

JAW: Studying Client-side CSRF with Hybrid Property Graphs and Declarative Traversals

Soheil Khodayari and Giancarlo Pellegrino CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security

30th USENIX Security Symposium August 11-13, 2021



Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)





Robust defenses already known:

• Referrer/Origin Checks

getOrigin(req₂) != bank.com

Hard-to-guess tokens

getToken(req₂) != CSRFToken

- SameSite Cookies
 - SameSite=Lax by default

isAuthenticated(req₂) != True

Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)



Robust defenses already known:

• Referrer/Origin Checks







Problem Statement

- Limited knowledge about client-side CSRF.
 - Facebook in 2018¹
- **Objective:** studying client-side CSRF vulnerabilities
 - (RQ1) Prevalence of client-side CSRF in webapps?
 - (RQ2) Attacker models and exploitations?
 - (RQ3) Degree of attacker control?
 - E.g., path, query, domain, body

POST /path/file.php?q=v\r\n
Host: example.com\r\n
\r\n
{body}





- A scalable, graph-based framework for detection and exploratory analysis of client-side CSRF vulnerabilities
- Components
 - Data Collection
 - Graph Construction
 - Analysis Traversals







- A scalable, graph-based framework for detection and exploratory analysis of client-side CSRF vulnerabilities
- Components
 - Data Collection
 - Graph Construction
 - Analysis Traversals







- A scalable, graph-based framework for detection and exploratory analysis of client-side CSRF vulnerabilities
- Components
 - Data Collection
 - Graph Construction
 - Analysis Traversals







- A scalable, graph-based framework for detection and exploratory analysis of client-side CSRF vulnerabilities
- Components
 - Data Collection
 - Graph Construction
 - Analysis Traversals







Hybrid Property Graphs (HPGs): Building Blocks





Symbolic Models and Semantic Types Propagation

- External libraries: over 60% of the total LoC of each webpage.
- Problem:
 - Existing approaches: Inefficient, include library code in the analysis
- Idea: Shared models for JS libraries









Evaluation: Forgeable Requests



- Evaluated JAW with all webapps from the Bitnami catalog
 - 106 webapps
 - 228M LoC
- Detected 12,701 forgeable requests affecting 87 webapps

Exploitations

- Manually looked for practical exploitations in 516 requests
- Created exploits for 203 requests of seven webapps
 - SuiteCRM, SugarCRM, Neos, Kibana, Modx, Odoo, and Shopware
 - Account takeover, deleting user assets, ...

Input Source	Forgeable	Apps
DOM.COOKIES	67	5
DOM.READ	12,268	83
*-Storage	76	8
DOC.REFERRER	1	1
POST-MESSAGE	8	8
WIN.NAME	1	1
WIN.LOC	280	12
Total Forgeable	12,701	87
Total Requests	49,366	106

Evaluation: Analysis of Forgeable Requests

- Exploitation landscape can be influenced by:
 - Type of controllable fields
 - Operation to forge a field
- Identified 25 distinct templates. For example:
 - 185/ 516 requests: manipulate any part of domain + path + query
 - 20/ 516 requests: manipulate multiple parts of path + body
 - 166/ 516 requests: manipulate a single part of body
 - See the paper for more



POST /path/file.php?q=v\r\n
Host: example.com\r\n
\r\n
{body}





Conclusion



