ResponseWriter interface should therefore use the first 512 bytes of the data passed to Write() to automatically detect and serve a sensible Content-Type according to the algorithm described in [3].

The HTTP server implementation as well as the ResponseRecorder mod implementation both exhibit the documented behavior. The CGI and F transports however were found to always set the Content-Type to "text/html; charset=utf-8".

For the CGI implementation, this can be found in net/http/cgi/child.go[4]:

```
func (r *response) WriteHeader(code int) {
       : (r 'respun...,
[...]
// Set a default Content-Type
if _, hasType := r.header["Content-Type"]; !hasType {
    r.header.Add("Content-Type", "text/html; charset=utf-8")
```

code looks similar for the FastCGI implementation in net/http/fcgi/child.go[5]:

```
func (r *response) WriteHeader(code int) {
   if r.wroteHeader {
                         return
           }
r.wroteHeader = true
if code == http.StatusNotModified {
    // Must not have body.
    r.header.Del("Content-Type")
    r.header.Del("Content-Length")
    r.header.Del("Transfer-Encoding")
} else if r.header.Get("Content-Type") == "" {
    r.header.Set("Content-Type", "text/html; charset=utf-8")
}
```

This difference in behavior leads to applications which depend on the behavior documented for implementations of the ResponseWriter interface becoming vulnerable to cross-site scripting when served via CGI or FastCGI. RedTeam Pentesting has discovered such vulnerable applications in the wild.

For example, consider a web application which allows uploading PDF files and pictures. During upload, the application checks (via the DetectContentType() mentioned in the documentation) that the uploaded content is either "application/pdf" or "image/png" and rejects all other data. When an uploaded file is requested again, the application does not

```
set a Content-Type header and depends on the auto detection. If the HTTP server from the standard library is used, the WriteHeader() method detects the content and sets the Content-Type header to either "application/pdf" or "image/png".
Attackers can generate a PNG file which includes a <script> tag with JavaScript in the comment field:
 $ convert \
              onvert \
-comment '<script>alert("RedTeam Pentesting")</script>' \
-size 1x1 xc:'#000000' exploit.png
The check during the upload process permits the file (because it is a valid PNG file). When the file is requested again, the Content-Type header is set to "image/png", the image is shown in the users' browsers and the embedded JavaScript code is not executed.
If the web application is run via CGI or FastCGI, it is now vulnerable to cross-site scripting. The upload process is exactly the same, but when the file is requested again, the Content-Type is set to "text/html". When users now access the file directly, it is interpreted as HTML and the embedded JavaScript code is executed.
 Proof of Concept
In the following, a small sample application is built which depends on the behavior documented for the ResponseWriter interface to return image data to HTTP clients. The source code is printed below:
package main
import (
   "encoding/base64"
   "flag"
   "log"
   "net"
   "net/http"
   "net/http/fcgi"
}
// generated with:
// convert // 
                                           er := flag.Bool("http", false, "run HTTP server instead of FastCGI")
            image, err := base64.StdEncoding.DecodeString(imageBase64)
if err != nil {
   panic(err)
}
            ln, err := net.Listen("tcp", "127.0.0.1:8001")
if err != nil {
    panic(err)
}
             handler := http.HandlerFunc(func(w http.ResponseWriter, req *http.Request) {
   w.Write(image)
            if *httpServer {
    // returns "Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8", safe
    log.Fatal(http.Serve(ln, handler))
} else {
    // returns "Content-Type: text/html", causes HTML/JavaScript to be interpreted
    log.Fatal(fcgi.Serve(ln, handler))
}
This program is started as follows:
 $ go mod init poc
It listens for FastCGI requests on the TCP port 8001.
 It can be served via FastCGI for example using nginx and the following
  configuration:
 daemon off;
pid /dev/null;
error_log /dev/stdout info;
 events {}
http {
              access log /dev/stdout;
             server {
                           listen 127.0.0.1:8000;
                           location / {
                                      fastcgi_pass localhost:8001;
include /etc/nginx/fastcgi_params;
             }
 The HTTP server can be run as follows:
$ nginx -c $PWD/nginx.conf
When the URL <a href="http://localhost:8000">http://localhost:8000</a> is opened in a browser, the JavaScript code is executed and a message box with the text "RedTeam Pentesting" is opened. This can also be verified using the command-line HTTP client curl as follows:
$ curl -i -o - http://localhost:8000
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Server: nginx/1.14.2
Content-Type: text/html; charset=utf-8
```

