Rack parses encoded cookie names allowing an attacker to send malicious `_Host-` and `_Secure-` prefixed cookies

Share: f in Y

TIMELINE

etchto99 submitted a report to Ruby on Rails.

Jun 10th (3 ye

The rack cookie parser parses the cookie string using unescape. This allows a malicious attacker to set a second cookie with the name being percent encoded. Typically it would be expected that we cannot trust cookies and in most cases that's true. However in a couple of cases certain expectations are set. Cookies allow cookie prefixes on the cookie name to indicate to the browser certain attributes. In this case there are 2 special attributes we care about: __Secure__ and __Host__ When the browser sends these cookies to the server certain assumptions are be made around these cookies:

- 1. Secure- prefix: Cookies names starting with Secure- (dash is part of the prefix) must be set with the secure flag from a secure page (HTTPS).
- 2. Host-prefix: Cookies with names starting with Host-must be set with the secure flag, must be from a secure page (HTTPS), must not have a domain specified (and therefore aren't sent to subdomains) and the path must be

It should be noted that while the cookie spec recommends encoding for the value of a cookie it doesn't make any suggestions around the encoding of the name of cookie.

Here's a simple PoC test case which fails:

```
Wrap lines Copy Dov
Code 1 34 KiB
   1 # frozen_string_literal: true
  3 require relative 'helper'
  5 describe Rack::Utils, "malicious cookie" do
   6 \, # Fails and \_{\mbox{Host-evil}} reads the malicious value and sets it as the cookie
      # rather than reading the actual __Host cookie
     # Furthermore, browsers enforce HostOnly for `_Host-` cookies but they would
  10  # not enforce it for " %48ost" cookies so a malicious script could potentially
  # set this cookie knowing it would be parsed as the `_Host-` cookie
  12 #
  \, 13 \, \, # Lastly, when the cookie is made it could be set with the `.example.com` domain
  14
      # wildcard, thus a malicious script on a subdomain could set the cookie and it
  15 # would be parsed by the root domain
  16
  17
      # This is due to the cookie being unescaped, thus:
  18
      # URI.unescape("__%48ost-evil") => "__Host-evil"
  19 #
  20 # Currently fails, should be passing
  21
       it "doesnt parse malicious __Host cookie" do
         env = Rack::MockRequest.env_for("", "HTTP_COOKIE" => "__%48ost-evil=evil;_Host-evil=abc")
  22
  23
        cookies = Rack::Utils.parse_cookies(env)
  24
        cookies.must_equal({ "__%48ost-evil" => "evil", "__Host-evil" => "abc" })
  25
  27
      # Less of a security issue and more of a bug
  28
      it "generic foo=bar example" do
         env = Rack::MockRequest.env_for("", "HTTP_COOKIE" => "%66oo=baz;foo=bar")
  29
  30
         cookies = Rack::Utils.parse_cookies(env)
  31
         cookies.must_equal({ "%6600" => "baz", "foo" => "bar" })
  32 end
  33 end
```

An attacker could potentially set the cookie from a malicious script on a subdomain like so, bypassing any expectations around the attributes of the cookie:

```
Code 60 Bytes

Wrap lines Copy Dow

1 document.cookie = "_%48ost-evil=evil; domain=.example.com";
```

I should note I work for GitHub, I'm not sure if there's any conflict with payouts in this case (and I certainly don't want/need a payout), however should you chose to payout for this I'd like the money to be donated to charity. If possible could it please be donated to NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund their donaiton page be found here.

Impact

An attacker can control cookies by encoding creating a second cookie with the name url encoded. This means that the __Host-_ and __Secure-_ prefixed cookies be controlled. Furthermore, a malicious attacker could set this cookie from a subdomain and have it apply to the root domain, in which case the Rack would parse t attackers cookie.



n (xcoxte-namez) cambe any 00-700m characters, except control characters, spaces, or tabs. It also must not contain a separator character line the following. (7 a,;:\"/[]?={}. chto99 posted a comment. and a go at attempting to patch the issue today. I'm not sure if it's the most performant solution but I figured I'd help out where possible. I'm not too sure what's required in terms of backports but hopefully this can help kickstart a fix. 1 attachment: F864477: fix.patch nderlove (Ruby on Rails staff) posted a comment. offetchto99 what do you think about this as a patch? It's based off of your patch, but passes the test suite and should allocate fewer objects. If you think it will wo ${\tt can\,you\,send\,me\,a\,patch\,using\,\,\,\,git\,\,\,format-patch\,\,\,}so\,\,I\,\,can\,retain\,your\,contribution\,information?}$ 1 attachment: F866010: out.diff etchto99 posted a comment. Jun 12th (3 ye Hey atenderlove, here's a patch file created via format-patch. Feel free to touch up the commit message if rack follows any guidelines around commit messages Cheers! 1 attachment: F866020: 0001-When-parsing-cookies-only-decode-the-values.patch ack_mccracken posted a comment. Jun 12th (3 ye Hey @fletchto99, I've prepared the following advisory and final patchset. Let me know if you spot any errors. 3 attachments: F866114: 0001-2.1.3-When-parsing-cookies-only-decode-the-values.patch F866115: 0001-2.2.2-When-parsing-cookies-only-decode-the-values.patch F866122: 895727_advisory.txt tchto99 posted a comment. Jun 12th (3 ye Hey Jack. The advisory looks good. I just noticed I used my GitHub email for the patches. I've updated them to use my personal email. Besides that everything loo good, thanks! 2 attachments: F866148: 0001-2.1.3-When-parsing-cookies-only-decode-the-values.patch F866149: 0001-2.2.2-When-parsing-cookies-only-decode-the-values.patch O-tenderlove (Ruby on Rails staff) updated the severity to Low. Jun 15th (3 ye nderlove (Ruby on Rails staff) closed the report and changed the status to • Resolved. Jun 15th (3 ye This is shipped, thanks! tchto99 requested to disclose this report. Jun 15th (3 ye hanks @tenderlove and @jack_mccracken, unless there's any reservations any issues with disclosing? O-jack_mccracken agreed to disclose this report. Jun 16th (3 ye O- This report has been disclosed. Jun 16th (3 ye e Internet Bug Bounty has decided that this report is not eligible for a bounty.

I implication of the state of t

our bounty rules say).