A deep overview HTTP Request Smuggling







1 Introduction

3 Types of Attacks





2

(4)

What is HTTP Request Smuggling?

Automation, is it worth it?

HTTP 2.0, Game over?



1. Introduction A bit of history about HTTP going from 0.9 to 2.0



HTTP 0.9

- HTTP (HyperText Transfer Protocol), created in 1991.
- Extremely Simple.
- One TCP connection per request.
- Only one method (GET) and a header request that only point the path.



The full URL wasn't included as the protocol, server, and # port weren't necessary once connected to the server. GET /mypage.html

The response was extremely simple too and only in HTML: # it only consisted of the file itself, not even response # headers (one TCP request per connection witho). <html>

A very simple HTML page </html>



HTTP 1.0

- Introduced it in 1996.
- Strong transition from simple documents retrieval to more dynamic web applications.
- More HTTP methods like POST, HEAD, PUT and DELETE.
- Multiple HTTP requests under the same TCP connection.
- Adding metadata and more context in several new headers in order to facilitate more specialised types of interactions.

TCP CONNECTION (not as default)





New Headers in HTTP 1.0

Content-Length

Indicating the size of the entitybody in bytes.

Connection

In HTTP/1.0, this header could include 'keep-alive' to request a persistent connection.

Content-Type

Specifying the media type of the entity-body sent to the recipient. E.G, text/html, application/json, etc.



Date

Indicating the date and time at which the message was originated.

Content-Encoding

Specifying the encoding applied to the entity-body, allowing compression or encryption.



New Headers in HTTP 1.0

Content-Language

Describing the natural language(s) of the intended audience for the entity-body.

Host

Specifies the domain name of the server.

User-Agent

Provides information about the client making the request, such as the type of browser or user agent.



Accept

Informs the server about the types of content the client can understand.

Authorization

Used for sending credentials (e.g. username and password) to access protected resources.



HTTP 1.1

- Just one year after the previous version, 1997.
- More focused in efficiency improvements.
- More HTTP Methods
- Keep-alive as default
- Pipelining
- Range Request



New Headers and changes in HTTP 1.1

Transfer-Encoding

Specifies the form of encoding used to safely transfer the payload body to the user.

Host

Changed it to **mandatory** to distinguish between different virtual hosts that share the same IP address.

ETag

Providing a unique identifier for a specific version of a resource, aiding in cache validation.



Cache-Control

Allowing sophisticate cache control with directives like "no-cache, no-store, max-age, etc".

Ranged

Enabled clients to request specific portions of resources, as we mentioned above.



New Headers and changes in HTTP 1.1

If-Range

Allowing conditional request based on a resources ETag, enabling clients to retrieve the resource only if it had been modified.

Content-Range

Sent by the server in partial responses to specify the range of bytes being returned.

Age

Informed clients about the time a resource had been cached in a proxy.



HTTP/0.9

Short-lived Connections

HTTP/1.0-1.1

Persistent Connections





Client

HTTP/1.1

HTTP Pipelining

ESTABLISH CONNECTION







Pipelining

We are able to send different HTTP request in the same connection without having to wait for the first response of the first request (for this example, red). Besides, we can see how we can delimit our payload length by using two different headers, Content-Length and Transfer-Encoding.

- 🖉 - Transfer-Encoding over Content-Length

"If a message is received with both a Transfer-Encoding header field and a Content-Length header field, the latter **must** be ignored" POST / HTTP/1.1 Host: example.local Content-Length: 5

HELLOGET /index HTTP/1.1 Host: example.local Content-Length: 23

This is another exampleGET /admin HTTP/1.1 Host: example.local Transfer-Encoding: chunked

5 HELLO 0

For more information about this please refer to:

https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2616#section-4.4



HTTP/2.0... Now what?

Introduced in 2015, it aimed to reduce latency and improve the performance of HTTP traffic.



