



Badlock

One Year In Security Hell

Stefan Metzmacher <metze@samba.org>

Samba Team / SerNet

2016-05-11

https://samba.org/~metze/presentations/2016/metze_sambaxp2016_badlock-handout.pdf

Agenda

- ▶ History of reports/findings
- ▶ The badlock related bugs in detail
- ▶ New options
- ▶ Behavior changes
- ▶ Coordination with Microsoft
- ▶ The final sprint
- ▶ Coordination with Vendors
- ▶ Regressions
- ▶ Future improvements
- ▶ Thanks!
- ▶ Questions?



History (Part 1)

- ▶ CVE-2015-3223: LDAP 00 search expression attack
 - ▶ Reported on June 9, 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on December 16, 2015
- ▶ CVE-2015-7540: Bogus LDAP request cause memory DoS
 - ▶ Reported on September 20, 2012, but (re-)noticed by CVE-2015-3223
 - ▶ Fix released on December 16, 2015
- ▶ CVE-2015-5370: Multiple errors in DCE-RPC code
 - ▶ Reported on June 18, 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on April 12, 2016
- ▶ CVE-2015-5252: Insufficient symlink verification
 - ▶ Reported on July 9, 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on December 16, 2015
- ▶ CVE-2016-2118: SAMR and LSA man in the middle attacks
 - ▶ Found in July 2015 (Badlock)
 - ▶ Fix released on April 12, 2016

History (Part 2)

- ▶ CVE-2015-5299: Currently the snapshot browsing is not secure
 - ▶ Reported on September 24, 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on December 16, 2015
- ▶ CVE-2015-5296: No man in the middle protection with smb encryption
 - ▶ Found on September 30, 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on December 16, 2015
- ▶ CVE-2015-8467: Microsoft MS15-096 / CVE-2015-2535 needs matching fix in Samba
 - ▶ Reported on October 13, 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on December 16, 2015
- ▶ CVE-2015-5330: Remote read memory exploit in LDB
 - ▶ Reported on November 12, 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on December 16, 2015
- ▶ CVE-2016-2110: Man in the middle attacks possible with NTLMSSP
 - ▶ Found in November 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on April 12, 2016

History (Part 3)

- ▶ CVE-2016-2111: NETLOGON Spoofing Vulnerability
 - ▶ Noticed in November 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on April 12, 2016
- ▶ CVE-2016-2112: The LDAP client and server don't enforce integrity protection
 - ▶ Found in November 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on April 12, 2016
- ▶ CVE-2016-2113: Missing TLS certificate validation
 - ▶ Noticed in November 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on April 12, 2016
- ▶ CVE-2016-2114: "server signing = mandatory" not enforced
 - ▶ Noticed in November 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on April 12, 2016
- ▶ CVE-2016-2115: SMB client IPC traffic is not protected
 - ▶ Noticed in November 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on April 12, 2016

History (Part 4)

- ▶ CVE-2015-7560: Setting ACLs on symlinks changes target
 - ▶ Reported on December 23, 2015
 - ▶ Fix released on March 8, 2016
- ▶ CVE-2016-0771: Read of uninitialized memory DNS TXT handling
 - ▶ Reported on January 22, 2016
 - ▶ Fix released on March 8, 2016
- ▶ Release of the first bunch of CVEs on December 23, 2015
 - ▶ We tried to get as much as possible out of our way
- ▶ Release of the second bunch of newly found CVEs on March 8, 2015
 - ▶ We knew the third bunch was going to be huge, so we released everything that was ready to ship
- ▶ Release of the third bunch of man in the middle related CVEs on April 12, 2015
 - ▶ This was a very huge release including a lot of rewritten code and new options resp. behavior changes

CVE-2015-5370: Multiple errors in DCE-RPC code

- ▶ The first denial of service problem was found at an interop event by Jouni Knuutinen from Synopsys
- ▶ Jeremy Allison did the initial research
- ▶ While reviewing the initial patches the nightmare begun
- ▶ I found new problems day after day
- ▶ About 20 problem classes (mostly denial of service and man in the middle)
- ▶ Distributed over 4 DCERPC implementations (2 servers, 2 clients)
- ▶ I analysed these problems deeply together with Günther Deschner
- ▶ At the end I had 94 patches including an almost complete DCERPC protocol verification testsuite

CVE-2016-2118: Badlock (Part 1)

- ▶ While thinking about the CVE-2015-5370 patches I thought about possible related problems
- ▶ After a while I found that the DCERPC auth_level can be downgraded and nasty things can be done with it
- ▶ My first finding was limited to clients using ncacn_ip_tcp with SAMR
- ▶ I created a man in the middle exploit that got the full AD database including all secret keys while joining a Windows DC into a Windows domain
- ▶ NOTE THIS IS A FULL TAKEOVER: information leak and remote code execution on all domain member computers (maybe also in trusted domains)
- ▶ The attacker only need see the clients network traffic
- ▶ I guess it's really not that unlikely that someone might find exploits for unpatched router firmware
- ▶ Jeremy and I reported this to secure@microsoft.com on July 31, 2015

