

Applying dynamic taint propagation in order to enforce domain driven security

FREDRIK ADOLFSSON

Master in Computer Science

Date: February 14, 2018

Supervisor: Musard Balliu

Examiner: Mads Dam

Swedish title: Tillämpa dynamic taint propagation för att
genomdriva domändriven säkerhet

School of Computer Science and Communication

Abstract

Sammanfattning

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Definitions	2
1.2	Problem	2
1.3	Aim	2
1.4	Delimitations	2
1.5	Methodology	2
2	Background	4
2.1	Web Application	4
2.2	Security Vulnerabilities	5
2.2.1	Injection	5
2.2.2	Cross-site Scripting	7
2.3	Dynamic Taint Propagation	7
2.4	Domain Driven Security	8
3	Implementation	10
3.1	Plain (Bad name)	10
3.2	Taint Propagation?	10
3.3	Domain Driven Security	10
4	Result	11
5	Discussion	12
6	Future Work	13
7	Conclusion	14
	Bibliography	15

Chapter 1

Introduction

One of the greatest strengths with deploying applications on the World Wide Web (web) is that they are accessible from everywhere where there exists a internet access. This is sadly one of its greatest weaknesses as well. The applications is easily accessible for people who wishes to abuse or cause them harm. Among the number of security risks that a web application is vulnerable to is two of the more common Injection Attack and Cross-Site Scripting. [14, 4]

To minimize the risk of accidentally introducing security flaws in to the application have a variety of tools and methodologies been created. One of these is the programming paradigm called Domain Driven Security which aim to secure applications by focusing on the core domain models and making certain that validation of the value object is correct. [12, 22, 9] Another example is Dynamic Taint Analysis which marks input from the user as tainted trough a taint variable attached to the input. This taint variable follows the input trough out the system and propagates into the other variables it comes in contact with. The taint value is later checked in sensitive areas trough something called sinks. Execution is halted if a tainted variable is detected trying to enter the sensitive area trough the sink. [16, 21]

The following sections of the chapter will aim to specify the why and how behind the conduction of the thesis. It starts with a section of *Definitions* followed by description of the *Problem* and explanation of the *Aim* of the thesis. These sections is then followed by a *Delimitations* section and then lastly is there a section about *Methodology* behind the thesis execution.

1.1 Definitions

Trough out this thesis will a consistent terminology be used. Some terms might be new or it might just be able to use it in different ways. To remove confusion will a list of definitions be introduced in this section.

Definition 1.1.1. Application is used to denote a computer process witch is constructed to solve one or more tasks for the user.

Definition 1.1.2. Domain is explained in Secure by Design [12] as part of the real world where something happens.

Definition 1.1.3. Domain Model is a fraction of the domain where each model have a specific meaning.

1.2 Problem

Is it possible to enforce the programming paradigm Domain Driven Security trough Dynamic Taint Propagation. What drawbacks and advantages would there be.

1.3 Aim

The aim of this thesis is to evaluate the possible drawbacks and advantages a implementation of Dynamic Taint Propagation can have on a web application and the developer.

1.4 Delimitations

The thesis will focus on security risks of web applications. Even though other application areas might be vulnerable to the same kind of vulnerabilities have this delimitation been drawn to keep the scope small and precise.

1.5 Methodology

The methodology of this thesis is a combination of quantitative and qualitative research. The first part of the thesis, which consists of the

literature study followed by reasoning about detainting rules, is based on quantitative research. The Second part of the thesis is to evaluate the implemented Dynamic Taint Propagation tool. This is done in a quantitative manner where test evaluating performance and functionality will be conducted.

Chapter 2

Background

This Chapter will present some background knowledge with needed information to comprehend the chapters that follow. The chapters starts with a generally description about how a web application work which then is followed by two of the most common security vulnerabilities to a web application. After that is the two recourses Dynamic Taint Propagation and Domain Driven Security introduced.

