The Web's Security Model

Philippe De Ryck – iMinds-DistriNet, KU Leuven philippe.deryck@cs.kuleuven.be





About Me – Philippe De Ryck

- Postdoctoral Researcher @ DistriNet (KU Leuven)
 - Focus on (client-side) Web security
- Responsible for the Web Security training program
 - Dissemination of knowledge and research results
 - Target audiences include industry and researchers
- Main author of the Primer on Client-Side Web Security
 - 7 attacker models, broken down in 10 capabilities
 - 13 attacks and their countermeasures
 - Overview of security best practices







Introducing example.com



Public Information



Analytics



Private Customer Area



Twitter Integration





Location Information



Public Forum



Deploying *example.com*







Deploying example.com in the Web

It can't be that simple, right?



Deploying *example.com*







Origin-based Isolation

III iMinds

KU LEUVEN



Integration of Third-party Components



III iMinds

KU LEUVEN

Remote Inclusion of Third-party Scripts



Compromise of Third-party Providers



as the site was <u>compromised between these dates</u> due to malicious code injected via a Wordpress bug. Apologies for any inconvinience caused by this, but as usual vulnerabilities like this can only be pro-actively remedied as they occur.



Large-scale Study of Remote JS Inclusions



Large-scale Study of Remote JS Inclusions





Remote Inclusion of Third-party Scripts



Mixed Content Inclusions



Large-scale Study of Mixed Content

"43% of 18,526 HTTPS sites in the Alexa top 100,000 has at least one mixed content inclusion"

14% exposed to request forgery and cookie stealing

2% exposed to DOM data leakage

27% exposed to JavaScript execution

57% of HTTPS sites have no mixed content inclusions



Mixed Content Inclusions



Violating Context Isolation



example.com Revisited



Challenges for this Session

- Compartmentalization using origins
 - Leverage the same-origin policy to isolate sensitive parts
- Sharing information and authentication
 - Share authentication information between contexts
 - Interact and exchange information between contexts
- Managing third-party code inclusion
 - Managing the risk associated with potentially untrusted code
 - Preventing mixed-content warnings
- Communication with the backend
 - Enable legitimate communication from HTML and JavaScript
 - Mitigate illegitimate requests from untrusted contexts



Compartmentalization

Separation based on origin

- Naturally enforced by the Same-Origin Policy
- Allows you to separate sensitive parts and non-sensitive parts
- Prevents unintended sharing of information
- Prevents escalation of successful attack

ORIGIN

The triple <scheme, host, port> derived from the document's URL. For *http://example.org/forum/*, the origin is *<http, example.org, 80>*

SAME-ORIGIN POLICY

Content retrieved from one origin can freely interact with other content from that origin, but interactions with content from other origins are restricted



Examples of the Same-Origin Policy

SAME-ORIGIN POLICY

Content retrieved from one origin can freely interact with other content from that origin, but interactions with content from other origins are restricted



Distrinet

http://private.example.com

Domains vs Subdomains

Subdomains

- E.g. private.example.com vs forum.example.com
- Considered different origin
- Possibility to relax the origin to example.com using document.domain
- Possibility to use cookies on example.com
- Completely separate domains
 - E.g. private.example.com vs exampleforum.com
 - Considered different origin, without possibility of relaxation
 - No possibility of shared cookies



Subdomains and Domain Relaxation

www.example.com



D forum.example.com

account.example.com



Subdomains and Domain Relaxation





document.domain = "example.com";



Subdomains and Domain Relaxation





document.domain = "example.com";



Compartmentalizing *example.com*

	B Public Information	Private Custome	Account Management	Public Forum
Sensitive Content	no	yes	yes	no
Requires authentication	no	yes	yes	yes
Deploy over HTTPS	preferable	yes	yes	yes
Needs cooperation	no	account	private	no
Origin	http://www.example	e.com	https://account.example	.com
	https:/	/private.examp	ole.com https://examp	oleforum.com



Compartmentalizing *example.com*





Authentication on the Web

- Typical authentication consists of two steps
 - Entity authentication
 - Maintaining the session associated with the authenticated user
- Entity authentication
 - Exchanging username and password
 - Challenge/response systems are also used
- Session management
 - De facto standard is cookie-based session management
 - Cookie contains unique identifier, associated with server-side state



Cookie-based Session Management



Modifying Cookie Behavior

Domain

- Allows to broaden the applicability of the cookie
- E.g. example.com applies cookie to *.example.com

Path

- Associates a cookie with a specific path
- E.g. /admin/ associates a cookie with /admin/*
- Conflicts with the same-origin policy

