

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

| Executive Summary ii | | | | |
|----------------------|------|---------|--|----|
| 1 | Tim | e Track | ting | 1 |
| 2 | Vul | nerabil | iteis Overview | 2 |
| | 2.1 | Online | 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 | Secure | eBank | 3 |
| 3 | Too | ls | | 4 |
| | 3.1 | Zed A | Attack Proxy (ZAP) | 4 |
| | 3.2 | SQLm | nap | 4 |
| 4 | Deta | ailed R | eport | 5 |
| | 4.1 | | guration and Deploy Management Testing | 6 |
| | | 4.1.1 | Test File Extensions Handling for Sensitive Information | 6 |
| | | 4.1.2 | Test HTTP Methods | 12 |
| | | 4.1.3 | Test HTTP Strict Transport Security | 13 |
| | | 4.1.4 | Test RIA cross domain policy | 14 |
| | 4.2 | Identi | ty Management Testing | 15 |
| | | 4.2.1 | Test Role Definitions | 15 |
| | | 4.2.2 | Test User Registration Process | 17 |
| | | 4.2.3 | Test Account Provisioning Process | 19 |
| | | 4.2.4 | Testing for Account Enumeration and Guessable User Account . | 20 |
| | | 4.2.5 | Testing for Weak or unenforced username policy | 21 |
| | 4.3 | Authe | entcation Testing | 22 |
| | | 4.3.1 | Testing for Credentials Transported over Encrypted Channel | 22 |
| | | 4.3.2 | Testing for default credentials | 24 |
| | | 4.3.3 | Testing for Weak lock out mechanism | 25 |

Contents

| | 4.3.4 | Testing for bypassing authentication schema | 27 |
|--------|---------|---|----|
| | 4.3.5 | Testing for Vulnerable Remember Password | 29 |
| | 4.3.6 | Testing for Browser Cache Weakness | 30 |
| | | | |
| | 4.3.7 | Testing for Weak password policy | 31 |
| | 4.3.8 | Testing for Weak security question/answer | 32 |
| | 4.3.9 | Testing for Weak password change or reset functionalities | 32 |
| | 4.3.10 | Testing for Weaker authentication in alternative channel | 32 |
| 4.4 | Autho | rization Testing | 33 |
| | 4.4.1 | Testing Directory traversal/file include | 33 |
| | 4.4.2 | Testing for bypassing authorization schema | 33 |
| | 4.4.3 | Testing for Privilege Escalation | 33 |
| | 4.4.4 | Testing for Insecure Direct Object References | 33 |
| 4.5 | Session | n Management Testing | 33 |
| 4.6 | Data V | Validation Testing | 33 |
| | 4.6.1 | Testing for Reflected Cross Site Scripting | 33 |
| | 4.6.2 | Testing for LDAP/ORM/XML/SSI/XPath Injection | 34 |
| | 4.6.3 | Testing for SQL injection | 35 |
| 4.7 | Error l | Handling | 38 |
| | 4.7.1 | Analysis of Error Codes | 38 |
| | 4.7.2 | Testing for Stack Traces | 40 |
| 4.8 | Testing | g for weak Cryptography | 40 |
| 4.9 | | ss Logic Testing | 40 |
| 4.10 | | Side Testing | 40 |
| | | | |
| Acrony | ms | | 41 |

1 Time Tracking

If a task is prefixed with (o), it refers to the Online Banking web application, if a task is prefixed with (s), the task refers only to the SecureBank web application.

Table 1.1: Time Tracking Table

| Name | Task | Time |
|----------------|---|------|
| Alexis Engelke | Setting up LaTeX template | 1 |
| Alexis Engelke | (o) Analyzing XSS vulnerabilities using ZAP | 2 |
| Alexis Engelke | (o) Analyzing SQL injection vulnerabilities in the web interface using SQLmap | 1.5 |
| Alexis Engelke | (o) Analyzing SQL injection vulnerabilities in the file upload | 2 |
| Alexis Engelke | (o) Exploiting the TAN verification in the file upload | 2 |
| Alexis Engelke | (o) Documenting SQL injection | 1 |
| Alexis Engelke | Testing and Documenting Configuration and Deploy Management Testing | 2 |
| Alexis Engelke | Testing and Documenting Identity Management Testing | 1 |
| Alexis Engelke | Testing and Documenting Authentication Testing | 2 |
| 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

3.1 Zed Attack Proxy (ZAP)

Using the Zed Attack Proxy (ZAP), we were able to reveal significant parts of the directory structure in both web applications. In the *Online Banking* web application, we found a stored XSS vulnerability in the registration and the transaction description as well as a SQL injection vulnerability in the login form using the fuzzer. We were also be able to find a buffer overflow vulnerability for the transaction description in the transaction batch files.