2.1 Web Application

The most common architectural design for a web application is based on three tiers. The first is the presentation tire which is the visual components rendered by a browser. The second is the logic tire which can be seen as the brain of the application. The last and third is the storage tier, where the second tier can store data as needed. [3]

LÄGG TILL BILD PÅ STRUKTUREN

As can be seen in picture **BILD** dose the tiers only communicate with the tire closest to itself. This causes the second tire to become a safe guard for the tire three where the valuable information for a attacker lies. The storage tier contains all the information the application needs to provide the wanted service. Such information might for example be name, email, personal number and credit card information. [3]

2.2 Security Vulnerabilities

The organization Open Web Applications Security Project, mostly known for its shortening (OWASP), is a online community which aim to help to secure web applications. [14] OWASP produces a report about the top 10 security risks with a web application. The report contains information about the ten most common application security risks that for the current year. Information such as how the security risk is exploited and possible prevention method is also presented. [15] This report will look at the number one and eight security risks of 2017 which is injection attacks and cross-site scripting. [15]

2.2.1 Injection

The most common security risk is Injection Attacks. [15] A Injection Attack is any attack where the attacker's input changes the intent of the execution and executes malicious code. Common result of Injection Attacks are file destruction, lack of accountability, denial of access and data loss. [20]

There is two kinds of different Injection Attacks. These two are SQL Injection and Blind SQL Injection. [20] Both will be described below.

SQL Injection

SQL Injection is when a SQL query is tampered with which then results in gaining data from the database which were not intended. Listing 2.1 displays a possible SQL Query which is open to SQL Injections. This is due to the fact that the variable `UserId` is never validated before it is being used to query the database. [3, 20]

Listing 2.1: Code Acceptable to SQL Injection

```
userId = userInput
"SELECT_*_FROM_Users_WHERE_userId=_ " + userId
```

The query will work as intended as long as the user input, notated with *userInput*, only is a user id. But what happens if the user input is *10 or 1 = 1*? This user input would result in the query seen in listing 2.2.

Listing 2.2: SQL Injection

```
SELECT * FROM Users WHERE userId = 10 or 1 = 1
```

This query would result in that the database returns the whole table of users since the second or parameter is always true. This problem can be prevented in a couple of different ways. The first is through validation of the input. In our example do we expect the input to be an Integer. By verifying that the input as seen in listing 2.3 can we protect the query from being injected with unwanted commands.

Listing 2.3: Preventing SQL Injection through Verification

```
userId = userInput
isInteger(userId)
"SELECT_*_FROM_Users_WHERE_userId=_ " + userId
```

A second more common alternative is to use SQL Parameters which handles the verification for the user. This leaves the verification and validation of input up to the SQL engine. Our example written with SQL Parameters can be seen in listing 2.4.

Listing 2.4: Preventing SQL Injection through SQL Parameters

```
userId = userInput
sqlQuery = "SELECT_*_FROM_Users_WHERE_userId=_@0"
db.Execute(sqlQuery, userId)
```

Blind SQL Injection

Blind SQL Injection is very similar to SQL Injection. The only difference is that the attacker does not receive the wanted information from the database. The information is instead received by monitoring variables such as how long time the response took or what kind of error messages it returns. An example of the first is to create a Blind SQL Injection where the query tells the SQL engine to sleep depending on a condition. An example of this can be seen in listing 2.5. [3, 20]

Listing 2.5: Time Based Blind SQL Injection

```
SELECT * FROM Users WHERE userId = 1 WAITFOR DELAY '0:0:5 '
```

The second variant of Blind SQL Injection is by analyzing the error messages and depending on what they return build a image off the wanted answer. [3, 20]

2.2.2 Cross-site Scripting

Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) have been a vulnerability since the beginning of the internet. One of the first XSS attacks created just after the release of JavaScript. The attack was passible by loading another website into a frame on the site that the attacker controls. The attacker could then trough JavaScript access any content that is visible or typed into the loaded frame. To prevent this from being possible were the standard of Same-Origin Policy which restricted JavaScript to only access content on it's own origin. [7, 18]

