Topics in Network Security

Jem Berkes MASc. ECE, University of Waterloo B.Sc. ECE, University of Manitoba

www.berkes.ca

February, 2009

Ver. 2

In this presentation

- Wi-Fi security (802.11)
- Protecting insecure channels
- Case study: an insecure application
- How is a computer hacked?

Wi-Fi Security (802.11)



As with other situations, two attack categories

- PASSIVE: silently listening and reading signals

- ACTIVE: modifying signals or affecting system

Some threats are more specific to wireless

- Radio jamming and interference
- Unauthorized access or authentication

Passive eavesdropping

- Signals sent through air on public frequencies
- Eavesdrop using any wireless card!



Active attacks

- Many possible scenarios
- e.g. attacker places rogue host onto network



- Various 802.11 security standards
- WEP, WPA, WPA2...
- Your wireless LAN requires a password

– Does that mean it's secure?

- Plenty of attacks are possible and practical
- WEP, Wired Equivalent Protocol (still around)
 - RC4 key easily discovered in about 1 minute
- WPA and WPA2, Wi-Fi Protected Access
 - Shared passwords under 13 chars breakable
 - Brute force speed rapidly improving
 - TKIP mode can be broken in a few minutes
 - No matter how strong the password
 - Might be safe: WPA and WPA2 using AES
 - Password must still be very strong

Horrendous track record for Wi-Fi security

- Latest critical attack published in Nov 2008
- Largely protocol/math flaws, some brute force

An average wireless LAN is likely insecure

- Home or small office Wi-Fi likely exploitable
- Configuring secure Wi-Fi is very challenging

Both my D-Link routers malfunction with WPA2

- We should not trust a wireless link for security
- Assume that Wi-Fi is an insecure channel

Protecting insecure channels

Wi-Fi is basically an insecure channel. Ethernet packets on wired LAN can be sniffed too. How do you protect data?

Two elements to protecting IP traffic

- Encryption (symmetric ciphers like RC4, AES)

- Key exchange (RSA, DSA) and authentication

Remember: <u>encryption alone is not enough!</u>

 Imagine a criminal sets up a web site that looks like your bank's, complete with SSL (lock icon)

Looks like your bank, looks secure

- It's not hard to run SSL (https)
- Encryption alone is not enough

INSOLVABANK INC.									
USER:									
PASS:	*****								
	<u></u>								

They can still steal your password

The ONLY thing that would alert you to fraud:

- The address isn't your bank web site address
- Or, there is a warning about the certificate
 - Certificate is invalid or doesn't match the domain

Certificate authentication is essential !

Catches impostors, man-in-the-middle attacks

Application layer solution

- Transport Layer Security (TLS), previously SSL
- Encrypts data so that it can not be sniffed
- Also supports checking of certificates
 - Digital signature; authenticates identity
- TLS is widely used in "https://" web sites
 - A cipher like 128-bit RC4 provides encryption
 - Site certificates provide authentication
 - Both must be used to achieve security!

- Tunneling solutions
 - IPsec, an OS-based tunnel for IP packets
 - Virtual Private Network (VPN) e.g. OpenVPN
 - Secure Shell (SSH) tunnel, easy to do



- Application-layer SSL/TLS is strong enough
 - The connection is safe even if the channel is not
- So why do you need tunnels at all?
 - Many applications fail to use SSL/TLS
 - Others make partial or incomplete use of it
 - e.g. Case study, coming up in presentation
 - Many https web sites fail to use total SSL/TLS
 - They often load images, content from plain http
 - Malicious attacks are still possible
 - When in doubt, safer to use tunnel for all traffic

- SSH tunnel is easy using OpenSSH software
- ssh -L 1234:google.com:80 user@host
 - Opens ssh connection to host and logs in user
 - Forwards local port 1234 to google.com port 80
 - You can load http://127.0.0.1:1234 in browser
 - Your IP address does not connect to google
 - Instead, your traffic is encrypted over to host
 - The ssh host is the one contacting google.com

ssh -D 1234 user@host

- Open ssh (secure) connection to trusted host
- Establishes a SOCKS proxy over ssh tunnel
- In web browser, set proxy to 127.0.0.1:1234
- All web traffic will be tunneled through host
- That host opens new connections on demand
 - Your IP doesn't make TCP connections to sites
- All traffic is encrypted before leaving your IP
- Traffic leaving the ssh host can still be sniffed

