

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN

Report

Black Box Testing Report

Alexis Engelke, Johannes Fischer, Ralph Schaumann, Saurabh Nawalgaria





TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN

Report

Black Box Testing Report

Author: Alexis Engelke, Johannes Fischer, Ralph Schaumann, Saurabh Nawalgaria

Team: 9

Lecture: Secure Coding, Phase 2

Submission Date: November 24, 2015



Executive Summary

Contents

Ex	ecuti	ve Sun	nmary	ii	
1	Time Tracking				
2	Vulnerabiliteis Overview				
	2.1	Onlin	e Banking	2	
		2.1.1	Stored XSS in Registration and Transaction Description	2	
		2.1.2	Missing check for amount in transactions from batch file	2	
		2.1.3	SQL injection in transaction batch file	2	
		2.1.4	Some critical vulnerability	3	
	2.2	Secur	eBank	3	
3	Too	ls		4	
4	Detailed Report				
	4.1	Config	guration and Deploy Management Testing	6	
		4.1.1	Test File Extensions Handling for Sensitive Information	6	
		4.1.2	Test HTTP Methods	8	
		4.1.3	Test HTTP Strict Transport Security	9	
		4.1.4	Test RIA cross domain policy	10	
A	crony	ms		11	

1 Time Tracking

Table 1.1: Time Tracking Table

Name	Task	Time
Alexis Engelke	Setting up LaTeX template	1
Foo	Fixing all issues	10

2 Vulnerabiliteis Overview

Through our testing, we identified the following vulnerabilities as the most critical for the Online Banking application and the SecureBank:

2.1 Online Banking

2.1.1 Stored XSS in Registration and Transaction Description

• Likelihood: high

• Implication: high

• Risk: high

With stored cross site scripting attacks it is possible to inject JavaScript code, which is run whenever an employee logs in and opens the list of unapproved accounts or transactions. It is also possible to inject script from other sites.

2.1.2 Missing check for amount in transactions from batch file

• Likelihood: medium

• Implication: high

• Risk: high

It is possible to get money from another client of the bank by filling in a negative number in the amount field of a transaction batch file. Therefore, one client can generate an infinite amount of money, while reducing the amount of money of other clients.

2.1.3 SQL injection in transaction batch file

• Likelihood: medium

• Implication: high

• Risk: high

The application is vulnerable to SQL injections in the transaction batch files. Therefore, it is possible to perform transactions while using any unused TAN in the system, which is not known to the attacker and might come from another client.

2.1.4 Some critical vulnerability

• Likelihood: high

• Implication: high

• Risk: high

The web application is vulnerable.

2.2 SecureBank

3 Tools

4 Detailed Report

4.1 Configuration and Deploy Management Testing

4.1.1 Test File Extensions Handling for Sensitive Information

Online Banking

Observation We found various files which are served as plain text but are

PHP source files. One of these files contains the credentials of the mail server. We were also able to download the compiled executable as well as the source code of the batch

file parser.

Discovery Using the OWASP ZAP tool, we used the forced browse

functionality on /InternetBanking/. We received a list of

files which were found using this tool, see below.

Likelihood This can be tested by anyone who enters specific strings

into the address bar of a browser. However, the likelihood of this vulnerability is much higher if the attacker uses

specific tools which test specific paths systematically.

Impact The attacker can get sensitive information, e.g. credentials

to the mail server or the database. He can analyze the

source of the parser and find vulnerabilies there.

Access Vector Network

Access Complexity Low

Privileges Required | None

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality High

Intigrity No Impact

Availability No Impact

TODO: Forced browsing results.

SecureBank

Observation We found some HTML snippets, which do not contain any

sensitive information, and the compiled executable of the

transaction file parser.

Discovery Using the OWASP ZAP tool, we used the forced browse

functionality on /seccoding-2015/. We received a list of

files which were found using this tool, see below.

Likelihood This can be tested by anyone who enters specific strings

into the address bar of a browser. However, the likelihood of this vulnerability is much higher if the attacker uses specific tools which test specific paths systematically.

Impact The attacker only has access to the parser executable, which

might contain information about the database connection. He can analyze the parser and find vulnerabilies there.

Access Vector Network

Access Complexity Low

Privileges Required | None

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality Low

Intigrity No Impact
Availability No Impact

TODO: Forced browsing results.

Comparison

The web application of the SecureBank discloses less sensitive information. However, both applications disclose information which should not be available to unauthorized persons.

4.1.2 Test HTTP Methods

Online Banking

Observation The server responded that the method POST, GET, OPTIONS

and HEAD are supported.

Discovery We submitted the request OPTIONS / HTTP/1.1 to the

server via NetCat on port 80.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

SecureBank

Observation The server responded that the method POST, GET, OPTIONS

and HEAD are supported.

Discovery We submitted the request OPTIONS / HTTP/1.1 to the

server via NetCat on port 80.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

Comparison

There are no significant differences between both applications.

4.1.3 Test HTTP Strict Transport Security

Online Banking

Observation The server did not send any Strict-Transport-Security

header.

Discovery Executing the command curl -s -D-

http://vm/InternetBanking/ | grep Strict resulted in

no results.

Impact n/a

Likelihood | n/a

CVSS n/a

SecureBank

Observation The server did not send any Strict-Transport-Security

header.

Discovery Executing the command curl -s -D-

http://vm/InternetBanking/ | grep Strict resulted in

no results.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

Comparison

There are no significant differences between both applications.

4.1.4 Test RIA cross domain policy

Online Banking

Observation	No cross domain policy files were found.
Discovery	We scanned the traffic using ZAP.
Impact Likelihood	n/a
Likelihood	n/a
CVSS	n/a

SecureBank

Observation	No cross domain policy files were found.
	We scanned the traffic using ZAP.
Impact Likelihood	n/a
Likelihood	n/a
CVSS	n/a

Comparison

There are no significant differences between both applications.

Acronyms

TUM Technische Universität München.