CVE-2016-2118: Badlock (Part 2)

- ▶ After thinking a bit more I finally realized that the problem is even worse
- ▶ It is not limited to a join of a new Windows DC
- ▶ Every login as an administrator can be used by an attacker
- ▶ It is not limited to just Windows domains, also Samba domains are affected
- ▶ The problem is a generic to DCERPC over unprotected transports like `ncacn_ip_tcp` or `ncacn_np` (without SMB signing)
- ▶ Some application layer protocols (e.g. DRSUAPI) only allow secure connections using integrity or privacy protection
- ▶ Samba was missing most of these checks which were already available on Windows

CVE-2016-2110: Man in the middle attacks with NTLMSSP

- ▶ While working on CVE-2015-5370 and CVE-2016-2118 I thought a complete audit of all protocols was required
- ▶ After a while I found that NTLMSSP flags, e.g. NTLMSSP_SIGN/SEAL can be removed by a man in the middle without noticing
- ▶ This has implication on encrypted LDAP traffic
- ▶ A bit of research revealed that Microsoft already implemented downgrade detection into NTLMSSP when using NTLMv2
- ▶ I decided to implement the same in Samba in order to improve NTLMSSP authenticated connections

CVE-2016-2111: NETLOGON Spoofing Vulnerability

- ▶ While researching about CVE-2016-2110 I found Microsofts CVE-2015-0005 "NETLOGON Spoofing Vulnerability"
- ▶ The problem with this was that any domain member was able to ask the domain controller for NTLM session keys of authentication sessions of all other domain members.
- ▶ The protection mechanism relies on NTLMv2 being used only via NTLMSSP
- ▶ During the research it turned out that the problem in Samba were even worse
- ▶ Anonymous attackers could ask for the session keys
- ▶ raw NTLMv2 was allowed without NTLMSSP wrapping, which allowed downgrade attacks

CVE-2016-2112: LDAP integrity protection is not enforced

- ▶ Fixing the specific NTLMSSP based problems of CVE-2016-2110 is not enough
- ▶ The LDAP client and server also need to verify the authentication (gensec) backend provides the requested features
- ▶ This is required in order to prevent Kerberos replay attacks
- ▶ It was required to fix these things in the LDAP server as well as in our two LDAP client libraries
- ▶ At the same time we improved the consistency of behaviors especially regarding the usage of configuration options
- ▶ The default behavior of the LDAP server is much stricter than before

CVE-2016-2113: Missing TLS certificate validation

- ▶ While analyzing CVE-2016-2110 and CVE-2016-2112, I realized that we don't do any certificate validation
- ▶ This applies to all TLS based protocols like ldaps:// and ncacn_http with https://
- ▶ For ldaps:// it only applies to tools like samba-tool, ldbsearch, ldbedit and other ldb tools
- ▶ Typically, these protocols are not used, but if someone does use them they are expected to be protected
- ▶ So (as a client) we now verify the server certificates as much as we can

CVE-2016-2114: "server signing = mandatory" not enforced

- ▶ While working on CVE-2015-5370 and CVE-2016-2118 I thought a complete audit of all protocols was required
- ▶ As all unprotected DCERPC transports are vulnerable to man in the middle attacks it was clear that SMB signing is important
- ▶ It turned out that we didn't require SMB signing even if we are configured with mandatory signing
- ▶ This is fixed now
- ▶ As an active directory domain controller we require signing by default now

CVE-2015-2115: SMB IPC traffic is not integrity protected

- ▶ While working on CVE-2015-5370 and CVE-2016-2118 I thought a complete audit of all protocols was required
- ▶ As all unprotected DCERPC transports are vulnerable to man in the middle attacks it was clear that SMB signing is important
- ▶ We can't change the default of "client signing" and "client max protocol" in a security release, because of performance reasons
- ▶ We try to use SMB3 and required signing for IPC\$ related SMB client connections, which are used as a DCERPC transport

New options

- ▶ In order to prevent the man in the middle attacks it was required to change the (default) behavior for some protocols.
- ▶ New smb.conf options:
 - ▶ allow dcerpc auth level connect (G)
 - ▶ client ipc signing (G)
 - ▶ client ipc max protocol (G)
 - ▶ client ipc min protocol (G)
 - ▶ ldap server require strong auth (G)
 - ▶ raw NTLMv2 auth (G)
 - ▶ tls verify peer (G)
 - ▶ tls priority (G) (backported from Samba 4.3 to Samba 4.2)

Behavior changes

- ▶ In order to prevent the man in the middle attacks it was required to change the (default) behavior for some protocols.
- ▶ Change behaviors:
 - ▶ The default auth level for ncacn_ip_tcp: bindings has changed to DCERPC_AUTH_LEVEL_INTEGRITY.
 - ▶ "client lanman auth = yes" is now required for LANMAN2 connections
 - ▶ "client ntlmv2 auth = yes" and "client use spnego = yes" require SPNEGO
 - ▶ "client ldap sasl wrapping" is now used for all LDAP client code