Multiplexing

Major update, enabling multiple concurrent requests and responses within a single TCP connection*, allowing resources to be sent and received asynchronously, improving data transfer efficiency and reducing latency.



Binary Protocol and Header Compression

It was adopted a binary framing layer that replaced the plain text format used in HTTP/1.1. Improved parsing efficiency, leading to faster processing and reduced bandwidth usage.



Server Push

This new version introduced the server push feature. Allowing servers to proactively send resources to the client's cache before they are requested*. This optimized the loading of web pages by pre-emptively providing necessary resources, reducing the need for subsequent requests.



Stream Prioritisation and Dependency

Allowing prioritisation of streams, *enabling critical resources to be prioritised for faster delivery*, improving the overall user experience. Dependency information between different resources helped optimise data



Newer version, newer ways to handle data

The following pseudo-headers are defined in an HTTP/2 request:

:method GET :path /index.php :authority bastionsecurity.co.nz :scheme https

Full compatibility with the previous versions (HTTP methods, headers, and query paths still exist but data is formatted differently in transit). From clear text to binary. Transfer-Encoding no longer supported.

nspector	🛄 💷 🚊 🔆 🤇	Request	
anuast headars	(18)	Pretty Raw Hex	
equest fieducia	1992	1 GET / HTTP/2	
Name	Value	<pre>2 Host: Dastionsecurity.co.nz 3 Sec-Ch-Ua: "Not A Brand":v="8", "Chromium":v="120"</pre>	
scheme	https	A Sec-Ch-Ua-Mobile: 70	
method	GET	> 5 Sec-Ch-Ua-Platform: "macOS"	
path		<pre>6 Upgrade-Insecure-Requests: 1 7 User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; x64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, lik Chrome/120.0.6099.199 Safari/537.36 8 Accept: text/html poplication/whtml.wml poplication/wmlia=0.0 impac/puif impac/whom impac/or </pre>	
authority	bastionsecurity.c		
ec-ch-ua	"Not A Brand";v=		
ec-ch-ua-mobile	20	> 0.8,application/signed-exchange;v=b3;q=0.7	nig
ec-ch-ua-platform	"macOS"	9 Sec-Fetch-Site: cross-site	
norada incacura	+	10 Sec-Fetch-Mode: navigate	
pyrade-insecure		<pre>11 Sec-Fetch-Dest: document 12 Sec-Fetch-Dest: document 13 Referer: https://www.google.com/ 14 Accept-Encoding: gzip, deflate, br 15 Accept-Language: en-US,en;q=0.9 16 Priority: u=0, 1 17 18</pre>	
ser-agent	Mozilia/5.0 (Windo		
iccept	text/html,applicati		
ec-fetch-site	cross-site		
ec-fetch-mode	navigate		
ec-fetch-user	21		
sec-fetch-dest	document	>	
eferer	https://www.goog		
accept-encoding	gzip, deflate, br	>	
accept-language	en-US,en;g=0.9		
priority	u=0 i	S	
	(A) (3) (3)		
	9 2 2		



HTTP REQUEST SMUGGLING

2. What is HTTP Desync? HTTP Request Smuggling



Request Smuggling (RS)

Desync Attack A.K.A Request Smuggling (RS) is considered an advance attack vector that exploits the discrepancy between frontend and a backend systems in the parsing of incoming HTTP request, by forcing a disagreement in the request boundaries between the two systems, thus causing a **desynchronization**.







Hacker

Malicious Code

Normal User

Stage 2 Requests processed by the application

Stage 3 Response sent back to users





Vulnerability Impact

Depending on the specific type of disagreement between the systems, this vulnerability can have a different impact, including mass exploitation of XSS, stealing of other users' data, and even WAF bypasses. For more details on HTTP request smuggling attacks, have a look at this great blog post by James Kettle.

https://portswigger.net/research/http-desync-attacks-request-smuggling-reborn



DESYNC ATTACKS

3. Types of Desync Attacks Live examples



CL.TE

- Most common type of desync attack.
- The Reverse Proxy takes the content-length as reference for the HTTP request boundary (not supporting chunked encoding).
- Instead, the Web Application Server uses Transfer-Encoding for delimitation.

