

Attacking 802.11 Networks

Joshua Wright
Joshua.Wright@jwu.edu
LightReading LIVE!
October 1, 2003

Attention

The material presented here reflects the personal experience and opinions of the author, and not of behalf of my employer.

Introduction

- Wireless LAN Attack Techniques
 - From the attacker's perspective
- How WLANs are compromised
- As many demonstrations as we can fit into 45 minutes
- Question and Answer

What an attacker is looking for

- Free Internet Access
- Unauthorized Information Disclosure
- Denial of Service targets
- Bypassing Perimeter Defense Systems
- Just to make administrators look stupid

Attacker – Free Internet Access

- Attacker is looking for access to the 'net
 - Anonymity – they don't want to get caught
 - Could be benign – access to google.com, email access, chat
 - Could be against AUP – access to adult content, child pornography, launching attacks against other victim networks
- Minimum steps will thwart this attack
 - Lower-fruit is likely just around the corner

Attacker - Unauthorized Information Disclosure

- “What is interesting about THIS network?”
 - Workstation configuration
 - Network device configuration and software version information (CDP)
 - Business-critical data? Confidential customer records?
- Some information disclosure will lead to escalated privilege for an attacker
 - Especially common for IPSec WLAN security implementations

Attacker – Denial of Service

- Significant threat to all 802.11 networks
 - Often exploiting weaknesses in the 802.11 specification and flawed driver software
 - Deficiency is in client software and drivers
 - Ranges from mild inconvenience to sustained attack crippling client devices
 - No easy fixes
- Attackers are difficult to locate
 - Is the attack from common mischief, a disgruntled employee or corporate espionage?

Attacker – Bypassing Perimeter Defenses

- “Crunchy on the outside, soft and chewy on the inside” – Mentos Network Design
 - Common to many organizations with few security resources to manage client devices
 - Attacker uses stepping-stone attacks
- Wireless network operate without boundaries
 - Network perimeter is exposed throughout the enterprise
 - Where are you exposed?

Attacker – Just to make administrators look stupid

- Increasingly common “attack”
 - “Well-intentioned” people demonstrating flaws in production wireless networks
 - “I wanted to show how much information is at risk” or “... how easy it is to break-in”
- Results in bad publicity and further exposure for a business
 - The press makes the flaws in your network public information

How an attacker exploits a wireless network

- Reconnaissance/Information Gathering
- Network Probing
- Vulnerability Testing/Attacking
- Information Retrieval

Recon/Information Gathering

- WLAN Discovery Tools
 - Tools report discovered wireless networks
 - Use passive or active analysis to discover type of AP's, type of clients and protocols in use
- Public Information Sources
 - Results of WLAN discovery posted for public analysis
 - <http://www.wigle.net/>
- Wardriving
 - Traditionally performed from a car in the parking lot, street, etc.
 - Can be done anonymously from your lobby, offices with handheld devices

Network Probing

- Discovering network SSIDs
 - Cloaked SSIDs are NOT passwords!
 - Implemented in the “essid_jack” tool
- Enumerating AP Information
 - SNMP attacks, banner grabbing
 - Probing AP's with undocumented protocols
- Passive Analysis
 - Determine what protocols are in use

Vulnerability Testing/Attacking

- How attackers exploit target systems
 - Exploiting IPSec-secured WLANs
 - Flaws in MAC-based authentication
 - Flaws in Cisco LEAP
 - Exploiting PEAP+WEP

Exploiting IPSec secured WLANs

- Common Security Configuration for protecting WLANs
 - Any traffic from WLAN must authenticate to VPN server before reaching internal network
- Attacking the IPSec Server
 - Exploiting flaws in IPSec implementation/IKE aggressive mode + pre-shared keys
 - Exploiting implementation bugs in VPN server software (IKE Crack, BUGTRAQ announcements)

Exploiting IPSec secured WLANs

- Layer 2 connectivity is often unrestricted
 - Permits any attacker to connect to other wireless clients
 - Attacker exploits vulnerable clients, connecting to corporate network through VPN
- Impact
 - An attacker is still unable to decrypt captured information since IPSec encryption is strong
 - Attacker can exploit vulnerable clients, and escalate privileges through existing connections

Flaws in MAC-based authentication

- Controlling access based on source MAC
 - Static lists on APs
 - Dynamic MAC access with captive web portals (hot-spot access)
- Authentication is solely based on MAC
 - Trivial to impersonate a valid user
 - All traffic on the network is from legitimate MACs

Flaws in MAC-based authentication

- Attack Scenario
 - Attacker identified a victim they want to impersonate
 - Connects to network with own MAC
 - Launches DoS against victim (BSOD)
 - Impersonates MAC+IP of victim
 - Gains unrestricted access
- Impact
 - Attacker can bypass security controls
 - Unrestricted access to internal hosts

Flaws in Cisco LEAP

- Weak authentication process
 - Username is sent in clear-text
 - Leaks information about user password
- Attacker can force user to reauthenticate
 - No waiting for victim to authenticate to the network
 - One packet forces reauthentication
 - No visible sign of attack to victim

Flaws in Cisco LEAP

- Attacker utilizes dictionary attack
 - Collect authentication credentials, off-line attack against weak passwords
- Impact
 - Account username and password disclosure
 - Unauthorized network access
 - Potential for privilege escalation – shared usernames/passwords among multiple systems

Flaws in PEAP+WEP

- Protected EAP – Microsoft/RSA/Cisco IETF draft
 - Uses TLS tunnel for encryption of weak authentication (MS-CHAPv2)
 - TLS provides mutual authentication
 - Protects against MitM, rogue APs
- Most implementations still use WEP
 - Flaws too numerous to enumerate
 - Latest attacks permit network access even with dynamic WEP keying (WEP Wedgie)
- TLS tunnel relies on trust of CAs
 - Most implementations include a standard list of CAs
 - Administrators add local CAs to avoid paying Verisign for digital certificates

PEAP Attack Scenario

- Attacker sets up Win2K CA Server on the Internet
- Attacker spams an organization
 - Uses a harvested list of addresses from google.com
 - HTML-formatted email exploits IE vulnerability to add their CA to each client
- Attacker launches MitM attack against a victim workstation
- Victim attempts to authenticate AP and establish a TLS tunnel
 - Checks list of CAs, attacker uses valid certificate from rogue CA server

Flaws in PEAP+WEP

- Impact
 - Attacker can establish MitM position
 - Lots of opportunity for attack
 - Password harvesting
 - Attacker impersonates valid internal resources
 - Collects passwords from “rogue” applications
 - Attack Escalation
 - DNS poisoning, session-piggybacking, SQL injection, etc.

What to do?

- Deploy WLANs with caution
 - Use careful site-surveys
 - Make use of planning tools to identify coverage areas
- Deploy WPA-I
 - Work with vendors on a clear upgrade path to AES
- Use WLAN IDS Systems
 - Train intrusion analysts on WLAN analysis
 - The best tools will not help an untrained person recognize and assess threats
 - SANS, e-fense, Foundstone training

Summary

- A determined attacker has a lot of opportunity to attack 802.11 networks
- Mitigating threats will improve defensive posture
- Deploy a defense-in-depth position
- Monitor networks with automated and manual assessment
- Design incident response plans
 - What is the impact to your organization?

Questions?

Thank You!

Joshua Wright

Joshua.Wright@jwu.edu