Call To Arms: A Tale of the Weaknesses of Current Client-Side XSS Filtering

Martin Johns, Ben Stock, Sebastian Lekies



About us

- Martin Johns, Ben Stock, Sebastian Lekies
- Security Researchers at SAP, Uni Erlangen and Google
- More and stuff at http://kittenpics.org

About this talk

- Results of a practical evaluation of client-side XSS filtering
- Technical analysis of the Chrome XSS filter
- Presentation of various techniques to bypass the filter









Cross-Site Scripting

a.k.a. XSS (duh)



The Same-Origin Policy

- Question: why can't attacker.org read the visitors emails from GMail?
- Answer: the Same-Origin Policy is "in the way"
 - · Only resources with matching protocol, domain and port may gain access
- That makes for a sad attacker (and his kitten)



 $http://and she said it.files.wordpress.com/2010/05/sad_kitten1.jpg$



XSS – the underlying problem

- Web Apps process **data**
 - $\cdot\,$ Which was provided by the user
 - POST, GET, headers,
- Data might be stored, or echoed back directly
- Data <script>alert(1) </script> is actually Code



- ... interpreted by the victim's browser, executed in the origin of vulnerable application
- Attack method
 - Find flaw in Web application that allows injection of CODE, not just DATA
 - (we will elaborate in a minute)
 - Make victim visit that site
- \rightarrow We can read your GMails \odot



XSS – what an attacker can do

- Open an alert box!
- Hijack a session
 - Oldest trick in the book: steal their cookies
 - Force victim to "click" a link (or post something about BlackHat on Twitter)
- Alter content
 - Display fake content
 - Spoof login forms
- .. Steal your password manager's passwords
 - See our AsiaCCS paper if you are interested $\textcircled{\sc {\odot}}$
- Do everything with the Web app, that you could do under your ID





Types of XSS

Reflected



Stored

?php

\$res = mysql_query("INSERT...".\$_GET['message']);

\$res = mvsql querv("SELECT..."):

\$row = mysql fetch assoc(\$res)

echo \$row['message'];

Client

script>
var name = location.hash.slice(1));
document.write("Hello " + name);
/script>

<scri

var html= location.hash.slice(1); localStorage.setItem("message", html); [...] var message = localStorage.getItem("mes

document.write(message);

</script>



http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/f/f1 /Kitten_and_partial_reflection_in_mirror.jpg



http://www.cat-lovers-only.com/images/kittens-in-a-box.jpg



Reflected XSS

http://vulnerable.org/?a= <script>alert(1)</script>			\rightarrow
<html> <script>alert(1)</script></html>		<html></html>	
 	•	<pre> <script>alert(1)</script> </pre>	



Stopping XSS attacks

If you are the application's owner:

- Don't use user-provided data in an unencoded/unfiltered way
- Use secure frameworks or other magic
- Use Content Security Policy, sandboxed iframes, ...



Stopping XSS attacks

If you are the application's owner:

- Don't use user-provided data in an unencoded/unfiltered way
- Use secure frameworks or other magic
- Use Content Security Policy, sandboxed iframes, ...

If you are the application's user:

- Turn of JavaScript
- Client-side XSS Filters
 - NoScript
 - IE
 - Chrome (the "XSS Auditor")



Quick digression: finding a lot of DOMXSS vulns



Finding and exploiting DOMXSS vulnerabilities automatically at scale

- ... using byte-level taint tracking in Chromium
 - each character in a string has its source information attached to it
- ... Chrome extension to crawl given set of Web sites
 - also the interface between taint engine and central server
- ... and an exploit generator
 - using taint information
 - and HTML and JavaScript syntax rules
 - to generate exploits fully automatic



Results (many many cats XSS)

- For our study, we analyzed $\mathbf{Alexa} \ \mathbf{Top} \ \mathbf{5k}$

- Found **480** domains with vulnerabilities
- Reran experiment against Alexa Top 10k
 - Found a total of **1,602 unique vulnerabilities**
 - .. On **958** domains
- Auditor turned off at that point



Motivation

- So, we had this considerable amount of real-world XSS vulnerabilities
- And our prime testing platform was built onto the Chrome browser
- Hence, we got curious: How well does the Chrome Auditor protect us?
- We reran our experiment, with the Auditor turned on
- The Auditor did not catch all of our exploits
- This made us even more curious...
 - Why were the exploits not blocked?
 - And can we increase the number of bypasses?





Bypassing the XSSAuditor



Reflected XSS (revisited)



XSS Payload is contained in the request (i.e., in the URL)!



XSS Filter Strategies

- NoScript: Check outgoing requests for JavaScript
- IE: Use regular expression to compare HTTP requests and responses

XSSAuditor

- Don't look at requests
- When response comes in, invoke HTML parser (actually, tokenizer)
- When a "dangerous" element or attribute is found during parsing, check the corresponding request's URL





How the XSS Auditor works

- An incoming HTTP response is parsed
- Every time the parser encounters an HTML construct that potentially executes JavaScript, the Auditor is invoked
 - Important fact one: Only during the initial parsing process
 - Important fact two: This check is done only if certain characters are contained in the URL: <, >, " and '
- The auditor checks the HTTP request, if the encountered HTML/JavaScript can be found in the request's URL (or body)
 - Important fact three: Depending on the HTML construct, the matching algorithm differs
- If a match is found, the parser replaces the potential attack with a harmless placeholder





Auditor matching rules (simplified)

Inline scripts

```
<script>alert(1)</script>
```

Matching rule

- ... the Auditor checks whether content of script is contained in the request
- ... skipping initial comments and whitespaces,
- ...only using up to 100 characters
- ...stop if encountering a "terminating character":
 - # ? // ...