HttpOnly

Restricts a cookie from being accessed through JavaScript

The SOP allows direct access to the iframe, exposing document.cookie





Cookies and HTTPS deployments

- Why the Secure flag matters
 - Cookies are associated with a domain, not an origin
 - No separation between cookies used on HTTP and HTTPS requests



Outgoing HTTP request, with any non-Secure cookies for secure.example.com attached

- Use separate cookies for HTTP and HTTPS
 - Associate different security levels to each cookie
 - Require HTTPS cookie to be present for sensitive operations



Sharing Authentication in example.com



III iMinds

KU LEUVE

Interaction between Contexts

Related contexts

- Documents can open popup windows, embed frames, etc.
- Related cross-origin contexts are isolated by default
- Limited interactions possible (navigation, messaging APIs, ...)
- Navigation
 - Navigate child frame to different resource
 - Navigate parent frame, reloading the entire document

Exposed APIs

Prime example: Web Messaging API, to support interaction



Web Messaging API

- Messaging mechanism between contexts
 - Used for iframes, Web Workers, etc.
 - Event listener for receiving messages (opt-in mechanism)
 - API function for sending data (text, objects, etc.)

Security considerations

- Specify origin of receiver to prevent leaking of content
- Check origin of sender to prevent malicious use
- Validate incoming content before using data to prevent injection attacks



Web Messaging API



SENDING MESSAGES

```
myframe.postMessage(data,'http://test.example.com');
```

RECEIVING MESSAGES

```
var handler = function(event) {
    if(event.origin ==
        'http://www.example.com') {
        alert(event.data);
    }
}
window.addEventListener('message', handler, false);
```



Example: a Client-side Storage Facility



Accessing local storage through Web Messaging allows enforcing access control and content inspection



Interaction in *example.com*

Exchange information using Web Messaging between *iframes*



Including Remote Content

- Types of remote content
 - Images
 - JavaScript
 - CSS Styles
 - HTML documents

- SVG images
- Audio/video

. . .

Plugin content (Flash, Java)

- Including remote content
 - Identified by a URL
 - Fetched by the browser, and subsequently integrated
 - For active content (e.g. JavaScript), the included code is typically executed in the context of the including page



Mixed Content Problems

requires additional resources

MIXED CONTENT INCLUSION

When an HTTPS-document includes resources from non-HTTP sources, potentially compromising the integrity of the document





Solving Mixed Content Problems

- Browsers blocking mixed content inclusion
 - IE 7 started with prompting users, other browsers are following
 - Active mixed content is typically blocked, passive content is allowed

🕶 Firefox 🤊

	view only the websace content that was delivered
securely?	view only the webpage content that was delivered
This webpage con connection, which	tains content that will not be delivered using a secure HTTPS could compromise the security of the entire webpage.

Testing mixed	content	+
🕘 🕡 🔒 htt	ps://people.mozilla.com/	•tvyas/mixedco ☆ マ C 🍳 💈 - Google
0	Firefox has blocked co	itent that isn't secure.
	Most web sites will sti content is blocked.	work properly even when this
	Learn more	
		Keep <u>B</u> locking -
		Disable Protection on This Page
		× Not Now

- Localize remote resources
 - Host remote resources locally within the application's HTTPS domain



Integration of Remote Code

- Two mechanisms to integrate code
 - Directly including JavaScript code using the <script> tag
 - Including code through an *iframe*, which hosts a separate document

Scripts

- Straightforward integration in the context, without restrictions
- Violates the security boundaries of a document

Iframes

- Depending on the origin, the SOP restrictions apply
- Preserves the security boundaries, but may hinder interaction



Script-based Content Integration

- No security boundaries offered by browser
 - Combination with remote providers is potentially dangerous
 - Full access to the client-side context, including local resources
- Existing techniques to constrain scripts
 - Localizing scripts → requires effort to update
 - Safe subsets of JavaScript → requires compatibility with existing scripts
 - Browser-based sandboxing \rightarrow requires modifications to the browser
 - Server-side rewriting \rightarrow requires control over the scripts
 - JavaScript-based sandboxing → upcoming technology



Iframe-based Content Integration

- Iframes are controlled by the same-origin policy
 - Documents with different origins are isolated by the SOP
 - Well-suited to integrate separate components (e.g. advertisements)
 - More difficult to achieve dynamic interaction
- HTML5 introduces the sandbox attribute
 - Gives coarse-grained control over capabilities in an iframe
 - Supports disabling scripts, plugins, forms, etc.
 - Supports a unique origin, alienating the iframe from any other origin
 - Well-suited for the integration of untrusted content



Best Practices for Integrating Code

- If possible, isolate the content in an iframe
 - Use the sandbox attribute to enforce even more restrictions
 - Especially true for untrusted content (e.g. user-provided)
- Only include code from trusted providers
 Google often provides mirrors of popular libraries
- Localize scripts for crucial applications
 - Keep scripts regularly up-to-date
 - Perform code reviews of the differences between versions



Remote Code in *example.com*



Interacting with Remote Services

- Ways to interact remotely
 - Triggered from HTML elements (image loads, form submissions, ...)
 - Programmatically from JavaScript (XMLHttpRequest)
 - Using alternative protocols (Web Sockets, WebRTC, ...)