Case study: an insecure application

- Real example: software from financial company
- Communicates very sensitive financial data
- Supposedly uses SSL, should be safe?
 - Turns out unencrypted data can still be sniffed
 - Failure to check certificates, so MITM possible



- How to investigate?
- First step: capture packets
 - e.g. tcpdump on Linux, unix
 - Wireshark (used to be Ethereal)
- Capture ethernet traffic while doing "SSL login"

First thing I notice: some http connections

 Application makes an http (not encrypted) connection to check for latest version.
 Wireshark decodes the http request.

- This request over the web is not encrypted, and neither is the reply (it is not SSL)
- Notice that this is a potential attack vector
 - An attacker could redirect this http to himself
 - Could interfere with application's mechanism to check its version and capabilities
 - Is this a threat? Very possibly.
- In any case, this connection should be over SSL/TLS. The software is in "SSL mode" !

- Second connection seen: tcp port 8001 (means nothing), but cleartext ASCII data is visible
- The data being received from the server looks like a TLS certificate which is likely part of the negotiation at the start of SSL/TLS

00000			~~~	10	20						2.2	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		<u> </u>		
0080	16	56	65	72	69	53	69	67	6e	20	54	72	75	13	74	20	.ver151g	n Trust
0090	4e	65	74	77	6f	72	6b	31	17	30	15	06	03	55	04	0b	Network1	.0U
00a0	13	0e	56	65	72	69	53	69	67	6e	2c	20	49	6e	63	2e	VeriSi	gn, Inc.
00b0	31	33	30	31	06	03	55	04	0b	13	2a	56	65	72	69	53	1301U.	.*Veris
00c0	69	67	<u>6e</u>	20	49	6e	74	65	72	<u>6e</u>	61	74	69	6f	6e	61	ign Inte	rnationa
00d0	6c	20	53	65	72	76	65	72	20	43	41	20	2d	20	43	6C	1 [°] Server	CA - Cl
00e0	61	73	73	20	33	31	49	30	47	06	03	55	04	0b	13	40	ass 31IO	GU@
00f0	- 77	77	77	2e	76	65	72	69	73	69	67	6e	2e	63	6f	6d	www.veri	sign.com
0100	2f	43	50	53	20	49	6e	63	6f	72	70	2e	62	79	20	52	/CPS Inc	orp.by R
0110	65	66	2e	20	4 C	49	41	42	49	4 C	49	54	59	20	4 C	54	ef. LIAB	ILITY LT
0120	44	2e	28	63	29	39	37	20	56	65	72	69	53	69	67	<u>6e</u>	D.(C)97	VeriSign
0130	- 30	1e	17	0d	30	37	30	36	30	31	30	30	30	30	30	30	00706	01000000
0140	5a	17	0d	30	39	30	35	33	31	32	33	35	39	35	39	5a	z09053	1235959z
0150	30	81	bf	31	0b	30	09	06	03	55	04	06	13	02	55	53	01.0	.UUS
0160	31	14	30	12	06	03	55	04	08	13	0b	43	6f	6e	6e	65	1.0U.	Conne
File: "C	File: "C:\DOCUME~1\Jem\LOCALS~1\Temp\ethe Packets: 379 Displayed: 379 Marked: 0 Dropped: 0																	

- In Wireshark, select only this port traffic by using display filter: tcp.port == 8001
- The rest of the packets all contain unreadable binary data (encrypted?). This is good news.
- It does appear that this port 8001 traffic is the SSL traffic which the application claims to use. This is an educated guess.

- But there are further TCP/IP connections to inspect: port 8000. Again tell Wireshark to use display filter: tcp.port == 8000
- This is where things get ugly...
- Virtually all of these packets contain readable ASCII data. It is definitely not encrypted, and there is no sign of a certificate.
- Some of the visible (sniffable) data is financial in nature. It's not private, but it is definitely financial and definitely in the clear.