Auditor matching rules (simplified)

HTML attributes

• Event handlers

```
<img onerror="alert(1)" src="//doesnot.exist">
```

Attributes with JavaScript URLs

```
<iframe src="javascript:alert(1)"></iframe>
```

For each attribute

- ... the Auditor checks whether the attribute contains a $\mathbf{JavaScript}~\mathbf{URL}$
- ... or if the attribute is an **event handler**

Matching rule

• Check if the **<u>complete</u>** attribute is contained in the request



Auditor matching rules (simplified)

• For HTML elements that can reference external content

<script src="//attacker.org/script.js"></script>
<embed src="//attacker.org/flash.swf"></embed>

Matching rule

- ... the Auditor checks whether the **tag name** is contained in the request
- ... and whether the **<u>complete</u>** attribute is contained in the request



How the XSS Auditor works

- An incoming HTTP response is parsed
- Every time the parser encounters an HTML construct that potentially executes JavaScript, the Auditor is invoked
 - Important fact one: This check is done only if certain characters are contained in the URL: <, >, " and '
- The auditor checks the HTTP request, if the encountered HTML/JavaScript can be found in the request's URL (or body)
 - Important fact two: Depending on the HTML construct, the matching algorithm differs
- If a match is found, the parser replaces the potential attack with a harmless placeholder



document.write

Yes

HTML

Parser

No

JavaScript

Engine

How the XSS Auditor works





How to bypass the XSS Auditor





How to bypass the XSS Auditor





How to bypass the XSS Auditor





Avoiding Auditor Invocation



Bypass invocation using eval

- Filter works only for injected HTML
- ... not for injected JavaScript





Bypass invocation in the HTML Parser

Parsing "document fragments"

- i.e. innerHTML, outerHTML, insertAdjacentHTML
- For performance reasons, Auditor is off for document fragments
- \rightarrow all vulnerabilities targeting these sinks go through

Unquoted attribute injection

- Auditor is disabled if <, >, " and ' are not found in the request
- All injections that lead to JS execution, that do not require these characters evade the Auditor





HTML-free injections



Various injection techniques that live solely in the JavaScript space

• As the HTML parser is not involved, the Auditor is not activated

1. DOM bindings

- e.g. assigning src attribute of existing script tag
- No HTML parsing, as the injection affects the already parsed DOM

2. Second-order flows

- e.g. cookies or Web Storage
- Injection vector cannot be found in the request

3. Alternative data sources

- e.g. postMessages
- Attack vector enters the page through non-request channels



String-matching issues

Create situations, in which the injected vector does not match the parsed JavaScript



Partial Injections

- Hijack an existing tag
- Hijack an existing attribute (e.g. script.src)

BINIC

Hijack an existing script node





Partial Injections

- Hijack an existing tag
- Hijack an existing attribute (e.g. script.src)
- Hijack an existing script node







Trailing content

- Idea: use existing content to fool Auditor
- ... while still resulting in valid JavaScript

FAIL







Trailing content

- Idea: use existing content to fool Auditor
- ... while still resulting in valid JavaScript





Trailing content

- Idea: use existing content to fool Auditor
- ... while still resulting in valid JavaScript
- Further trailing content-based bypasses
 - Trailing slashes (Auditor stops search for payload after **second** slash)
 - Trailing SVG (using Semicolon)





- Single input, multiple injections, single sink
- Multiple inputs, multiple injections, single sink
- Multiple injection points, multiple sinks





- Single input, multiple injections, single sink
- Multiple inputs, multiple injections, single sink
- Multiple injection points, multiple sinks

```
...multi.html#")</script>'><script>cat(); void("
```

```
<img height='250
")</script>'><script>cat(); void("
' src='c.jpg'><img height='250
")</script>'><script>cat(); void("
' src='c.jpg'>
```





- Single input, multiple injections, single sink
- Multiple inputs, multiple injections, single sink
- Multiple injection points, multiple sinks





- Single input, multiple injections, single sink
- Multiple inputs, multiple injections, single sink
- Multiple injection points, multiple sinks

```
...multi.html#")</script>'><script>cat(); void("
```

```
<img height='250")</script>'>
<script>
cat(); void("' src='c.jpg'><img height='250")
</script>
'><script>cat(); void("' src='c.jpg'>
```





Bypasses in the wild



Empirical study

- Using our existing infrastructure, we found
 - ... 1,602 DOM-based XSS vulnerabilities
 - ... on **958** domains
- We enhanced our exploit generator to target **bypassable** vulnerabilities
 - Not targeting DOM bindings, second-order flows or alternative attacks

Results of our study

• 776 out of 958 domains with bypassable vulnerabilities

Bypass type	Domain count
innerHTML	469
eval	78
srcdoc (tag hijacking)	146
Trailing content	80
Multi flows	42
Unquoted attribute	7
Inscript injection	7
Assignment to existing script src	7



Conclusion



What to take away?

• XSS still is a problem

- Attack potential maybe bigger than you thought
- DOM-based XSS on about 10% of the Alexa Top 10k domains

Browsers deploy countermeasure to protect users

- IE and Chrome built-in, Firefox as a plugin
- Chrome arguably best filter

Security analysis of the Auditor shows that

- \ldots there are many bypasses, related to both
- ... invocation and
- ... string-matching issues



What else to take away?

- We built a fully-automated system to find DOMXSS
 - Taint-aware browser
 - Context-aware exploit generator
- We enhanced the generator to target known issues in the Auditor
 - Allowing for more exploits to bypass the Auditor
- We evaluated the impact of the issues
 - Bypassing the filter on 776 out of 958 domains (81%)
 - ... 1,162 out of 1,602 vulnerabilities (73%)



Thank you visit us at kittenpics.org



Martin Johns @datenkeller Ben Stock @kcotsneb Sebastian Lekies @sebastianlekies

