

SSRF: send arbitrary POST requests into local networks

[HackerOne report #1037411](#) by yvvdf on 2020-11-18, assigned to [@dcouture](#):

[Report](#) | [How To Reproduce](#)

Report

Hello,

Prometheus integration service allows to issue any POST requests into local network.

Steps to reproduce

1. In any existing project (or create a new one), goto Settings/Integrations/Prometheus
2. Setting the following parameters:
 - Active: check
 - API URL: `https://gitlab.com` (or any url)
 - Google IAP Audience Client ID: `test` (or any string)
 - Google IAP Service Account JSON: `{"token_credential_uri": "http://localhost:1234/arbitrary-query=x=y", "private_key": "512"}`
3. Click "Test" button, gitlab will hit `localhost:1234` (e.g. open a web server at port 1234 to receive the requests)

Impact

The SSRF allows attackers to issue arbitrary POST requests into local network. The impact will be different, depending on which services are running on the local network. For example, if there exists a docker daemon that is listening on localhost2375, then attackers may read any files by issuing a POST request to build an image from remote dockerfile. With your permission, I will try to discover gitlab.com .

Output of checks

This bug happens on GitLab.com

Impact

The SSRF allows attackers to issue arbitrary POST requests into local network. The impact will be different, depending on which services are running on the local network. For example, if there exists a docker daemon that is listening on localhost2375, then attackers may read any files by issuing a POST request to build an image from remote dockerfile. With your permission, I will try to discover gitlab.com .

How To Reproduce

Please add [reproducibility information](#) to this section:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Edited 1 year ago by [Dominic Couture](#)

⬇️ Drag your designs here or [click to upload](#).

Tasks 0

No tasks are currently assigned. Use tasks to break down this issue into smaller parts.

Linked items 0

Link issues together to show that they're related or that one is blocking others. [Learn more](#).

Related merge requests 1


[Support IAP protected prometheus installations](#)
133508 13.1 🧑🏻 🧑🏻 ⚠️

Activity

[GitLab SecurityBot](#) changed due date to January 17, 2021 [2 years ago](#)

[GitLab SecurityBot](#) added [Weakness](#) [CWE-918](#) [priority](#) 2 [severity](#) 2 scoped labels [2 years ago](#)

[GitLab SecurityBot](#) added [HackerOne](#) [security](#) labels [2 years ago](#)


**Dominic Couture** [@dcouture](#) · [2 years ago](#)

Developer

Hello [@mnchr](#) 🙌! We received a report for a POST SSRF vulnerability in the prometheus integration.

This appears to be because of the [gooleauth](#) gem that obviously doesn't use `GitLab::HTTP`.

https://gitlab.com/gitlab-org/gitlab/-/blob/c39c15466fe929a22b070d6a3ad3024c5551fde/app/models/run/pjct_services/prometheus_service.rb#L187

**Dominic Couture** [@dcouture](#) · [2 years ago](#)

Developer

The reporter stated that `Google::Auth::Credentials.new` also accepts a filename as an argument and while it doesn't seem to be exploitable at the moment, we should probably block that and make sure the parsed JSON `.is_a?(Hash)`.

Hi Dominic,

Thank you for triaging. Otherwise, going further in google auth method, I found a *potential* vulnerable that can occur on gitlab and I think that gitlab should fix it.

`Prometheus service` calls `Google::Auth::Credentials.new` by giving a hash object that is generated from JSON string given by users via `google_iap_service_account_json` variable.

```
def iap_client
  @iap_client ||= Google::Auth::Credentials.new(Gitlab::Json.parse(google_iap_service_account_json), t
end
end
```

In fact, the function `Google::Auth::Credentials.new` accepts also a *string as file name* then it will read json content from that file. Imagine if we set value of `Google IAP Service Account JSON` to `"tmp/tata"` (the opened and closed quotes are important as `Gitlab::Json.parse` will generate a string)... If the file does not validate json format, an exception will be thrown with content of the file.

Currently the exception is printed out to execution log of gitlab. Thus, it is only a *potential* vuln (and we know what happens if attackers are able to find an endpoint to request prometheus service and it returns the bug message.)

Regards,

Please [register](#) or [sign in](#) to reply

[Dominic Couture](#) added [group](#) [ecosystem \(DEPRECATED\)](#) [discuss](#) [create](#) scoped labels [2 years ago](#)

[GitLab SecurityBot](#) [@gitlab-securitybot](#) · [2 years ago](#)
[@devdev](#) [@leapt](#) This issue is ready for triage as per [HackerOne process](#).

