YAWATT - (yet) Another web application testing toolkit

HITB 2006 Kuala – Lumpur

Or a "non-monkey" approach to web applications hacking

By fyodor and meder

fygrave@o0o.nu meder@o0o.nu

"Nope. we are not writing another web scanner!!"



Agenda

Why hacking web applications

What scanners do. Why they are useless (or not)

What else could be done, but isn't (yet)

Introduction to YAWATT

- User-session based approach
- Distributed
- Intelligent (or not?)
- Modular
- More than "application security scanner" ...

So, why going for the web

Good Admins learnt to configure their firewalls

- Good Admins disable services they don't want
- Good Admins even finally know how to use nmap (and even nessus!!)
- But Good Admins still need to provide Web
- And they are not programmers

The web applications get complex New web frameworks make it even more fun (AJAX)

And more ...

Ē

Due to high demand of web application programmers, many only have "learn {CGI|PHP|perI|ASP|..} in 24 hours" experience

So the Web applications remain the largest hole in one's network

The code is bad

- Q/A not security oriented
- Must get product to market ASAP
- Firewalls are there but they can't help
 - IDS are there but they are blind

Application "firewalls" - stop limited number of web application attacks (basic user input validation), but are useless when it comes to detection of logical vulnerabilities

Scanners evolution - summary

Libwhisker/nikto – signature based. Relatively primitive. Efficient for finding default misconfigiurations and typical vulnerabilities Nessus et all – don't see web applications beyond the underlying software configuration Kavado/Webinspect/N-Stalker/Watchfire Appscan – intelligent scanners. Session aware. But closed architecture, "blackbox" (some allow scripted plugins) and costs \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$

Why scanners aren't enough

Single-host based

Non-extendable, non-correctable.

- Little or no control on "hacking" process execution flow
 - Not easily "extend on the fly" with new 'automation' methods
 - Often primitive, strict signature based logic

What would we like to have Maximum automation of web hacking process F Minimum of code writing. Event-driven workflow Manual control

More on the wishlist

Autonomous functionality (you can shutdown, restart, reload modules, provide new data on the fly and so on)

"Human to machine" knowledge transfer
Ability to add new 'hacks' on the fly
Deal with uncertainty in "intelligent way"
Learn from valid user session data

Wish list (cont)

Be able to attack web application from multiple-locations (bypass IP restrictions, improve brute-forcing process)

Be able to automate the testing of application logic bugs

Ē

Be able to make intelligent guesses in case of uncertainty



YAWATT learns from user sessions

User sessions – collections of user's requests and responses (url, name/value pairs, session information and selective HTTP protocol data)

Classified user session data include semantic classification of URL, parameters, responses and HTTP protocol data (server type, backend system(s) if visible, "unusual" HTTP headers detected and included)

Automation

Application content is learnt from user sessions (data feeders: proxies, enumeration tools)

Real-time content analysis with additional verification

Classification

User session data is classified by:

- Semantic and functional classification of URL
- HTTP protocol classificators (server type, cookies ..)
- Session classificators
- Input data classification type, semantics
- Output classification (application error detection, redirects, "bogus' responses etc)

Classification process as new data arrives into the system



Testing process

Plugins (tests) could be executed during the collection of user session data if any of user session data triggers certain plugin Plugins (tests) are executed on demand, when user session data is completed

YAWATT Intelligence components (components under development)

- Web application components (URL) classification
- Semantic classification for web application input data
- LSI based response analysis (comparison of web content)

In response analyzers.

Use of queries to external sources, search engines

Limited "binary analysis" of downloaded files (decoding pdf, doc, rtf (other formats later)'

Generation of target-specific bruteforce dictionaries

H2M Knowledge Transfer

Possibility to create new classification rules on the fly (and let the system re-learn from it) Possibility to 'reclassify' application responses

Possibility to add new 'testing' plugins and methods on the fly or correct the old ones

How is URL classification used

Vulnerability scenario testing – uses 'classificators' subscription mechanism.

For example: login page tester will need 'login', 'executable' and 'session'

Ē





Additional research directions

Other ideas to work on:

- Detection of "hidden" parameters ("intelligent" fuzzy tests)
- Identification of "hidden" URLs
- Fuzzy recognition of "negative" and 'positive" responses using LSI
- Detection of application failures, redirects
- Evaluation and priority based execution for plugins





What distributed approach gives us:

Heterogeneous environment (different platforms with different software can work together)

Distributed brute-forcing. Bypassing IP based restrictions, bandwidth limitations

IDS – more tricks to evade

Bypass packet filtering restrictions (ability to place agents behind the firewall!)

Communication layer framework in detail:

Modified version of spread toolkit used as base

Robust

- Reliable message delivery
- Portable (windows/unix)
- Available in C/C++ and Java flavours. Bindings exist for Python, Ruby!
- Spread is used in proof-of concept code and will be ditched in future!

More on intelligence

Aside from application vulnerabilities, other things of interest are:

- Email addresses, user ids that could be seen within web content
- Domain names (within web pages, comments, binary files, etc)

 Building 'target-oriented' dictionary files (used by brute-force cracking modules)

How the targeted dictionaries for brute-force attacks are generated:

- A statistical information extraction method is applied:
- Step 1:Random similarly styled texts in the same language as the target application content, are analyzed and the statistical occurrence of each word is calculated
- Step 2:Statistical occurrence of each word within the target website is calculated

 Step 3: The dictionary is produced by selecting those words which probability produced in Step 1 and Step 2 is significally different

Other good things

Add your plugin code on the fly (attack automation plugins via subscription mechanism, classification plugins etc):

Can't be simpler:

```
P 172.16.131.205 - PuTTY
                                                                              - D ×
method.rb
             server.rb
                          urlanalyzer.rb
fygrave@loo ~/devel/ruby/YAWATT/HTTPCollector/plugins $ cat method.rb
if input.request.method == "POST"
    result << " executable post"
end
fygrave@loo ~/devel/ruby/YAWATT/HTTPCollector/plugins $ cat server.rb
sre=/^Server: (.+)$/
result=""
if input.response.httpdata=~sre
    serverline=$1
    serverline.each(' ') { |srv| s,v=srv.split('/')
        result << " " << s }
end
fygrave@loo ~/devel/ruby/YAWATT/HTTPCollector/plugins $
```





Trying code

http://o0o.nu/ - pre-release.

You will need:

- Spread toolkit (www.spread.org)
- Patched version of Ruby, Spread bindings for ruby.
 'classifier' package (Bayesian, LSI algorithms),
 'mysqldb'
- Burp proxy as data source
- MYSQL database

Questions and Answers

Sample questions, pick one: ;------) Why another web hacking tool? Can you do X too..? Can X be integrated too ..? This presentation is boring, any excuse ..? © E

Thanks

Thanks for your patience

Send us emails if you try the code

The code, slides and docs will be available in a while:

http://o0o.nu/