A PostgreSQL Security Primer

PGDay'15 Russia St Petersburg, Russia

Magnus Hagander magnus@hagander.net

PRODUCTS • CONSULTING • APPLICATION MANAGEMENT • IT OPERATIONS • SUPPORT • TRAINING

Magnus Hagander

PostgreSQL

- Core Team member
- Committer
- PostgreSQL Europe
- Redpill Linpro
 - Infrastructure services
 - Principal database consultant



It's hard



- It's hard
 - No, really!



There is no one solution



There is no one requirement



PostgreSQL provides a toolbox
You don't need everything
Maybe you don't need anything...

Agenda today

- Environment
- Communication
- Authentication
- Application

Agenda today

Environment

- Communication
- Authentication
- Application

Secure PostgreSQL Environment

- Only as secure as the environment
- If someone owns the OS, they own the db
 - Owns the server -> owns the OS
 - Owns the datacenter -> owns the server
- Defined trust levels!
 - •e.g. outsourcing/cloud vendors

Pick your operating system
Something you know
Regardless of PostgreSQL
Secure "reasonably"
No other local users!

Use standard installers
Don't roll your own
Usually adapted for OS
E.g. SELinux

•Consistent security!



Keep updated

Both operating system and PostgreSQL

• yum/apt makes it easier

- But you have to use it!
- Monitor!

•Mind restarts!

•Encrypted disks?

- Performance/reliability implications
- •Attack vectors?
- Key management?
 - •What happens on restart?

Multi instance

Different security domains?

Different OS user

Sometimes not well packaged

Virtualization/containers?



Agenda today

- Environment
- Communication
- Authentication
- Application

Securing communications

- Do you need it?
 - •Attack vectors?
- •Overhead!

Securing communications

- (physical)FirewallsVPN
- ipsec
- SSL

Firewalls

PostgreSQL traffic is simple

- Single port TCP
- Block at perimeter
- Block at host
 - (Does not replace pg_hba!)

VPN

Many scenarios

- Site -> Site
- Host -> Site
- •Host -> Host
- Typically ipsec or pptp
- •Combine with firewall!

IPSEC

- Transport security
- Individual connections
- Allows for detailed policies
- Kernel/system implementation

SSL

Connection encryptionIndividual connectionsProtocol adapted

SSL in PostgreSQL

OpenSSL only (sorry)

- Abstraction in 9.5
- No other implementations yet
- Certificate/key
 - Like any other service
- Disabled by default on server
 - •Enabled on client!!

SSL in PostgreSQL

- Negotiated upon connection
- Same port!
- First packets of exchange
- Before authentication etc

Certificates

- Server certificate mandatory
- Does not need public ca
 - Probably should not use public ca
- "Snakeoil" self-signed works
 - But no MITM protection!
- Use custom (dedicated?) CA!

OpenSSL CA

OpenSSL comes with built in CA
Or use other CA software
Always distribute CA certificate
But not the key

Setting up certificate

- Generate secret and public key
- Generate certificate request
- Sign :g: certificate request
- Deploy certificate

Generating OpenSSL cert

- \$ openssl req -new -newkey rsa:4096 -text -out server.req
- General SSL parameters apply
 - •Use large enough keys!
 - Always set CN to server name
 - Other attributes ignored

Generating OpenSSL cert

- OpenSSL always secures key with passphrase
- Makes auto-start impossible
- Remove key:

\$ openssl rsa -in privkey.pem -out server.key
\$ rm privkey.pem

Generating OpenSSL cert

- Securely store server.key
- Transfer server.req to CA
 - Does not have to be secured
 - If you verify fingerprint!

Sign certificate request

Use your CA

For example, OpenSSL built-in one

• Or generate self-signed:

\$ openssl req -x509 -in server.req -text -key server.key -out server.crt

Securely transfer server.crt

Distribute CA certificate

Each client needs cert to verify CA

- Not required, but strongly recommended
 - •~/.postgresql/root.crt
- Also distribute CRL if used
 - •~/.postgresql/root.crl
- Connection string can override file names

Enable server SSL

Set ssl=on

server.key/server.crt in data directory

- Check permissions!
- Should be 0600, must be 0x00.
- Restart, done.

CA Certificate on server

Required for client certificate auth

- •root.crt
- CRL not required but recommended
 - root.crl
- File names controllable in postgresql.conf

SSL negotiation

- SSL negotiated between client and server
- Server provides
- Client decides
- Controlled by sslmode parameter
SSL negotiation

- sslmode default is prefer
 - This is stupid....
- No guarantees
- Don't use!