About this automation: [AppSec Escalation Engine](#)

[GitLab SecurityBot](#) added [security-set-milestone](#) label [2 years ago](#)

[GitLab Bot](#) added [section](#) [dev](#) scoped label [2 years ago](#)

[GitLab SecurityBot](#) [@gitlab-securitybot](#) · [2 years ago](#)

@devin, This [search](#) [2](#) [security](#) issue has no milestone yet. (For remediation goals, please see [Severity and Priority Labels on -security issues](#))

About this automation: [AppSec Escalation Engine](#)

Lukas 'Eini' Eipert @leipert · 1 year ago

Developer

@mmohr If it relates to the Prometheus integrations it sounds like --"group:monitor".

Bringing this to your attention. @crystalpoole!

Lukas 'Eini' Eipert added group respond · [previous](#) [monitor](#) scoped labels and automatically removed group ecosystem (DEPRECATED) · [delete](#) [create](#) labels 1 year ago

Crystal Poole @crystalpoole · 1 year ago

Developer

@ck3q @vdesousa Can you triage this and decide how it can be resolved? @splattael has ideas for a couple of options.

@sarahwaldner I'm adding this to [%13.0](#)

Sarah Waldner @sarahwaldner · 1 year ago

Developer

Thank you @crystalpoole

Peter Leitzen @splattael · 1 year ago

Maintainer

@crystalpoole Thanks for pingin 🙏

My ideas were:

- [Validate](#) token_credential_uri the same we're doing with [GitLab::Http](#)
 - Maybe it's worth extracting this code to encourage use for future cases
- Check if IAP JSON input is a Hash to prevent users passing a string which [is treated a filename](#)

Dominic Couture @dcouture · 1 year ago

Developer

Because the actual HTTP request doesn't come from our code, the challenge here will be to avoid a Time of Check/Time of Use bug where the attacker could use DNS rebinding to have a valid non-local URL when we validate it but change the DNS record to an internal IP when the library issues the request.

I'm aware I'm just dropping this without offering a solution, I'll keep thinking about it and try to contribute something more helpful if I have a good idea. 🙏

Peter Leitzen @splattael · 1 year ago

Maintainer

@dcouture Thanks for jumping on a call with me and clarifying 🙏

[Validating](#) the token_credential_uri before handing it off to the googleauth gem does not prevent DNS rebinding because we'd need to reuse the resolved IP (see https://gitlab.com/gitlab-org/gitlab/-/blob/54b1afcb381d7733c1bca3947e41eafa08f6350/lib/gitlab/http_connection_adapter.rb#L124) during the HTTP call and we cannot control the gem code.

One idea could be to just block the property token_credential_uri to be set by users and exclude it from the JSON. We'd need to check whether users are actually providing this property for good use beforehand though 🙏

@akohlbecker Do you remember use cases where it'd make sense for users to set token_credential_uri ? 🙏

Peter Leitzen @splattael · 1 year ago

Maintainer

@dcouture It seems that one can configure a connection by [passing additional options](#) to [Google::Auth::Credential::is_new](#). So, there's hope that we can perform the very same checks as well 🙏

Edited by Peter Leitzen 1 year ago

Adrien Kohlbecker @akohlbecker · 1 year ago

Developer

@splattael @dcouture I wasn't really familiar with how this parameter can be used, however I have done some quick research and for reference:

- This is the MR that introduced the functionality in GitLab [21508 \(merged\)](#)
- In google-auth-library-ruby this is the MR that added support for reading this property from the JSON. (It doesn't have details on why that would be needed, unfortunately) <https://github.com/googleapis/google-auth-library-ruby/pull/251>. However, this shows that the default behavior when not provided is to use google's token endpoint.
- In signet which is the underlying auth gem, they say this property is used to issue tokens and refresh outdated ones automatically, which would explain the outgoing request https://github.com/googleapis/signet/blob/cd5d793055d99e188b81a4210e717ddb4071fa3/lib/signet/oauth_2/client.rb#L37-L39

My inclination would be to strip this property or maybe prevent the form from being valid if a user has it set. Given that this feature is intended to be used with Google IAP, we probably don't need to support any other token issuer, so resetting it to google-auth-library-ruby's default seems the right call.

I would also second taking a look in the prod DB and see if any user has it set and what values they used, which could inform the decision.

Let me know your thoughts!

