Encrypted traffic interception on Hetzner and Linode targeting the largest Russian XMPP (Jabber) messaging service

ValdikSS 20th October 2023 at 3:58pm

TL;DR: we have discovered XMPP (Jabber) instant messaging protocol encrypted TLS connection wiretapping (Man-in-the-Middle attack) of jabber.ru (aka xmpp.ru) service's servers on Hetzner and Linode hosting providers in Germany.

The attacker has issued several new TLS certificates using Let's Encrypt service which were used to hijack encrypted STARTTLS connections on port 5222 using transparent MiTM proxy. The attack was discovered due to expiration of one of the MiTM certificates, which haven't been reissued.

There are no indications of the server breach or spoofing attacks on the network segment, quite the contrary: the traffic redirection has been configured on the hosting provider network.

The wiretapping may have lasted for up to 6 months overall (90 days confirmed). We believe this is lawful interception Hetzner and Linode were forced to setup.

Last updated: 20 Oct 2023

Introduction

oxpa, experienced UNIX administrator who is in charge for the oldest Russian XMPP service jabber.ru established in year 2000, was puzzled by "Certificate has expired" message upon connecting to the service on 16 October 2023. All the certificates seemed to be up-to-date on the server, but the connection to port 5222 (XMPP STARTTLS) was presenting an outdated certificate to the client.

During all kinds of software, network and configuration checks with the help of other professionals and ejabberd software author, it was discovered that:

- The software serves proper, non-expired certificate in the network traffic
- The expired certificate is not present on the server
- It is based on other private key and was never issued by the server's acme.sh certificate issuing script
- Incoming TCP connections to port 5222 are altered: they have different source port, SEQ/ACK numbers, and appear to arrive without any intermediate routing hops (TTL=64).
- This behavior is not observed on other, non-5222 ports, such as 5223 XMPP TLS port

The affected machines are dedicated server on Hetzner and two virtual servers on Linode, all hosted in Germany.

