



INTERNET STANDARDS AND WEB SECURITY

Jeff Hodges
PayPal
August 2012



OVERALL AGENDA

The Current Web Has Some Holes

(some) Help is On The Way

Venues

What can you do to help?

[includes bonus references on the last slide!]



The Current Web Has Some Holes

Sort of Like This:





IT IS HARD TO DO EVEN SIMPLE THINGS SAFELY

- Include an ad on your site
- Use third-party Site-Analytics
- Allow user input (“Rich” or otherwise)
- Uniform use of HTTPS

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE HOLES?

- Cross Site Request Forgery (CSRF)
- Cross Site Scripting (XSS)
- Clickjacking
- Malvertising
- TLS/SSL Man In The Middle (MITM)
 - For example - sslstrip



WHY DO THESE ATTACKS EXIST?

- Core protocol/technology weaknesses
- Too much required of each and every developer
- Lack of Security Policy Mechanisms

CORE PROTOCOLS/TECHNOLOGIES HAVE WEAKNESSES

- Cookies are broken:
 - Their scope rules are broken
 - “Secure” Flag doesn’t really mean the same thing everywhere
 - “HTTPOnly” and “Secure” only partially effective
 - Network MiTM attacker can overwrite cookies by spoofing..
<http://www.example.com>
..to overwrite real “secure cookies” for..
<httpS://www.example.com>
- **Practically anything** can be interpreted as JavaScript
- Browsers default to **HTTP** first (Not **HTTPS**)

TOO MUCH REQUIRED OF EACH AND EVERY DEVELOPER

- To Implement a “Strong” Security Policy.....
- Every Cookie has to have HTTPOnly and Secure Flag
- Every link generated has to have the right scheme (HTTP vs. HTTPS)
- Every page must have the right content encoding
 - This is TOO HARD

LACK OF “SITE” SECURITY POLICY MECHANISMS

- A Developer or WebSite Administrator has *no coherent way* to say, for example:
 - Treat all my cookies “Securely”,
 - Only load HTTPS Content,
 - And don’t frame my site.



(Some) Help Is On The Way

“RECENT” WEB SECURITY STANDARDS

- Cookies aka “HTTP State Management” [RFC6265]
- The Web Origin Concept [RFC6454]
- X-Frame-Options (*de-jure*)
- Cross Origin Resource Sharing (CORS) [W3C]
 - Still a “working draft”

“EMERGING” WEB SECURITY STANDARDS

- HTTP Strict-Transport-Security (HSTS) [IETF I-D]
- Content Security Policy (CSPv1) [W3C WD]
- Content Sniffing controls
 - E.g., X-Content-Type-Options: nosniff

“IN GENESIS” WEB SECURITY STANDARDS

- CSPv1.1
 - Adds new directives:
 - Form-action, Script-nonce, plugin-types, frame-options (so far)
 - Frame-Options directive intended as successor to x-frame-options
- User Interface Safety directives for CSP
 - More fine-grained framing control with input protections from click, keypress, touch, and drag events



LEVERAGABLE, EMERGING SECURITY STANDARDS

- Secure DNS (aka DNSSEC)
- TLSA (aka DANE) [RFC6698]



Venues for the Foregoing Work

VENUES FOR THE FOREGOING WORK

- We actively contributed to the creation of, and participate in, these working groups:
- IETF HTTP State Working Group
 - Dec-2009 to May-2011
 - RFC6265 “HTTP State Management Mechanism”
 - (The WG successfully achieved its goal and was closed)
- IETF WebSec Working Group (Feb 2011)
 - Web Origin [RFC6454]
 - HTTP Strict Transport Security (HSTS) [RFC-to-be-soon]
 - X-Frame-Options (a real spec, retroactively)
 - Web Security Framework Requirements

VENUES FOR THE FOREGOING WORK CONT'D

- W3C WebAppSec (Jun 2011) and WebApps Working Groups
 - Key specs underway:
 - CORS “Cross Origin Resource Sharing”
 - CSP “Content Security Policy”
 - UI Safety
- Related:
 - IETF DANE WG
 - RFC6698 “The DNS-Based Authentication of Named Entities (DANE) Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol: TLSA”
 - Now working on applying these techniques to other protocols, e.g., IPSEC

SOME THINGS NOT YET ADDRESSED

- Use of third-party script
 - E.g., include arbitrary ads on your site or third-party Site-Analytics
 - Note: (draft) ECMAScript v5 “strict mode” plus Caja is a promising solution here
- Allow arbitrary user input (“Rich” or otherwise)
- Automatic uniform use of HTTPS
- A Coherent Web Security Policy framework
 - Still inventing new one-off HTTP headers for specific issues, e.g., HSTS
 - CSP is step in right direction, e.g., in how the UI Safety spec leverages CSP for policy conveyance

SOME GOALS FOR APPROACHES

- Should not rely on every developer (and user) “getting it right” 100% of the time
- Security mechanisms should be “declarative policy and configuration”
 - separate from “code”
- Reduce the need for new individual HTTP headers for each specific issue
- Overall – create security mechanisms that allow/enforce the concept of **Least Privilege**

SOME WORK STILL LACKING A HOME

- Common Security User-Interfaces
 - Browsers presently display security issues differently
 - Also have differing approaches to dealing with issues
 - Is an area of active research & experimentation so standardizing is perhaps premature (W3C eventually?)
- Fixing the Certificate Authority (CA) Situation
 - Multitude of CAs in browser & OS “Trust Anchor Repositories (TARs)”
 - All trusted equally
 - Each can certify any domain name
 - Large attack surface
 - Whither the CA/Browser Forum?
 - BOF session at IETF-85 Atlanta (Nov 2012) on “Web PKI Operations” (WPKops) ? (a step in a useful direction)

WHAT CAN YOU DO TO HELP?

- Participate in the IETF and W3C Working Groups, and other such cross-industry orgs
- Deploy your website uniformly via HTTPS
- Use HSTS and CSP in your web application
- Provide feedback to the working groups

QUESTIONS?

- For more details:
- [The Need for Coherent Web Security Policy Framework\(s\)](http://w2spconf.com/2010/papers/p11.pdf)
<http://w2spconf.com/2010/papers/p11.pdf>
- W3C Web App Security Working Group
<http://www.w3.org/2011/webappsec/>
- IETF WebSec Working Group
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/websec/charter/>
- IETF DANE (TLSA et al) Working Group
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/dane/charter/>
- WPKops (non-working group, exploratory) mailing list
<https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/wpkops>

- Jeff Hodges (Jeff.Hodges@paypal.com)
- Brad Hill (bhill@paypal.com)
- Andy Steingruebl (asteingruebl@paypal.com)