But the introduction of the Same-Origin Policy did not stop the attackers from preforming XSS attacks. The next wave of attacks were mostly towards chat roms where it was possible to inject JavaScript tags into the input of the message. Which would then later be reflected by the server itself, when displaying the message for other users, and thereby bypassing the Same-Origin Policy. [7]

Reflected vs Persistent

2.3 Dynamic Taint Propagation

Taint propagation, also known as taint analysis and taint checking [SOURCE NEEDED?], is a tool to analyse the flow of information in a domain. [16] It works by giving input data a tainted property which follows the data and propagate onto other data which it is in contact with. The taint property is later checked in security sensitive sinks. [16]

Perl and Ruby are two programming languages which have adapted to user dynamic taint checking. [17, 10] And there are some tools who enables taint checking for other languages such as TaintDroid [11] and FlexTaint [21].

Two of OWASP top 10 application security risks of 2017 is Injection and Cross-Site Scripting (XSS). [15] Protection against these two attacks are best done by validating input data which taint propagation reminds and forces the developer to do.

2.4 Domain Driven Security

There exists a plethora of tools who aim to help in the process of developing complex domain models, but Domain Driven Design (DDD) is not one of them. [2, 8] DDD is more of a thought process and methodology to follow every step of the process. [6] In *Domain-driven design reference: definitions and patterns summaries* do Evans [5] describe DDD through three core ideas:

- Focus on the core domain.
- Explore models in a creative collaboration of domain practitioners and software practitioners.
- Speak a ubiquitous language within an explicitly bounded context.

The core domain is the part of your product that is most important and often is your main selling point compared to other similar products. [13] A discussion and even possible a documentation describing the core domain is something that will help the development of the product. The idea is to keep everybody on the same track heading in the same direction. [6]

The second idea is to explore and develop every model in collaboration between domain practitioners, who are experts in the given domain, and software developers. This ensures that important knowledge needed to successfully develop the product is communicated back and forth between the two parties. [13] The third idea is important to enable and streamline the second. By using a ubiquitous language will miscommunication between domain and software practitioners be minimized and the collaboration between the two parties can instead focus on the important parts which is to develop the product. [5]

Evans [5] do as well argue about the weight of clearly defining the bounded contexts for each defined model, and this needs to be done

in the ubiquitous language created for the specific product. The need of this exists because of the otherwise great risk of misunderstandings and erroneous assumptions in the collaborations between the different models. [13]

Wilander [22] and Johnsson [9] created 2009 a blog post each in a synchronous manner where they together introduces the concept of Domain Driven Security (DDS) to the public. They describe DDS as the intersection between Domain Driven Design (DDD) and application security. DDD is about developing complex domain models and one of the most basic rule of application security is to always validate input data. DDS in other hand, is about the importance of creating and maintaining domain models who are reflecting the product correctly and they are validated so they cant be populated with erroneous data. [22, 9, 1, 19]

