


Exploiting known vulnerabilities,
misconfigurations and weaknesses in native
protocols to compromise Windows Active
Directory Domains with a focus on traceability
and ease of use.

Søren Fritzboøger - s153753

Vejledt af Henrik Tange

20. Januar 2019

DTU



Danmarks Tekniske Universitet

Abstract

Abstract here

Table of contents

Abbreviations	4
1 Introduction	5
1.1 Problem background	5
1.2 Problem brief	5
2 Initial foothold	6
2.1 Spoofing	6
2.1.1 NBNS - NetBIOS Name Resolution	6
2.1.2 LLMNR - Link-local Multicast Name resolution	6
2.2 Credential acquiring	6
2.2.1 Credential types	6
2.2.2 SMB	8
2.2.3 HTTP	8
3 Attack methods	8
3.1 LSASS secrets	8
3.1.1 Impacket wmiexec	8
3.1.2 Mimikatz	8
3.2 secretsdump	8
4 Reconnaissance	8
5 Implementation	8
5.1 Technologies	8
5.1.1 ASP.NET Core	8
5.1.2 SignalR	8
5.1.3 VueJS	8
5.2 Considerations	8
5.2.1 Modularity	8
5.2.2 Ease of use	8
5.2.3 Traceability	8
5.3 Storage	8
6 Discussion	8
6.1 Ethics	8
7 Conclusion	8
List of Figures	9
References	9

Abbreviations

AV Antivirus. 5

IDS Intrusion Detection System. 5

LLMNR Link-local Multicast Name resolution. 5

NBNS NetBIOS Name Resolution. 5

SIEM Security Information and Event Management. 5

1 Introduction

1.1 Problem background

When performing a pentest on Windows Active Directory environments, one of the goals is usually to obtain Domain Administrator privileges, usually in the form of a Domain Admin account. There are numerous ways to gain initial foothold in an Active Directory Domain, but the most common one is by exploiting the native protocols NetBIOS Name Resolution (NBNS) and Link-local Multicast Name resolution (LLMNR)[2] to gain crackable hashes which can be bruteforced offline. Hereafter a number of different techniques and exploits can be used to gain additional credentials, but it usually consists of dumping cached credentials on domain joined hosts in one way or another.

As one can easily figure out this is usually a manual job where many different tools are joined together to produce the right result. This usually means it is a trivial and easy job, which requires a lot of time that can be spent on more advanced tasks. This is often done with tools not written by the pentester themselves, which can pose a security risk as the tools can be backdoored or otherwise have security vulnerabilities.

One of the objectives of a pentest is usually to be as silent as possible and not trigger any alerts in any Intrusion Detection System (IDS), Security Information and Event Management (SIEM) or similar systems. The risk of using publicly available tools is therefore also that the tools are highly likely to be detected by Antivirus (AV) and will often trigger unwanted alerts.

Another issue of performing pentests is to document and remember the order of tasks that were done. A pentest usually concludes with a report where the necessary steps are explained to the customer, and this includes in what order tasks were done and which user credentials were used.

1.2 Problem brief

The purpose of this project is to determine whether a proper solution to the aforementioned problem can be found, and to analyze how such a tool can be developed. The problem is split in two, where the first goal is to gain an initial foothold and the second is to gain Domain Administrator privileges. To accomplish this the many techniques and methods will be discussed and evaluated in comparison to each other, and the most valid solution will be implemented in a piece of software that aims to be easy to use and contain a high level of traceability.

The developed piece of software must be able to be easy to use so that an incentive to use it instead of other tools is created. It should be constructed with AV evasion in mind, such that it will not be detected by AVs. Furthermore it must be designed with traceability in mind, such that a clear timeline can be constructed and documented.




Figure 1: SMB NTLM authentication[1]

2 Initial foothold

2.1 Spoofing

2.1.1 NBNS - NetBIOS Name Resolution

2.1.2 LLMNR - Link-local Multicast Name resolution

2.2 Credential acquiring

2.2.1 Credential types

LM

NT

NTLM

NetNTLMv1

NetNTLMv2




Figure 2: Test figure

2.2.2 SMB

2.2.3 HTTP

3 Attack methods

3.1 LSASS secrets

3.1.1 Impacket wmiexec

3.1.2 Mimikatz

3.2 secretdump

4 Reconnaissance

5 Implementation

5.1 Technologies

5.1.1 ASP.NET Core

5.1.2 SignalR

5.1.3 VueJS

5.2 Considerations

5.2.1 Modularity

5.2.2 Ease of use

5.2.3 Traceability

5.3 Storage

6 Discussion

6.1 Ethics

7 Conclusion

List of Figures

1	SMB NTLM authentication[1]	6
2	Test figure	7

References

- [1] Microsoft. *NTLM Over Server Message Block (SMB)*. URL: <https://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/cc669093.aspx> (visited on 11/15/2018).
- [2] Georgia Weidman. *Scenario-based pen-testing: From zero to domain admin with no missing patches required*. URL: <https://www.computerworld.com/article/2843632/security0/scenario-based-pen-testing-from-zero-to-domain-admin-with-no-missing-patches-required.html> (visited on 11/15/2018).