/ * *	dusk.jabber.ru_tests.pcapng ~			^ ×		* *	dusk.pcap_ad6b24b6cc4a	4cd793a930460b5a6f83cda122e4	~ ^ ×	
<u>F</u> ile <u>E</u> dit <u>V</u> iew <u>G</u> o	<u>Capture Aratyze Statistics relephony Wireless</u> Tools <u>H</u> elp				<u>F</u> i	le <u>E</u> dit <u>V</u> iew <u>G</u> o	<u>Capture</u> <u>A</u> nalyze <u>S</u> tati	t <mark>ics Telephony Wireless <u>T</u>ools <u>H</u>elp</mark>		
		≻ ≪ ≫[]` »			G 🔝 🕅 🌀	SERVER 🛪 🔳 🗄	a e »	
tcp.stream eq 0] +		tcp.stream eq 1			+	
Source	Destination	Protocol L	ength Info	-	Sou	urce	Destination Proto	ocol Length Info	A	
192.168.100.3	172.104.234.182	TCP	60 45886 → 5223		95	.215.45.33	172.104.234.182 TCP	74 45886 → 5223 [SYN] Seq=0	Wir	
172.104.234.182	192.168.100.3	TCP	60 5223 → 45886		17	2.104.234.182	95.215.45.33 TCP	74 5223 → 45886 [SYN, ACK] S	seq=	
192.168.100.3	172.104.234.182	TCP	52 45886 → 5223		95	.215.45.33	172.104.234.182 TCP	66 45886 → 5223 [ACK] Seq=1	Ack	
192.168.100.3		TLSv1.2	373 Client Hello		95	.215.45.33	172.104.234.182 TLSV	1.2 387 Client Hello		
172.104.234.182	192.168.100.3	TCP	52 5223 → 45886		1/	2.104.234.182	95.215.45.33 ICP	66 5223 → 45886 [ACK] Seq=1	ACK	
1/2.104.234.182	192.108.100.3	TLSV1.2	1398 Server Hello		17	2.104.234.182	95.215.45.33 ILSV	1.2 2/58 Server Hello	woh	
192.108.100.3	102 168 100 2	TCP	52 45880 → 5223 1208 5222 - 45886		05	2.104.234.182	95.215.45.33 ILSV 172 104 224 182 TCD	1.2 1/54 Certificate, Server Key (66 /5886 5222 [ACK] Seg-2	22 4	
102 168 100 3	172 104 234 182	TCP	52 45886 - 5223		95	215.45.33	172.104.234.102 TCP	66 45886 - 5223 [ACK] Seq=3	22 4	
172.104.234.182	192.168.100.3	TLSv1.2	1398 Certificate		95	.215.45.33	172.104.234.182 TCP	66 45886 → 5223 [ACK] Seq=32	2 4 -	
1	1021100110010	1201112	1000 001 CITIOUCO		1	1220110100			Þ	
<pre>> Frame 4: 373 byte Raw packet data > Internet Protoco > Transmission Com Source Port: 4 Destination Po [Stream index: [Conversation [TCP Segment L Sequence Numbe Sequence Numbe [Next Sequence Acknowledgment 1000 = He > Elags: 0x018 (Window: 512 [Calculated wi [Window size s Checksum: 0x3f [Checksum Stat Urgent Pointer > Options: (12 b > [SEQ/ACK analy [CP payload (3]</pre>	es on wire (2984 bits), 373 by l Version 4, Src: 192.168.100, trol Protocol, Src Port: 45886 base base completeness: Complete, WITH_ en: 321] er: 1 (relative sequence nu er (raw): 1309604767 e Number: 322 (relative seq t Number: 1 (relative ack n t number (raw): 3470116728 eader Length: 32 bytes (8) (PSH, ACK) indow size: 65536] scaling factor: 128] f1d [unverified] tus: Unverified] tus: Unverified] r: 0 bytes), No-Operation (NOP), No (vsis] 321 bytes)	tes captured (3, Dst: 172.10) Dst Port: 52 DATA (31)] nber) uence number)] umber) -Operation (NOF	2984 bits) on intern 4.234.182 23, Seq: 1, Ack: 1, Port 52 ALL MATC P), Timestamps	Le 2.3	© ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞	Frame 21: 387 H Ethernet II, Sh Internet Protoco Transmission Co Source Port: Destination [Stream inde [Conversatio [TCP Segment Sequence Num [Next Sequent Acknowledgme Acknowledgme Acknowledgme 1000 = Flags: 0x018 Window 512 [Calculated [Window size Checksum: 0x [Checksum St Urgent Point) Options: (112 [Timestamps]] [SEQ/ACK ana [CP payLoad]	bytes on wire (3096 b c: 90:de:01:49:76:ae col Version 4, Src: 9 ontrol Protocol, Src 45886 Port: 5223 x: 1] ber: 1 (relative ber (raw): 130960476 ce Number: 322 (r nt Number: 1 (rel nt number (raw): 3477 Header Length: 32 by (PSH, ACK) window size: 65536] scaling factor: 128 d6d0 [unverified] atus: Unverified] er: 0 bytes), No-Operatio lysis] (321 bytes)	<pre>its), 387 bytes captured (3096 bits (90:de:01:49:76:ae), Dst: f2:3c:91 5.215.45.33, Dst: 172.104.234.182 Port: 45886, Dst Port: 5223, Seq: 1 lete, WITH_DATA (31)] sequence number) 7 elative sequence number)] ative ack number) 9116728 tes (8)] n (NOP), No-Operation (NOP), Timesta</pre>	38:d8: Ack:	
Transport Layer :	Security				•	Transport Layer	Security			Traffic dump on port 5223
all the data intact as	s it should be.									
≰ ★ ⊗	dusk.jabber.ru tests	pcapng	~	^ ×		* *	dusk.pcap_ad6b24b6cc4a	4cd793a930460b5a6f83cda122e4	~ ^ X	
File Edit View Go	Capture Analyze Statistics Telephor	v Wireless Tools	Help		Fi	le Edit View Go	Capture Analyze Statio	stics Telephony Wireless Tools Help		
				-7	1					
(3 (0)		> K >> =		>>>	>	3.00	F X 🕒 🤇		× >>	



the connection is hijacked on application level (L7), the server receives replaced ClientHello message from the client.