Chapter 3

Implementation

3.1 Plain (Bad name)

3.2 Taint Propagation?

3.3 Domain Driven Security

Chapter 4

Result

Chapter 5

Discussion

Chapter 6

Future Work

Chapter 7

Conclusion

Bibliography

- [1] Johan Arnör. “Domain-Driven Security’s take on Denial-of-Service (DoS) Attacks”. In: (2016), p. 54. URL: <http://kth.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:945831/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- [2] Steven C Bankes. “Tools and techniques for developing policies for complex and uncertain systems Introduction: The Need for New Tools”. In: (). URL: http://www.pnas.org/content/99/suppl%7B%5C_%7D3/7263.full.pdf.
- [3] Justin Clarke-Salt. *SQL Injection Attacks and Defense, 2nd Edition*. eng. Syngress, June 2009. ISBN: 9781597499736.
- [4] Michael Cross. *Developer’s guide to web application security*. eng. Rockland, MA: Syngress Publishing, 2007. ISBN: 1-281-06021-6.
- [5] Eric Evans. *Domain-driven design reference: definitions and patterns summaries*. Dog Ear Publishing, 2015.
- [6] Eric Evans. *Domain-driven design : tackling complexity in the heart of software*. eng. Boston, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 2004. ISBN: 0-321-12521-5.
- [7] Seth Fogie. *XSS attacks cross-site scripting exploits and defense*. eng. Burlington, MA: Syngress, 2007. ISBN: 1-281-06024-0.
- [8] Rabia Jilani et al. “ASCoL: A Tool for Improving Automatic Planning Domain Model Acquisition”. In: *AI*LA 2015 Advances in Artificial Intelligence*. Ed. by Marco Gavanelli, Evelina Lamma, and Fabrizio Riguzzi. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 438–451. ISBN: 978-3-319-24309-2.
- [9] Dan Bergh Johnsson. *Dear Junior - Letters to a Junior Programmer: Introducing Domain Driven Security*. 2009. URL: <http://dearjunior.blogspot.se/2009/09/introducing-domain-driven-security.html> (visited on 01/25/2018).

- [10] *Locking Ruby in the Safe*. URL: <http://ruby-doc.com/docs/ProgrammingRuby/html/taint.html> (visited on 01/25/2018).
- [11] Jianan Ma. "TaintDroid : An Information- - Flow Tracking System for Realtime Privacy Monitoring on Smartphones Jianan Ma Problem Contribution / Implementation Details Questions / Suggestions". In: (2010), p. 3.
- [12] FIX ME!!! *Secure by Design*. FIX ME!!!, 2018.
- [13] Scott Millett. *Patterns, principles, and practices of domain-driven design*. Wrox, a Wiley brand, 2015.
- [14] Open Web Application Security Project. OWASP. URL: https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Main%7B%5C_%7DPage (visited on 02/01/2018).
- [15] OWASP. "OWASP Top 10 - The Ten Most Critical Web Application Security Risks". In: *Owasp* (2017), p. 22. URL: https://www.owasp.org/images/7/72/OWASP%7B%5C_%7DTop%7B%5C_%7D10-2017%7B%5C_%7D%7B%5C_%7D28en%7B%5C_%7D29.pdf.pdf%7B%5C_%7D0Ahttp://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en%7B%5C_%7DbtnG=Search%7B%5C_%7Dq=intitle:OWASP+Top+10+-2010%7B%5C_%7D1.
- [16] Jinkun Pan, Xiaoguang Mao, and Weishi Li. "Analyst-oriented taint analysis by taint path slicing and aggregation". In: *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering and Service Sciences, ICSESS 2015-November* (2015), pp. 145–148. ISSN: 23270594. DOI: 10.1109/ICSESS.2015.7339024.
- [17] *perlsec - perldoc.perl.org*. URL: <http://perldoc.perl.org/perlsec.html> (visited on 01/25/2018).
- [18] *Same Origin Policy - Web Security*. URL: https://www.w3.org/Security/wiki/Same%7B%5C_%7DOrigin%7B%5C_%7DPolicy (visited on 02/07/2018).
- [19] Jonas Stendahl. "Domain-Driven Security". In: (2016), p. 39. URL: <http://kth.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:945707/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.

- [20] Praveenkumat H Subbulakshmi T. *Secure Web Application Deployment Using Owasp Standards: An Expert Way of Secure Web Application Deployment*. Createspace Independent Publishing Platform, 2017.
- [21] Guru Venkataramani et al. "FlexiTaint: A programmable accelerator for dynamic taint propagation". In: *Proceedings - International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture* (2008), pp. 173–184. ISSN: 15300897. DOI: 10.1109/HPCA.2008.4658637.
- [22] Johan Wilander. *OWASP Sweden: Domändriven säkerhet / Domain-Driven Security*. 2009. URL: <http://owaspsweden.blogspot.se/2009/09/domandriiven-sakerhet-domain-driven.html> (visited on 01/25/2018).