SSL negotiation

	Protect against		Compatible with server set to		Performance
Client Mode	Eavesdrop	МІТМ	SSL required	SSL disabled	overhead
disable	no	no	FAIL	works	no
allow	no	no	works	works	If necessary
prefer	no	no	works	works	If possible
require	yes	no	works	FAIL	yes
verify-ca	yes	yes	works	FAIL	yes
verify-full	yes	yes	works	FAIL	yes

SSL enforcement

•Client decides??!!?!?!

- •Huh??
- Client decides, but server can reject
- •Using hostssl in pg_hba.conf



SSL enforcement

hostssl xxx yyy ...

. .

•Always use!



Client certificates

Not required by default

- Can be requested by server
 - •clientcert=1 in pg_hba.conf

hostssl xxx yyy zzz abc clientcert=1

•

Client certificates

Provide in PEM format file

- Or through OpenSSL compatible engine
- Validated against root CA on server
 - PostgreSQL specific root
- By default just needs to exist

Client certificate authentication

- Use for full login
- Username extracted from CN attribute
- Must chain to known trusted CA
- •Can map using pg_ident.conf

Agenda today

- Environment
- Communication
- Authentication
- Application

Authentication

Make sure it's the correct userAnd that they can prove it

Authentication

PostgreSQL supports many methods

- Host Based Authentication
- •Combined in the same installation!
- Don't just "dumb down"

pg_hba.conf

- Top-bottom file
- Filter by:
 - Connection type
 - User
 - Database
 - Connection source
- "Firewall" and authentication choice

pg_hba.conf

• Order by most specific:

local	all	all		peer
host	all	all	127.0.0.1/32	md5
hostnossl	webdb	webuser	10.1.1.0/30	md5
hostssl	all	+admin	192.168.0.0/24	gss

Implicit reject at end

Authentication methods

Many choices

- Internal
- OS integrated
- Fully external
- And some really bad ones...

trust

Trust everybody everywhere

- Why would anybody claim they're someone else?
 "Turn off all security"
- Any use case? Maybe one...

trust

• Use it? Change it!



peer

Only over Unix sockets

- Sorry Windows, sorry Java
- Local connections only
- Asks OS kernel
 - Trustworthy!

md5

- Simplest one?
- Username/password
- Double MD5-hash
- Do not use "password"

Looks like password to client

- Regular prompt
- Passed over to LDAP server
- No special support needed
- Construct URLs different ways
 - •Prefix+suffix
 - Search+bind

Suffix and prefix

ldapprefix="CN=" ldapsuffix=", DC=domain, DC=com"

Binds to

CN=mha, DC=domain, DC=com

Double binding

ldapbasedn="DC=domain, DC=com"
 ldappbinddn="CN=postgres, DC=domain, DC=com"
 ldapbindpasswd="supersecret"
 ldapsearchattribute="uid"

Double binding URL syntax

ldapurl="ldap://1.2.3.4/dc=domain, dc=com?uid?sub"
 ldappbinddn="CN=postgres, DC=domain, DC=com"
 ldapbindpasswd="supersecret"

Cleartext!

- •Use with IdaptIs=1
- Use with hostssl
- Password policies from LDAP server
- •Only authentication!

Kerberos based GSSAPI

- Including Active Directory
- Single Sign-On
 - •No password prompt!
 - All Kerberos supported auth methods
- Secure tickets
- "krb5" deprecated/removed

Uses kerberos keytabs
Uses principals and realms

Similar to users and domains

Mutual authentication
Default service principal

postgres/server.domain.com
Case sensitive!

Install keytab

- Readable by PostgreSQL
- Can be specific for PostgreSQL or shared
- Any principal will be accepted
- But must match client!

Client principals

- •user@domain.com
- Matched with or without realms
 - Recommendation is to always include
 - •Strip with pg_ident.conf

gss include_realm=1 map=gss

can also restrict realms

gss include_realm=1 krb_realm=DOMAIN.COM

radius

Looks like password to client

- Use with hostssl!
- Shared-secret encryption to Radius server
- Common for OTP solutions

radius

radiusserver=1.2.3.4 radiussecret=supersecret



cert

Map client certificate to login

- Uses CN attribute
- Any certificate "engine" supported by OpenSSL
 - Normally uses PEM encoded files

cert

Server must have CA certificate

And CRL if used

Client must have CA certificate

And CRL if used

User name mapping

- External systems with different usernames
 - Peer
 - •gss/sspi
 - cert
- Allow static or pattern mapping

User name mapping

•pg_hba.conf:

local	all	all	peer map=local
hostssl	all	all 10.0.0/24	gss map=gss includerealm=1
hostssl	all	all 0.0.0.0/0	cert map=cert

User name mapping

•pg_ident.conf:

local	root	postgres
gss	/^(.*)@DOMAIN.COM\$/	\1
 cert	/^cn=(.*)\$/	\1

Agenda today

- Environment
- Communication
- Authentication
- Application
- Summary

Application security

Huge topic

- •Let's stick to a few tips...
- •And an example or two
Superuser

- Never use superuser
- Disables all security
 - Allows arbitrary code execution!
 - Allows replacement of configuration!