3.2 SQLmap

Using SQLmap, we found the SQL injection vulnerability in the login form, which we found using ZAP earlier. SQLmap did not reveal further SQL injection possibilities.

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

Forced Browsing Results:

```
http://vm/InternetBanking/
http://vm/InternetBanking/DataAccess/
http://vm/InternetBanking/auth/
http://vm/InternetBanking/client/
http://vm/InternetBanking/controller/
http://vm/InternetBanking/controller/clientController.php
http://vm/InternetBanking/controller/clientFunctions.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/controller/employeeController.php
http://vm/InternetBanking/controller/employeeFunctions.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/controller/loginController.php
http://vm/InternetBanking/controller/logoutController.php
http://vm/InternetBanking/controller/registrationController.php
http://vm/InternetBanking/css/
http://vm/InternetBanking/css/bootstrap-theme.css
http://vm/InternetBanking/css/bootstrap-theme.css.map
http://vm/InternetBanking/css/bootstrap-theme.min.css
http://vm/InternetBanking/css/bootstrap.css
http://vm/InternetBanking/css/bootstrap.css.map
http://vm/InternetBanking/css/bootstrap.min.css
http://vm/InternetBanking/employee/
http://vm/InternetBanking/fonts/
http://vm/InternetBanking/fonts/glyphicons-halflings-regular.eot
http://vm/InternetBanking/fonts/glyphicons-halflings-regular.svg
http://vm/InternetBanking/fonts/glyphicons-halflings-regular.ttf
http://vm/InternetBanking/fonts/glyphicons-halflings-regular.woff
http://vm/InternetBanking/fonts/glyphicons-halflings-regular.woff2
http://vm/InternetBanking/index/
http://vm/InternetBanking/js/
http://vm/InternetBanking/js/bootstrap.js
http://vm/InternetBanking/js/bootstrap.min.js
http://vm/InternetBanking/js/npm.js
http://vm/InternetBanking/login/
http://vm/InternetBanking/logout/
http://vm/InternetBanking/model/
http://vm/InternetBanking/model/Payment.class
http://vm/InternetBanking/model/PaymentRequest.class
http://vm/InternetBanking/model/User.class
```

```
http://vm/InternetBanking/model/UserRequest.class
http://vm/InternetBanking/parser/
http://vm/InternetBanking/parser/Makefile
http://vm/InternetBanking/parser/exec
http://vm/InternetBanking/parser/main.c
http://vm/InternetBanking/parser/mysql_query_function.c
http://vm/InternetBanking/parser/mysql_query_function.h
http://vm/InternetBanking/registration/
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/account.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/accounts.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/approvepayments.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/approveregistrations.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/client.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/employee.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/file.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/history.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/historypdf.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/login.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/online.inc
http://vm/InternetBanking/view/registration.inc
```

SecureBank

Observation We found some HTML snippets, which do not contain

any sensitive information, and the compiled executable of the transaction file parser. We also found that the library

TCPDF appears to be used.

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

Forced Browsing Results:

http://vm/seccoding-2015/

http://vm/seccoding-2015/database/

http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/

http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/auth.html

http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/dberror.html

http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/default.html

http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/display_userstate.html

```
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/display_userstate_table.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/dologin_fail.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/dologin_success.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/doregister_fail.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/doregister_success.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/edoverify_fail.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/ehome.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/ehome_transaction.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/ehome_user.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/entry_page.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/etakeover.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/etransactionpdf_fail.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/home.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/login.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/register.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/root.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/simpleRoot.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/transaction.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/udotransactionupload_fail.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/utransaction.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/html/utransactionupload.html
http://vm/seccoding-2015/index/
http://vm/seccoding-2015/login/
http://vm/seccoding-2015/parser/
http://vm/seccoding-2015/parser/parser
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/CHANGELOG.TXT
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/LICENSE.TXT
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/README.TXT
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/composer.json
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/config/
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/config/tcpdf_config.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/fonts/
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/barcodes/
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/barcodes/datamatrix.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/barcodes/pdf417.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/barcodes/qrcode.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/sRGB.icc
```

```
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/tcpdf_colors.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/tcpdf_filters.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/tcpdf_font_data.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/tcpdf_fonts.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/tcpdf_images.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/include/tcpdf_static.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/tcpdf.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/tcpdf_autoconfig.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/tcpdf_barcodes_1d.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/tcpdf_barcodes_2d.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/tcpdf_import.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/tcpdf_parser.php
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/tools/
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/tools/
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/tools/convert_fonts_examples.txt
http://vm/seccoding-2015/tcpdf/tools/tcpdf_addfont.php
```

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

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

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 CVSS | n/a |
| Likelihood | n/a |
| CVSS | n/a |

SecureBank

| 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 |

Comparison

4.2 Identity Management Testing

4.2.1 Test Role Definitions

Online Banking

| Observation | We found the following functionality for the different roles: |
|-------------|---|

| The found the following functionality for the | Client | Employee |
|---|--------|----------|
| | Chem | Employee |
| View own account | × | × |
| View own transaction history | × | _ |
| Create new transactions | × | _ |
| View account and transaction history of clients and employees | _ | × |
| Change account details and balance of clients and employees | _ | × |
| Approve transactions | _ | × |
| Approve registrations of clients and employees | _ | × |
| We noticed that there are links to view the transaction history and change the account balance of employees, too. | | |
| We gathered the information by exploring the web application interface manually. | | |
| n/a | | |

Impactn/aLikelihoodn/aCVSSn/a

Discovery

SecureBank

| Observation | We found the following functionality for the | differen | t roles: |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|----------|
| | | Client | Employee |
| | View own account | × | _ |
| | View own transaction history | × | _ |
| | Create new transactions | × | _ |
| | View account and transaction history of clients | _ | × |
| | Approve transactions | _ | × |
| | Approve registrations of clients and employees | _ | × |
| Discovery | We gathered the information by exploring the tion interface manually. | he web a _l | pplica- |
| Impact | n/a | | |
| Likelihood | n/a | | |
| CVSS | n/a | | |

Comparison

The SecureBank web application does not offer a possibility for an employee to change the account balance of a client. However, the Online Banking application allows to view the transaction history and change the account balance also for employees, which have no account. This behaviour might be confusing.

4.2.2 Test User Registration Process

Online Banking

Observation

For registration, a username, an e-mail address, a password and whether the registrant is a client or an employee are needed. Anyone can register for access. The registration has to be approved by an employee before the registrant can use the account. A person can register only one time with the same e-mail address. However, a person can register many times with the same username. (The activation of such an account fails with a database error.) We could not find out, whether the registrants are verified personally before the approval.

Discovery

We tried to register several accounts with the same e-mail address and/or username using the web application.

Impact

n/a

Likelihood

n/a

CVSS

n/a

SecureBank

Observation

For registration, the full name, an e-mail address, a password and whether the registrant is a client or an employee are needed. Anyone can register for access. The registration has to be approved by an employee before the registrant can use the account. A person can register only one time with the same e-mail address. We could not find out, whether the registrants are verified personally before the approval.

Discovery

We tried to register several accounts with the same e-mail address and/or names using the web application.

Impact

n/a

Likelihood

n/a

CVSS

n/a

Comparison

The Online Banking web application allows the double-registration of the same username at first, it only fails at the activation. This behaviour is confusing. Also, the application should ask for the full name be able to verify the name. Otherwise, there are no significant differences between both applications.

4.2.3 Test Account Provisioning Process

Online Banking

Observation There is no way to change the role of a user. Account

requests (both, client and employee) must be approved by

an employee.

Discovery We followed the links in the user interface and tried to login

as a non-verified user.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

SecureBank

Observation There is no way to change the role of a user. Account

requests (both, client and employee) must be approved by

an employee.

