Cross Site Request Forgery

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ = 三 のへで

Unraveling the Web: An Introduction to Penetration Testing

Chuanshu

May 4, 2025

Cross Site Request Forgery

Conclusion

Outline



- 2 Web security concepts
- 3 Cross Site Request Forgery



- ▲ ロ ト ▲ 国 ト ▲ 国 ト → 国 - の Q ()

Introduction ●0000

Web security concepts

Cross Site Request Forgery

Conclusion

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

Hello BSides Ballarat!



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ = 三 のへで



- I have been a pentester for 3 years
- Occasionally I play capture the flag (CTF)
- I love puzzles

Penetration testing

- Offensive side of security
- Hired by companies to hack their systems before they are hacked by someone else
- Wide array of skills
 - Application testing (Web, desktop, mobile etc)
 - Network testing
 - Phishing/Social engineering campaigns
 - Physical access testing

Web application testing

- Many different kinds of web apps exist
- Look for common vulnerabilities
 - OWASP (Open Worldwide Application Security Project)
 - MITRE CWE (Common Weakness Enumeration)

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Talk aims

- Explore a simple web attack: Cross site request forgery
- Overview of modern web security mechanisms
- Aim: To give a responsible introduction to web application hacking

Introduction

Web security concepts

Cross Site Request Forgery

Conclusion

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ = 三 のへで

Web security concepts

- Authentication
- Browser features
 - Cookies
 - localStorage

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Authentication

- Authentication is like the front door to an application
- Traditionally username/password
- Big push for Multi factor authentication (MFA)

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Authentication



- Server returns information about authentication status
- Authentication information stored in browser

What's in a browser

- We are particularly interested in where secrets are stored
- Browser storage has gotten much more complex over time to support complex app designs and requirements
- Browser storage is designed with security in mind ¹

Cross Site Request Forgery

Conclusion

What's in a browser



◆□> ◆□> ◆豆> ◆豆> ・豆 ・ のへで

Cross Site Request Forgery

Conclusion

What's in a browser



- Cache storage and IndexedDB are for web workers ²
- Wont be going through them in this talk, recommended reading if interested:
 - https://portswigger.net/research/ hijacking-service-workers-via-dom-clobbering

²https:

//developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/API/Web_Workers_API 🗉 🖉 🖉 ५ ० ५ ए

Cross Site Request Forgery



🕞 🗘 Inspector 🕞 Console	> Debugger	• ↑↓ Network	{} Style Edit	or 🕜 P	erformance 🗄 Sto	rage 🔀	> 😲 7	🖂 ɗ] ••• ×
🕨 🗄 Cache Storage	🗑 Filter Ite								+ C'
▼ 🗄 Cookies	Name			Path					
https://www.google.com	csrf_token								
https://accounts.google.com	csv								
https://www.reddit.com	edgebuc						false		
	g_state								
▶									
Local Storage									
Session Storage									
	token_v2	eyJhbGciOiJSU	.reddit.com	I	Fri, 02 May 2025 13	1207	true	true	None

- Cookies were the original way for apps to store data in a user's browser
- Partitioned based on web origin, e.g. accounts.google.com and www.reddit.com are different origins
- Sent on each request to the relevant origin (almost always)

```
Introduction
```

Cross Site Request Forgery

Conclusion

Cookies



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで



🕞 🗘 Inspector 🕞 Console	> Debugge	↑↓ Network	{} Style Edit	or 🞧 Pe	erformance 🗄 Sto	rage ≯	• 10	🖂 á.] ••• ×
🕨 🗄 Cache Storage									+ C
👻 🗄 Cookies							HttpOnly	Secure	SameSite
https://www.google.com							false		Strict
https://accounts.google.com							false		None
ttps://www.reddit.com	edgebuc						false		None
							false		None
							false		None
Local Storage							false		None
🕨 🗄 Session Storage							false		None
	token_v2	eyJhbGciOiJSU	.reddit.com	1	Fri, 02 May 2025 13	1207	true	true	None

HTTPOnly Cannot be accessed by JavaScript Secure Only transmitted over HTTPS connections SameSite Whether cookies are sent over cross-origin requests • Strict, Lax (default), and None

Cross Site Request Forgery

localStorage and sessionStorage



- Used to store much larger amounts of data that doesn't need to be sent to the server on each request
- localStorage persists across sessions, sessionStorage cleared when page is closed or reloaded
- Also partitioned by origin by the browser, always accessible by JavaScript

Cross Site Request Forgery

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Web security concepts summary

- Authentication requires exchanging information such as username or passwords for a secret stored in browser
- Browser storage is separated by web origin
- Cookies are small bits of data sent with each request (most of the time)
- localStorage and sessionStorage are a newer storage mechanism