Peter Leitzen @splattael · 1 year ago

Maintainer

@akohlbecker Thank you so much for your research 🙏

This is great to know that we potentially can strip this dangerous property since it's much easier than verifying (to protect from DNS rebinding) the URL in the googleauth gem 🙏

On #database-lab I've tried to find out who's actually google_iap_service_account_json with token_credential_uri:

Overall

```
SELECT count(*) FROM "services" WHERE "services"."type" = 'PrometheusService' and properties like '%google_'
```

Result: Aggregate (cost=43259.43..43259.44 rows=1 width=8) (actual time=48.489..48.491 rows=1 loops=1)

rows=1 !

With token_credential_uri

```
SELECT count(*) FROM "services" WHERE "services"."type" = 'PrometheusService' and properties like '%google_'
```

Result: Aggregate (cost=43259.40..43259.41 rows=1 width=8) (actual time=38.887..38.889 rows=1 loops=1)

rows=1 ! !

So we have a single user on GitLab.com who uses google_iap_service_account_json but also passed token_credential_uri. This might be the HackerOne reporter 🙏

I'll ask for its contents in #production - 🙏

Edit: See <https://gitlab.com/gitlab-com/qi-infra/infrastructure/-/issues/12291>

Edited by Peter Leitzen 1 year ago


Adrien Kohlbecker @akohlbecker · 1 year ago

Developer

Hey @splattael I just ran your query 🙏

```
[ gprd ] production: res = ActiveRecord::Base.connection.execute(%(SELECT properties FROM "services" WHERE
=> #<PG::Result:0x0007f6b18a598 status=PGRES_TUPLES_OK ntuples=2 nfields=1 cmd_tuples=2>
[ gprd ] production: res[0]
=> {"properties"=>{"api_url":"https://gitlab.com/","google_iap_service_account_json":"{}","token_cred
[ gprd ] production: res[1]
=> {"properties"=>{"api_url":"https://gitlab.com/","google_iap_service_account_json":"{}","token_cred
```

So these seem to be dummy values.

**Peter Leitzen** @solattai · 1 year ago


[@ak-chibacker](#) Thanks a lot for getting this data 🙏

REDACTED seems to be connected but does not respond on port 80 🤔 🤔


```
$ curl http://REDACTED/
curl: (7) Failed to connect to REDACTED port 88: Connection refused
```

Let's block token_credential_url then 🙏

Edited by [Peter Leitzen](#) 1 year ago


**Dominic Couture** @dcouture · 1 year ago


yvdfw is the username of the person reporting this through HackerOne, definitely test data.

**Vitor Meireles De Sousa** @vdesousa · 1 year ago

Thanks [@dcouture](#) for handling that while i was out! 🙏


Please [register](#) or [sign in](#) to reply


[GitLab SecurityBot](#) @[gitlab-security-bot](#) · [1 year ago](#)
[@crystalpools](#) · [@ClemMakesApps](#) This [security](#) [2](#) [security](#) issue has an active milestone, but currently no assignee(s).
 About this automation: [AppSec Escalation Engine](#)

 **Peter Leitzen** @splattae · 1 year ago Maintain

https://qilab.com/qilab-org/security/qilab/-/merge_requests/1204 attempts to fix this issue.

/cc [@drcouture](#)



Peter Leitzen @solltael · 1 year ago

Async issue update

Please provide a quick summary of the current status (one sentence).

Fix created and MR (target **master**) is in **backflow in review**.


When do you predict this feature to be ready for maintainer review?

It is in review and 3 more backport MR to follow after successful approval.

Are there any opportunities to further break the issue or merge request into smaller pieces (if applicable)?

No

Costel Maxim @cmaxim · 1 year ago Developer

 [GitLab SecurityBot](#) @gitlab-security-bot · 1 year ago


This [security](#) [issue](#) was closed 30 days ago and may become public.

Please ensure the following items are true and add a ☒ reaction:


- Issue description and comments do not contain sensitive data belonging to GitLab.
- Issue does not reveal private information of the reporter (i.e. session ID's, passwords).

If the issue needs to stay confidential, please add the [\[security-confidential\]](#) label.

If you removed confidential data from the issue description before making it public, make sure that the description history entry is deleted.

 **Peter Leitzens** @[solattae](#) · 1 year ago

I've redacted potential private information in [#284819 \(comment 484809681\)](#).

 **Peter Leitzens** @[solattae](#) · 1 year ago

Making this issue public.

[Please register or sign in](#) to reply

 Dominic Couture changed the description 1 year ago

Please [register](#) or [sign in](#) to reply