POST / HTTP/1.1 Host: philocyber.com Content-Length: 10 Transfer-Encoding: chunked

0 HELLO



Reverse Proxy interpretation

Host: philocyber.com Content-Length: 10 Transfer-Encoding: chunked

HELLO

Web Server interpretation



DESYNC ATTACKS



DEMO CL-TE

Identification and Exploitation



TE.TE

- Overlooked by several automate tools.
- There's a difference in how the comments follow the RSA standard; but both still support the Transfer-Encoding header.
- We need to force the misinterpretation by manipulating the header as:

Description	Header
Substring Match	Transfer-Encoding: test chunked
Space in Header name	Transfer-Encoding: chunked
Horizontal Tab Separator	Transfer-Encoding: [\x 09]chunked
Vertical Tab Separator	Transfer-Encoding: [\x 0b]chunked
Leading Space	Transfer-Encoding: chunked

Note: The sequences [\x09] and [\x0b] are not the literal character sequences used in the obfuscation. Rather they denote the horizontal tab character (ASCII 0x09) and vertical tab character (ASCII 0x0b).



It's about how the different systems are interpreting the TE header, might only check the presence of "chunked", while the other is checking an exact match.



DESYNC ATTACKS



DEMO TE-TE

Identification and Exploitation



TE.CL

The most complex one to manually identify and exploit.

- The Reverse Proxy takes the transfer-encoding as reference for the HTTP request boundary (not supporting CL).
- Instead, the Web Application Server uses the content-length for delimitation.

POST / HTTP/1.1 Host: philocyber.com Content-Length: 3 Transfer-Encoding: chunked

5 HELLO 0



Reverse Proxy interpretation

Host: philocyber.com Content-Length: 3 Transfer-Encoding: chunked

HELLO

Web Server interpretation



DESYNC ATTACKS



DEMO TE-CL

Identification and Exploitation



AUTOMATION

4. Automation Is it worth it?



Scenarios

- Automation may be worthwhile during extensive scope testing, but the availability of free GitHub tools for such testing is limited.
- In terms of tools/automation the best one currently is the HTTP Request Smuggler created by James Kettler, but can return false positives.
- We should try to avoid relaying in automate tools, even more if we know that there is not mature tool available like nmap, sqlmap, etc.



5. Preventions

Possible mitigations

Mitigating HTTP request smuggling attacks can be challenging since the <u>vulnerabilities</u> <u>causing them typically reside within the web server software</u>, making prevention from within the web application impossible.



Prevention

- Ensure that web server and reverse proxy software are kept up-to-date such that patches for security issues are installed as soon as possible.
- Ensure that client-side vulnerabilities that might seem unexploitable on their own are still patched, as they might become exploitable in an HTTP request smuggling scenario.
- Ensure that the default behaviour of the web server is to close TCP connections if any \blacklozenge exception or error occurs on the web server level during request handling or request parsing.
- If possible, configure HTTP/2 usage between the client and web server and ensure that \blacklozenge lower HTTP versions are disabled.



HTTP/2.0

6. HTTP/2.0, Game Over? Let's keep track of the new changes



HTTP/2.0 features

- Chunked encoding is not longer supported.
- HTTP/2 transmits the request body in a binary format consisting of data frames.
- There is no explicit length field required to determine the length of the request body.
- The data frames contain a built-in length field that any system can use to calculate the request body's length.
- So good news... HTTP desync attacks are almost impossible if HTTP/2 is used correctly in a deployment setting!

...Wait a minute, what about HTTP/2 Downgrading?



Thank you for your time



Ricardo Prieto Penetration Tester at **BASTION**