Introduction

Web security concepts

Cross Site Request Forgery •00000000000 Conclusion

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Cross Site Request Forgery



- CSRF is a client side attack
- Client-side attacks target the application running in another user's browser
- Server-side attacks target the application server or other backend components

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Cross site request forgery

- A common goal is to leak information stored inside the target's browser, usually authentication secrets to gain control of that user's accounts
- Requires the target to load malicious content in their browser: "1-click" attacks

Cross site request forgery (CSRF)

- Rather than leaking secrets, the goal of CSRF attacks is to perform actions in the vulnerable web app as the target user
- If leaking client secrets is like stealing someone's keys, CSRF is like tricking someone inside the house into opening the door for you
- Scenario: The target clicks on a link sent to them by an attacker while logged in to the vulnerable application:
 - i.e. the secrets for that application are stored in the target's browser

Example 1: GET based CSRF

- Weakness: The web app bank.com uses a GET request to update user passwords
 GET /change-password?new-password=<new password>
- When the target clicks the link below, the browser automatically sends a GET request with the parameter ?new-password=hacked!1.
- If the target is authenticated using cookies, this request will be authenticated

https://bank.com/change-password?new-password=hacked!1

Example 2: POST based CSRF

- Weakness: SameSite attribute of authentication cookie is None
- The snippet below could be included within a completely benign looking page or email
- Doesn't work if SameSite attribute is Secure or Lax

Cross Site Request Forgery

Conclusion

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Example 2: POST based CSRF (discussion)

- Browser protects you against POST based CSRF attacks as Cookies are set to *SameSite* by default
- Security guidelines should forbid using GET requests to make state changing operations

Introduction

Web security concepts

Cross Site Request Forgery

Conclusion

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Interlude



- CSRF issues were rampant circa 2012
- Browsers now make it very difficult to make your app vulnerable to CSRF

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Example 3: No cookies involved

- App used Authorization header to send user tokens
 - Tokens were stored in localStorage of admin.app.com
- Weakness: The app automatically makes authenticated requests using variables in the URL
- Browsing to https://admin.app.com/users/1000 sends the request:

Request GET /users/1000 Host: api.app.com Authorization: <token>

Example 3: No cookies involved

- Browsing to https://admin.app.com/users/foo gave me a "User not found" error:
- Browsing to https://admin.app.com/users/%252f gave me a different error:

Request

GET /users/%2f Host: api.app.com Authorization: <token>

Response 404 Not Found ... { "status": "404", "error": "Path not found", "path": "/users//" }

Example 3: No cookies involved

- Checked API routes to see if there were any state changing GET requests
- There was one: /admin/verify-user/1000
- Use path traversal to navigate backwards: /users/../admin/verify-user/1000
 - Note: Directly accessing admin.app.com/admin wouldn't work as there was no automatic API call
 - Note: Directly accessing api.app.com wouldn't work as the user token was stored in localStorage on admin.app.com

Example 3: No cookies involved

• Malicious URL:

https://admin.app.com/users/%252e%252fadmin% 252fverify-user%252f1000

Request

```
GET /admin/verify-user/1000
Host: api.app.com
Authorization: <token>
```

Response
200 OK
{ "message": "user verified" }

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Example 3: No cookies involved

- Possible to create a link that sent arbitrary authenticated GET requests on behalf of the user who clicks on the link
- Reshaped my idea of CSRF attacks
 - \bullet Look for automatic requests being sent \rightarrow Sources
 - $\bullet\,$ Look for APIs that could be consumed using these automatic requests $\to\,$ Sinks
- The idea of a POST sink was not unreasonable

Example 3: No cookies involved (discussion)

- Cause of the issue was not due to legacy systems but rather a redesign of their frontend
- Single page apps are increasing in popularity these apps load a single HTML page and rely on JavaScript to render different components

Relevance to today

- Web apps are becoming increasingly client heavy
- Popularising of client-side protocols such as OAuth
 - Recommend reading my blog!
- Targeted and sophisticated phishing incidents occur very frequently in large companies

Conclusion

- Web technologies will continue to get more complex to support the needs of different application designs
- Complexity often creates security issues
- Secure by default, insecure by choice
- Problems arise when features designed for a certain purpose are used in unexpected ways

Recommended study

- Educational labs
 - PortSwigger labs (free)
 - Pentesterlab (free and paid option)
 - Hack The Box
- Wargames
 - OverTheWire
- CTFs
 - PicoCTF for practice
 - DownUnder CTF (local)
 - Happening all the time, find at ctftime.oeg
- Blogs & Articles
 - Infosec aggregator: talkback.sh

Introduction

Web security concepts

Cross Site Request Forgery

Conclusion 000●

Questions?