Discovery We followed the links in the user interface and tried to login

as a non-verified user.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

Comparison

4.2.4 Testing for Account Enumeration and Guessable User Account Online Banking

Observation There are no differences in the servers response for not

activated accounts, valid usernames and invalid usernames.

Discovery We tested the login for activated and non-activated accounts,

existing and not-existing usernames and valid or invalid

passwords.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

11/6

CVSS n/a

SecureBank

Observation There are no differences in the servers response for not

activated accounts, valid usernames and invalid usernames.

Discovery We tested the login for activated and non-activated accounts,

existing and not-existing usernames and valid or invalid

passwords.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

Comparison

4.2.5 Testing for Weak or unenforced username policy

Online Banking

| Observation | We were not able to find a username policy. |
|-------------|---|
| Discovery | We tested various usernames. |
| Impact | n/a |
| Likelihood | n/a |
| CVSS | n/a |

SecureBank

| Observation | The username has to be a valid e-mail address of the client/employee. There is no policy regarding the e-mail address. |
|-------------|--|
| Discovery | We tested valid and invalid e-mail addresses. |
| Impact | n/a |
| | n/a |
| CVSS | n/a |

Comparison

The only difference between the applications is that the Online Banking application uses usernames, which might have less correlation to the user than the e-mail address.

4.3 Authentcation Testing

4.3.1 Testing for Credentials Transported over Encrypted Channel

Online Banking

Observation We were unable to connect to the application via HTTPS.

Discovery We tried to access the application via HTTPS on port 443.

Impact An attacker can retrieve sensitive information by sniffing

the network.

Likelihood High

Access Vector Adjacent Network

Access Complexity | Medium

Privileges Required None

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality High

Intigrity No Impact

Availability No Impact

SecureBank

Observation We were unable to connect to the application via HTTPS.

Discovery We tried to access the application via HTTPS on port 443.

Impact An attacker can retrieve sensitive information by sniffing

the network.

Likelihood High

Access Vector Adjacent Network

Access Complexity | Medium

Privileges Required None

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality High

IntigrityNo ImpactAvailabilityNo Impact

Comparison

Both applications transport sensitive information about non-encrypted channels.

4.3.2 Testing for default credentials

We decided to not test for default credentials, because we are working with custom software and therefore assume that all users and administrators choose secure passwords.

4.3.3 Testing for Weak lock out mechanism

Online Banking

Observation We were not able to find any lock out mechanism. There-

fore, brute force attacks on passwords are possible.

Discovery We entered a valid username and incorrect passwords 10

times, and always got the error message about an incorrect password. Afterwards, we were able to log in with a correct

password.

Impact An attacker can brute-force the password of any user and

therefore take the user over.

Likelihood High

Access Vector Network

Access Complexity Low

Privileges Required | None

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality Low

Intigrity Low

Availability No Impact

SecureBank

Observation We were not able to find any lock out mechanism. There-

fore, brute force attacks on passwords are possible.

Discovery We entered a valid username and incorrect passwords 10

times, and always got the error message about the failed login. Afterwards, we were able to log in with a correct

password.

Impact An attacker can brute-force the password of any user and

therefore take the user over.

Likelihood High

Access Vector Network

Access Complexity Low

Privileges Required | None

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality Low

Intigrity Low

Availability No Impact

Comparison

Both applications do not provide any lock out mechanism.

4.3.4 Testing for bypassing authentication schema

Online Banking

Observation We were able to bypass the authentication schema via a

SQL injection. This gave us the ability to login as any user

without knowing the password.

Discovery Using the fuzzer jbrofuzz / SQL Injection of ZAP on

the username field of the login page, we were able to login as admin or another user without knowing the password. We had no success with direct page requests, modifying

the session ID and parameter modification.

Impact An attacker can take over a user without knowing the valid

access credentials.

Likelihood High

Access Vector Network

Access Complexity Low

Privileges Required | None

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality Low

Intigrity Low

Availability No Impact

SecureBank

Observation We were not able to bypass the authentication schema.