- Challenges with remote interaction
 - Difficult to determine which context a request originated from
 - Difficult to determine if a request was intended by the user



HTML-based Remote Interaction

- Several types of requests can be triggered
 - GET requests from , <script>, …
 - POST requests with control over body content from <form>
- Not affected by the Same-Origin Policy
 - GET and POST requests can be sent to other origin
 - Browser attaches available cookies to the request
- Session cookies are implicit authentication!
 - Results in an attack known as Cross-Site Request Forgery



Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)





Mitigating Cross-Site Request Forgery

- Mitigation techniques need to be explicitly present
 - Token-based approaches
 - Origin header



TOKEN-BASED APPROACH

```
example.com
```

```
<form action="submit.php">
<input type="hidden" name="token"
value="qasfj8j12adsjadu2223" />
```

</form>

...



Programmatic Remote Interaction

- Sending requests with XMLHttpRequest
 - Supports different types of requests
 - Possibility to modify/manipulate "safe" headers
 - Response can be processed from within JavaScript

SENDING REQUESTS

```
var url = "http://test.example.com/api.php";
var req = new XMLHttpRequest();
req.open("GET", url, true);
req.onload = function(e) { ... }
req.send();
```



XMLHttpRequest and the SOP

- Same-origin requests
 - No restrictions imposed on the use of XMLHttpRequest
 - Custom headers, use of credentials, etc.
- Cross-origin requests
 - Required to enable remote interaction (e.g. APIs) without hacks
 - Enables capabilities not found in traditional HTML (e.g. PUT, DELETE)
 - Legacy server code does not expect such cross-origin requests

New security policy: Cross-Origin Resource Sharing



Cross-Origin Resource Sharing (CORS)

- Enables client-side cross-origin requests
 - Opt-in mechanism to grant other origins access to certain resources
 - Allows the easy use of online APIs without hacks
- Preventing additional attack vectors
 - Configurable security policy to determine who can access response
 - Preflight request to approve "dangerous" requests up front
 - Attacker capabilities with CORS largely correspond to HTML elements
- Already used beyond XMLHttpRequest
 - Regulating access to cross-origin HTML elements (canvas, ...)



Cross-Origin Resource Sharing (CORS)

```
SENDING CORS REQUESTS
```

```
var url = "http://api.provider.com/api.php";
var req = new XMLHttpRequest();
req.open("GET", url, true);
xhr.withCredentials = true;
req.onload = function(e) { ... }
req.send();
```

CORS RESPONSE HEADERS

Access-Control-Allow-Origin: *http://www.example.com* Access-Control-Allow-Credentials: *true* Access-Control-Expose-Headers: *APIVersion*



Sharing an API with CORS

PUBLIC CORS API (/API/PUBLIC/)

- Allow wildcard origin

```
Access-Control-Allow-Origin: *
```

RESTRICTED CORS API (/API/ACCOUNTS/)

- Allow the customer area origin
- Allow the use of credentials
- Expose the X-Version header

CORS PROCESSING CHECKLIST

- Check origin of request
- Check used method
- Perform traditional access control
- Execute request
- Add appropriate response headers

Access-Control-Allow-Origin: https://private.example.com Access-Control-Allow-Credentials: true Access-Control-Expose-Headers: X-Version



Remote Interaction in *example.com*



Wrap Up



Take-home Message

• The *origin* is a core concept in web security

Compartmentalize where possible

- Treat incoming messages as potentially untrustworthy
- Consider the trust relationship with external parties



Further Reading

SPRINGER BRIEFS IN COMPUTER SCIENCE

Philippe De Ryck Lieven Desmet Frank Piessens Martin Johns

Primer on Client-Side Web Security

🙆 Springer



THE DEATH OF THE INTERNET Edited by MARKUS JAKOBSSON 高等教育出版社 WILEY > IEEE



The Web's Security Model

Philippe De Ryck – iMinds-DistriNet, KU Leuven philippe.deryck@cs.kuleuven.be