Coordination with Microsoft

- ▶ After a face to face meeting in Redmond in September I had regular phone calls with them
- ▶ I proposed a very simple change for the urgent (badlock) problem
- ▶ We also discussed some more advanced changes, but they didn't pass Windows regression tests and were therefore postponed
- ▶ In order to get the most important fixes out of the door we agreed on April 12, 2016 as target release date
- ▶ We have planed to continue the discussion regarding more advanced solutions and improved protocol hardening once we're (or at least I'm) fully recoverd

Coordination with Vendors (Part 1)

- ▶ As the Samba Team we only have resources to provide security fixes for 3 maintained branches (currently 4.4, 4.3 and 4.2)
 - ▶ 4.4.2 had 323 patches on top of 4.4.0 (note that 4.4.1 had a regression and was superseded by 4.4.2)
 - ▶ samba-4.4.0-security-2016-04-12-final.patch
227 files changed, 14582 insertions(+), 5037 deletions(-)
 - ▶ 4.3.8 had 352 patches on top of 4.3.6 (note that 4.3.7 had a regression and was superseded by 4.3.8)
 - ▶ samba-4.3.6-security-2016-04-12-final.patch
236 files changed, 14870 insertions(+), 5195 deletions(-)
 - ▶ 4.2.11 had 440 patches on top of 4.2.9 (note that 4.2.10 had a regression and was superseded by 4.2.11)
 - ▶ samba-4.2.9-security-2016-04-12-final.patch
319 files changed, 17636 insertions(+), 7506 deletions(-)
- ▶ Given huge amount of changes we (at SerNet) thought it would be good think to inform the public about the target release date
 - ▶ <http://badlock.org> was created in order to provide a central location for information

Coordination with Vendors (Part 2)

- ▶ Vendors shipping Samba as part of their product get early access to security patches and releases
 - ▶ They need to prepare binary packages and maybe backport patches
- ▶ This time backport patches for the most critical parts in older branches were mostly done by Ralph Böhme, Andreas Schneider and Günther Deschner
 - ▶ `samba-v4-0-security-2016-04-12-fileserver-only.patch`
70 files changed, 3145 insertions(+), 540 deletions(-)
 - ▶ `samba-v3-6-security-2016-04-12.patch`
95 files changed, 4007 insertions(+), 978 deletions(-)
- ▶ Jeremy Allison also notified other non-Samba vendors, with their own SMB/DCERPC implementation, e.g. Apple, EMC, NetApp, Oracle, Nexenta and Huawei.
- ▶ Given the impact of these bugs we avoided plaintext email or bugzilla comments until the release day

The final sprint

- ▶ I spend about 3 person months on security problems between June 2015 and February 2016
 - ▶ Mostly alone, but also with a lot of help from Günther Deschner (who reviewed every single patch of the April 12, 2016 releases carefully)
- ▶ I somehow managed to work 2 person months during March 2016
 - ▶ The aim was to get the patches to our vendors as fast as possible and be ready 3 weeks before the release
 - ▶ But it took a bit longer than expected and the patches (for the upstream releases) were ready and reviewed 12 days before the public release
- ▶ The public release date announcement was able to finally get the interest of more Samba-Team members (and their employers)
 - ▶ This was important in order to get as much regression testing as possible
 - ▶ It was a time with a lot of intense team work and a lot of conference calls

Regressions

- ▶ In Samba we have testsuite called "autobuild" with several thousand tests
 - ▶ This runs before each push to the public branches
 - ▶ Using private autobuilds prevented a lot of bad surprises
- ▶ We had a lot of testing the Redhat, SuSE and SerNet QA teams
 - ▶ Which also found some regressions before the final release
- ▶ Although we had so much testing we had some regressions in the April 12, 2016 releases
 - ▶ They were mostly regarding guest access with NTLMSSP against Samba and Apple clients and servers
 - ▶ In some scenarios the communication with the domain controller was broken
 - ▶ These were fixed on May 2, 2016
- ▶ A few days ago we got the bug reports of ntlm_auth crashes
 - ▶ We already have a fix for one issue (bug #11912)
 - ▶ We are still debugging the other one (bug #11914)

Future Improvements

- ▶ I have ideas how improve the DCERPC security in a generic way
 - ▶ This needs to be done in a backward compatible way in order to avoid breaking existing implementatins
 - ▶ These ideas will be discussed with Microsoft
- ▶ We plan to do further protocol hardening in Samba
 - ▶ Disable NTLMv1 by default for the next major release
 - ▶ Add ways to disable NTLMSSP completely
- ▶ Add support for Kerberos FAST
 - ▶ This is available in Windows 2012 (maybe R2) domains
 - ▶ It protects the password based Kerberos authentication using the much more secure machine password
- ▶ We'll always search for new ways to improve the security of Samba

Thanks!

People who helped out:

- ▶ Günther Deschner
- ▶ Andreas Schneider
- ▶ Ralph Böhme
- ▶ Jeremy Allison
- ▶ Andrew Bartlett
- ▶ Alexander Bokovoy
- ▶ Michael Adam
- ▶ Others

Questions?

<http://badlock.org/>

<https://www.samba.org/samba/history/security.html>

https://www.samba.org/samba/latest_news.html#4.4.2