Discovery Using the fuzzer jbrofuzz / SQL Injection of ZAP and

SQLmap on the username field of the login page, we were not able to find SQL injection vulnerabilities to bypass the authentication schema. We also had no success with direct page requests, modifying the session ID and parameter

modification.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

Comparison

The Online Banking web application provides a way to bypass the authentication schema via SQL injection. The SecureBank application does not offer such vulnerabilities.

4.3.5 Testing for Vulnerable Remember Password

We did not found a remember password functionality, so we decided to not further test on this.

4.3.6 Testing for Browser Cache Weakness

Online Banking

Observation | Clicking the back button in the browser does not cause

a re-login. All sites have the header Cache-Control: no-store, no-cache, must-revaildate, post-check=0, pre-check=0 and the Pragma: no-cache as well as an

Expires: <date in the past> header set.

Discovery Using ZAP, we analyzed the response header for different

pages which are only available when a user is logged in.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

SecureBank

Observation | Clicking the back button in the browser does not cause

a re-login. All sites have the header Cache-Control: no-store, no-cache, must-revaildate, post-check=0, pre-check=0 and the Pragma: no-cache as well as an

Expires: <date in the past> header set.

Discovery Using ZAP, we analyzed the response header for different

pages which are only available when a user is logged in.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

Comparison

4.3.7 Testing for Weak password policy

Online Banking

Observation There is a password policy enforced, which states that a

password has have a length ≥ 6 and has to include at least one number, one lowercase character, one uppercase character and one symbol. There is no way to change the

password. The password does not expire.

Discovery We tested various passwords, like 123456. If a password

does not match the policy, an error message is shown which

informs the user about the policy.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

SecureBank

Observation The password has to have a length ≥ 6 . There is no way to

change the password. The password does not expire.

Discovery We tested various passwords, like 123456. If a password

does not match the policy, an error message is shown which

informs the user about the policy.

Impact n/a

Likelihood n/a

CVSS n/a

Comparison

The Online Banking application enforces a more strict password policy than the Secure-Bank application. This reduces the risk of brute force attacks.

4.3.8 Testing for Weak security question/answer

We could not find such functionality in both application. Therefore, we decidede to not proceed testing on this.

4.3.9 Testing for Weak password change or reset functionalities

We could not find such functionality in both application. Therefore, we decidede to not proceed testing on this.

4.3.10 Testing for Weaker authentication in alternative channel

We could not find an alternative channel for authentication. Therefore, we decidede to not proceed testing on this.

4.4 Authorization Testing

4.4.1 Testing Directory traversal/file include

TODO!

4.4.2 Testing for bypassing authorization schema

TODO!

4.4.3 Testing for Privilege Escalation

TODO!

4.4.4 Testing for Insecure Direct Object References

TODO!

4.5 Session Management Testing

TODO!

4.6 Data Validation Testing

TODO!

4.6.1 Testing for Reflected Cross Site Scripting

Online Banking

| Observation | We were not able to find any reflected XSS vulnerability in |
|-------------|---|
| | this application. |

Discovery We tried to inject basic scripts into the register, login and

transaction form as well as into the administration form.

Impactn/aLikelihoodn/aCVSSn/a

SecureBank

| Observation | We were not able to find any reflected XSS vulnerability. |
|-------------|---|
| Discovery | We tried to inject basic scripts into the register, login and transaction form as well as into the administration form. |
| Impact | n/a |
| | n/a |
| CVSS | n/a |

Comparison

Based on our testing, we found that both applications operate on a similar security level.

4.6.2 Testing for LDAP/ORM/XML/SSI/XPath Injection

We did not test any of these injection types as it appears that these techniques are not used in any of the two applications. Therefore, we decided to not further investigate in these types of injection.

4.6.3 Testing for SQL injection

Online Banking

Observation

We were able to log into the application as any user without knowing the passwordand to perform transactions with any unused TAN of any user when uploading a transaction batch file.

Discovery

We used the fuzzer of ZAP on the username field of the login form, with the query parameters username=admin&password=123, where the fuzzing point was at the end of the username. We compared the answers of the server and found that in one case we got redirected to the employee page. We analyzed the login page also using SQLmap, which delivered a similar result. Additionally, we ran SQLmap on the fields of the perform transaction form, it returned that none of the four inputs where exploitable for SQL injection.

