


New issue

Jump to bottom

## DTLS Fingerprints in SDP Offer/Answer are not verified #1708

 Closed gaukas opened this issue on Mar 17, 2021 · 9 comments

gaukas commented on Mar 17, 2021 • edited

### Your environment.

- Version: pion/webrtc v3.0.14
- Browser: N/A
- Other Information - reproducible with example/data-channels-create & example/data-channels

### What did you do?

- Run both `data-channels-create` and `data-channels` from example.
- Once the SDP offer has been generated, decode it with base64.
- Randomly edit the DTLS fingerprint value in the SDP offer
- Copy & paste the base64-encoded SDP offer into the waiting `data-channels`
- Copy & paste the SDP answer generated by `data-channels` into `data-channels-create`

### What did you expect?

The built-in fingerprints verification should throw an error and therefore prevent the data-channel from being established.

### What happened?

The data channel was created as usual.

```
ICE Connection State has changed: checking
ICE Connection State has changed: connected
Data channel 'data'-'824635660400' open. Random messages will now be sent to any connected DataChannels every 5 seconds
Sending 'SBFBWYafZaFZDIv'
Message from DataChannel 'data': 'EtaKTfGg1NgpNn'
```

Sean-Der commented on Mar 17, 2021

Member

Hey @gaukas

We do have a test for this `TestInvalidFingerprintCausesFailed` that is properly catching this. I will confirm this works and update as appropriate thanks for filing this!

 1

 Sean-Der closed this as completed in [c901d6f](#) on Mar 17, 2021

Sean-Der commented on Mar 17, 2021

Member

Hey @gaukas what browser are you using to test?

I believe the remote peer isn't the one properly asserting.

thanks

gaukas commented on Mar 17, 2021

Author

I am not using any browser. The offerer is `data-channels-create` and the answerer is `data-channels`. Both are go binaries.

gaukas commented on Mar 17, 2021

Author

It may not be that simple because I tried to mess with both fingerprints in offer and answer. The data channel was still created successfully.

gaukas commented on Mar 17, 2021

Author

@Sean-Der but thank you for the fast response! I really appreciate it. Please let me know if there's anything else I could help with.

Sean-Der commented on Mar 17, 2021 • edited

Member

Ah I see. So the issue is that we set `PeerConnectionState` to failed, but we don't actually tear down the connections.

I will fix that and tag a new release. This probably even warrants a CVE! If you are interested, good for resume and helps people update quicker.

gaukas commented on Mar 17, 2021

Author

Just for your reference, attached is the log from both instances, in which 2 bytes from the fingerprint in the offer (generated by `data-channels-create`) have been altered.

◀ [REDACTED] ▶

◀ ▶

✖ 465865e

Merged

 1

✖ 9a1da17

✓ 545613d

Thanks for the fast response! Now I see the problem has been fixed.

No one assigned

None yet

None yet

No milestone

No branches or pull requests

2 participants