PNG[...]EXtcomment<script>alert("RedTeam Pentesting")</script>[...]

```
The same happens when the CGI transport is used.
When the sample program is run with the flag "-http", the HTTP server from the standard library is run instead on TCP port 8001:
 $ go run . -http
 Now the correct Content-Type header is returned:
$ curl -i -o - http://localhost;8001
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
 Content-Type: image/png
 PNG[...]
 Workaround
Applications should explicitly set a Content-Type via the Header().Set() method of the ResponseWriter interface. The relevant code from the sample application mentioned above then looks like this:
handler := http.HandlerFunc(func(w http.ResponseWriter, req *http.Request) {
    w.Header().Set("Content-Type", "image/png")
    w.Write(image)
The CGI and FastCGI implementations of the ResponseWriter interface should behave as documented and infer the Content-Type from the response data. This was implemented in Go versions 1.14.8 and 1.15.1 (the patch can be found here [7]).
 Security Risk
The risk of this vulnerability heavily depends on the concrete application at hand. If it depends on the documented behavior and is accessed via CGI or FastCGI and provides attackers a means to request data they can influence, this may lead to a cross-site scripting vulnerability.
When other users of the same application request the attackers' data, the embedded JavaScript code is executed and the attackers can interact with the web application in the user's name, display arbitrary content within the user's browser, and observe the user's interaction with the web application.
Considering the severe consequences and the requirements for exploitation (serving via CGI/FastCGI instead of HTTP), this vulnerability is rated as a medium risk.
 Timeline
2020-08-07 Vulnerability identified
2020-08-10 Vendor notified
2020-08-10 Vendor acknowledges receipt of report
2020-08-14 Vendor confirms security issues
2020-08-20 Vendor announces plans for a minor release of Go
2020-09-01 Vendor releases new version of Go, issue[6] is #40928, patch[7]
 References
        https://pkg.go.dev/net/http/?tab=doc#ResponseWriter
                                                                                 /
//ha9e10889976025ee1d027dh6h1cad383ec56de8/src/net/http/cgi/child_go#I.196-I.199
 RedTeam Pentesting GmbH
 RedTeam Pentesting offers individual penetration tests performed by a team of specialised IT-security experts. Hereby, security weaknesses in company networks or products are uncovered and can be fixed immediately.
As there are only few experts in this field, RedTeam Pentesting wants to share its knowledge and enhance the public knowledge with research in security-related areas. The results are made available as public security advisories.
 More information about RedTeam Pentesting can be found at:
 Working at RedTeam Pentesting
RedTeam Pentesting is looking for penetration testers to join our team in Aachen, Germany. If you are interested please visit: <a href="https://www.redteam-pentesting.de/jobs/">https://www.redteam-pentesting.de/jobs/</a>
 RedTeam Pentesting GmbH
Dennewartstr. 25-27
52068 Aachen
                                                                    Tel.: +49 241 510081-0
Fax : +49 241 510081-99
https://www.redteam-pentesting.de
Registergericht: Aachen HRB 14004
Patrick Hof, Jens Liebchen
 Germany
Geschäftsführer:
 Attachment: signature.asc
Description:
Sent through the Full Disclosure mailing list https://nmap.org/mailman/listinfo/fulldisclos
 Nttps://nmap.org/mailma
Web Archives & RSS: htt
```

By Date By Thread

Current thread:

### Site Search Nmap Security Scanner Npcap packet capture Security Lists Security Tools About Nmap Announce Vuln scanners About/Contact Ref Guide User's Guide Nmap Dev Password audit Privacy API docs Install Guide Full Disclosure Web scanners Advertising Docs Download Nmap Public Source License Open Source Security Wireless Download Npcap OEM

Exploitation

BreachExchange

Nmap OEM