Database owner

Avoid using database owner

- Overrides any object permissions
 - But much better than superuser

Schema boundaries

Schemas for compartmentalization
USAGE required to access all objects
Object permissions required as well
Sub-divide access

Password management

Specifically considering webapps

- Lots of data collected today
 - Username
 - Password
 - Email
- and more

And then what happens?

•What typically happens?

And then what happens?

You get hacked

- Seems to only be a matter of time
- So plan for that!



So what do we do?

- Didn't we already solve this?
- Passwords are hashed!
 - We've even got extra advanced methods!

People still get hacked

Hashed passwords prevent some hacks

- But "dumping" those still allow offline attacks
- Leaked email addresses are valuable
 - Valuable makes it a target

So what can we do?

• We can easily improve on this

- There is no reason for bulk downloads
- Your database can help
- So let's look at a typical webapp

The valuable users table

CREATE TABLE users (userid text, pwdhash text, email text

The SQL injection attack

•Lets the attacker do:

SELECT * FROM users

And they get all data...

Hashed passwords for offline attacks

Email addresses for sale

• Haven't we seen this before?

• Haven't we seen this before?

• Like pre-1990?



• Haven't we seen this before?

- Pre-1990
- •/etc/passwd

Shadow passwords!!

- Invented a long time ago (1988, SysV 3.2 Linux 1992)
- Why are we repeating the mistakes?

Shadow passwords are based on "views"

• We have this in PostgreSQL

Shadow passwords requires "suid"

• We have this in PostgreSQL

•The problem:

.

webapp=#	SELECT * FROM users;	l omail
<i>useriu</i>	pwunasn	
mha	\$2a\$06\$1dtSqWdv0hfsbpDRsfZ9e0HlGoLUj	magnus@hagander.net

webapp=# ALTER TABLE users RENAME TO shadow; ALTER TABLE webapp=# REVOKE ALL ON shadow FROM webuser; REVOKE

```
webapp=# CREATE VIEW users AS
webapp-# SELECT userid, NULL::text AS pwdhash, NULL::text as email
webapp-# FROM shadow;
CREATE VIEW
webapp=# GRANT SELECT ON users TO webuser;
GRANT
```

But now it's useless...No way to log in

webapp=# CREATE EXTENSION pgcrypto; CREATE EXTENSION



pgcypto password hashing

- •pgcrypto provides crypt()
- Dual-use function
- Create password hashes (salted, of course!)
- Validate password hashes

- Functions with SECURITY DEFINER
- Acts like setuid binary
- Powerful access

CREATE OR REPLACE FUNCTION login(userid text, pwd text, **OUT** email text) **RETURNS** text LANGUAGE plpgsql SECURITY DEFINER **AS** \$\$ BEGIN **SELECT** email **INTO** email **FROM** shadow WHERE shadow.userid=lower(userid) AND pwdhash = crypt(pwd, shadow.pwdhash); **END;\$\$**



webapp=> SELECT * FROM login('mha', 'foobar');
 _email

(1 row)
webapp=> SELECT * FROM login('mha', 'topsecret');
_email

magnus@hagander.net



Beware!!

SQL-in-SQL injections
Unbounded data access
Never use superuser

Agenda today

- Environment
- Communication
- Authentication
- Application
- Summary

Security

- Determine your requirements
- Determine your trust levels
- Determine your attack surface
- Determine your threat vectors

Security

Deploy correct countermeasures

- "Checkbox featuring" is useless
- Or even counterproductive
- Lock all doors
 - E.g. why encrypt disks if keys are local?
 - Why require smartcards if data is cleartext?

Layered security

A firewall alone doesn't protect you
Doesn't mean you shouldn't have one

Too simple to mention

• Never use trust

- (not even in testing)
- •Use pg_hba.conf
 - Mix auth methods
 - Restrict IP addresses
- Go SSL if you have to

Iterative process

Re-evaluate

Requirements and landscape are dynamic!

Stay secure!



Thank you!

Magnus Hagander *magnus@hagander.net @magnushagander* http://www.hagander.net/talks/

This material is licensed CC BY-NC 4.0.