- Wireshark even identifies it as "Financial Information eXchange Protocol" and a user name is readable!
- This user name is, in fact, transmitted many times in the clear... something that should never happen when we are expecting "SSL" mode!

```
Financial Information exchange Protocol
BeginString (8): FIX.4.1
BodyLength (9): 0087
MsgType (35): A (Logon)
MsgSeqNum (34): 000000
SendingTime (52): 20090203-04:59:09
EncryptMethod (98): 0
HeartBtInt (108): 30
RawDataLength (95): 19
RawData (96): S_____/12/usfarm
6034: 8894
```

- One of the packets contains something truly interesting; user name (in the clear) combined with what looks like the hash of the password.
- The word SHA-1 appears; this is a hash algorithm and the hexadecimal ASCII format data dump looks a lot like a hash output.



- We take an educated guess that the application is transmitting the hash of the password
- Transmitting the hash of a password is safer than sending the password in the clear; however, it can still be a bad idea.
- Depending on implementation, this kind of data could be abused by an attacker or even used to gain account privileges.

What some simple packet dumps have showed:

 While one connection is in fact SSL/TLS, other non-SSL connections are made too

 Those unprotected connections contain sensitive data, including user names. The password may be compromised too.

 All the unencrypted connections have no certificate and could be spoofed, or attacked by a man-in-the-middle (MITM)

 The software is misleading people if they presume it is SSL enabled and secure.

- Keep in mind, this particular software is used by many people from a major financial company.
- What we can learn from this case study:
 - Even "SSL-enabled" software can make poor use of SSL/TLS and send insecure data
 - Every connection should use TLS and check certificates; nothing short of this is acceptable
 - Software shouldn't rely on home-grown security mechanisms. Use a reliable layer like TLS.
 - Assume the IP network is insecure; it often is.
 - Sensitive programs shouldn't be used on Wi-Fi

 Actually getting hacked is an unlucky combination of network circumstances and software/hardware circumstances



How is a computer hacked?

- Many scenarios, we will focus on one:
 - Computer connected to a network (victim)
 - External attacker also has access to network
 - This could be the Internet, or just a LAN
 - i.e. could be bad guy using Wi-Fi on your LAN
 - Or could be a bad student at the university
 - External attacker knows nothing about victim
 - Attacker wants to gain access, somehow

- Attackers typically want to know what services this victim has (what IP ports are reachable)
- The "nmap" tool can scan for open IP ports
- This is of interest, because network services often have exploitable bugs
- Those exploits vary greatly on specific cases

- Sample nmap scan output on Windows host
- This victim has open RPC (remote procedure call) and NetBIOS ports, among others

> nmap -0 192.168.0.100

Starting Nmap 4.11 (http://www.insecure.org/nmap/) at 2009-02-03 00:28 CST Interesting ports on 192.168.0.100: Not shown: 1676 closed ports PORT STATE SERVICE 135/tcp open msrpc 139/tcp open netbios-ssn 445/tcp open microsoft-ds 1025/tcp open NFS-or-IIS MAC Address: 00:50:BA:CF:07:B7 (D-link) Device type: general purpose Running: Microsoft Windows NT/2K/XP OS details: Microsoft Windows XP Pro SP1/SP2 or 2000 SP4

Nmap finished: 1 IP address (1 host up) scanned in 1.911 seconds

- Each open port represents a service running on the victim computer
- Most services have vulnerable versions
- Search of "windows critical rpc" brought up
 - Microsoft Security Bulletin MS08-067 Critical
 - "The vulnerability could allow remote code execution if an affected system received a specially crafted RPC request."

Describes an RPC flaw reported October 2008

 If the victim did not update the OS to patch this RPC vulnerability, they are likely exploitable.

- Many computers run older operating systems and have components that are out of date
- Attacks are not Windows-specific
- Linux, FreeBSD, etc. hosts also run services

A host with vulnerable services can be hacked

- The actual exploits usually circulate on the Internet and can do a variety of things
- Typically, an attacker wishes to run a custom program to gain some form of access/control

• How to minimize risk of getting hacked:

- Close unnecessary services (ports). Each open service is a potentially vulnerable entry point.
- Keep software up to date, especially the operating system and services.
- Restrict access to ports from the outside world, using a firewall.