We tested the fields of the transaction batch form manually by trying some standard SQL injection parts (e.g. ';- and ";-). We noted that the application gives no usual feedback when uploading a transaction file where the username or the comment contains strings that apparantly results in a syntactically erroneous SQL query. We continued to determine the table structure using a brute force script which tests for some expectable table and column names, the results can be found below. Finally, we were able to exploit the SQL injection vulnerability in the TAN field to use any unused TAN from any user.

Impact

An attacker can log into any account, of which he knows the username, and perform transactions without knowing valid TANs for that account by uploading a transaction batch file. Furthermore, as an attacker can take over an administrator account, if he knows the username, he has access to all accounts and can change the account balances at will. Also, an attacker can analyze the structure of a database.

Likelihood

High

Access Vector Network

Access Complexity Low

Privileges Required None

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality High

Intigrity High

Availability No Impact

Access Vector Network

Access Complexity Low

Privileges Required Low

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality High

Intigrity High

Availability No Impact

Results of the brute-force script

Login vulnerability

TAN vulnerability

Table payment: id, trancode, payer, receipt, amount, purpose

Table user: id, balance, email, username, password, isemployee

Table userrequest: id, email, username, password, isemployee

Table paymentrequest: id, trancode, payer, receipt, amount, purpose

Table trancode: id, clientid

SecureBank

Observation

Discovery

We used the fuzzer of ZAP on the username field of the login form, with the query parameters username=admin@localhost&password=123, where the fuzzing point was at the end of the username. We also analyzed the login page also using SQLmap. Using both methods, we were not able to log in without knowing the password. Additionally, we ran SQLmap on the fields of the registration form and the perform transaction form, it returned that none of the four inputs where exploitable for SQL injection.

Impactn/aLikelihoodn/aCVSSn/a

Comparison

The Online Banking web application is vulnerable to SQL injection at different places, allowing an attacker to take over user accounts and transfer money without knowing any credentials. In the web application of the SecureBank, we were not able to find SQL injection vulnerabilities.

4.7 Error Handling

4.7.1 Analysis of Error Codes

Online Banking

Observation We were not able to get reveal any information about the

database, but we were able to get usual error codes of an apache server. The error pages also revealed information about the version, which is 2.2.22 on an Ubuntu server.

Discovery By using the fuzzer jbrofuzz / SQL Injection / MySQL

Injection 101 of ZAP on the purpose field of the online transaction form, we got one response which simply stated Database error, but gave no further information. Using a browser, we requested the page /InternetBanking/foobar/, which returned a 404 error, with further information about the server operating system

and the Apache version.

Impact Using the apache version, an attacker can run known ex-

ploits for this specific version.

Likelihood Medium

Access Vector Network

Access Complexity Low

Privileges Required | None

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality No Impact

Intigrity No Impact

Availability No Impact

SecureBank

Observation We were not able to get reveal any information about the

database, but we were able to get usual error codes of an apache server. The error pages also revealed information about the version, which is 2.2.22 on an Ubuntu server. On the login page, we found an error code if the login was unsuccessful. Apparently, the code is always 1, if the

credentials are incorrect.

Discovery By using the fuzzer jbrofuzz / SQL Injection / MySQL

Injection 101 of ZAP on the purpose field of the online transaction form, we were not able to produce a databse error. Using a browser, we requested the page /seccoding-2015/foobar/, which returned a 404 error, with further information about the server operating sys-

tem and the Apache version.

Impact Using the apache version, an attacker can run known ex-

ploits for this specific version.

Likelihood Medium

Access Vector Network

Access Complexity Low

Privileges Required | None

User Interaction None

Scope Unchanged

Confidentiality No Impact

Intigrity No Impact

Availability No Impact

Comparison

Although the Online Banking application produces an error message about a database error, they provide the similar information in error messages.

4.7.2 Testing for Stack Traces

We were not able to produce stack traces in both applications using invalid inputs (e.g. negative numbers), or SQL injection.

4.8 Testing for weak Cryptography

TODO!

4.9 Business Logic Testing

TODO!

4.10 Client Side Testing

TODO!

Acronyms

TUM Technische Universität München.