Incident investigation

It was apparent that the connections on port 5222 are under Man-in-the-Middle attack which intercepts encrypted communications.

At first we had 2 hypothesis to check: whether the servers have been hacked and whether the traffic is altered due to some kind of local network (neighbor) spoofing.

For the server, we tested:

- All kind of logs
- Date of executable files and libraries modification
- Running processes, memory maps and "dangling" file descriptions of each of them
- Presence of userland LD_PRELOAD hijacking libraries with statically compiled busybox
- Presence of kernel-level hijacking modules by dumping the kernel memory with LiME and analyzing with volatility

But nothing stood out. We noticed the only uncommon record in the kernel log on Hetzner dedicated machine, it lost the physical network link for 19 seconds on 18 July 2023:

[Tue Jul 18 12:58:29 2023] igb 0000:04:00.0 enp4s0: igb: enp4s0 NIC Link is Down [Tue Jul 18 12:58:48 2023] igb 0000:04:00.0 enp4s0: igb: enp4s0 NIC Link is Up 1000 Mbps Full Duplex, Flow Control: RX/TX

In addition, Linode machines are only used as a tunnel to Hetzner server as an alternative route, and are running only bare-bones basic services like SSH and NTP. Yet we still see unaltered ServerHello packet from the Hetzner server in Hetzner +Linode tunnel on Linode machine, which is alerted upon sending it to the client over Linode network interface. In other words, the encrypted connection interception of the same kind happens both on Hetzner dedicated and Linode VPS machines.

Note about kernel memory dump

From the network perspective, we tested:

- Whether MAC address of the gateway have been altered with ARP spoofing
- Whether any single IP address in L2 segment replies multiple times for ARP request
- Whether rogue routing rules are present in the routing table (injected e.g. with ICMP redirect)
- Netfilter rules
- The presence of non-trivial-to-discover tunnels, such as IPsec (ip xfrm)

No sights of any hijacking by the network segment neighbors on either servers, nothing out of ordinary in the network configuration.

While it's still not uncommon to see insufficient spoofing protection on physical networks for dedicated servers, it's hard to believe that such sophisticated stealth spoofing is possible on a virtual infrastructure.

On the Linode machines there aren't any neighbors at all except the router. Affected Linode machines are unable to ARP-discover or ping any adjacent IP addresses in the same network segment which are perfectly functioning from the outside network.

"That's weird", I thought.

The unaffected (third-party) Linode VM can ping its neighbors. It is connected to the Cisco systems router:

ip neigh 172.104.234.1 dev eth0 lladdr 00:00:0c:9f:f0:05 REACHABLE

OUI lookup: 00:00:0C Cisco Systems, Inc

However the affected VPS are connected to some unidentified MAC manufacturer:

ip neigh 172.104.226.1 dev eth0 lladdr 90:de:01:49:76:ae REACHABLE

OUI lookup: (no matches)

It became clear that the affected Linode VM have uncommon network setup compared to regular Linode instances, possibly have been isolated into separate VLAN.

Certificates

After checking crt.sh certificate transparency database, rogue certificates have been discovered which were not issued by any of jabber.ru servers.

There are two genuine certificates used in XMPP service: the one issued for xmpp.ru, *.xmpp.ru and the other one is for jabber.ru, *.jabber.ru.

The maliciously-issued certificates are slightly different from the regular ones for these domains: either the wildcard Subject Alternative Name is missing or a single certificate is issued for both jabber.ru, xmpp.ru. Moreover, MiTM configuration on xmpp.ru domain (which points to Linode servers) was slightly misconfigured: it serves only xmpp.ru certificate, yet the original server is configured to serve both jabber.ru and xmpp.ru certificates depending on requested XMPP domain.

List of rogue certificates:

Domain	Serial	Not Before	Not After	Used in MiTM
xmpp.ru	03:f3:68:ee:36:30:80:6a:07:81:17:81:04:0c:e3:d9:10:b1	Jul 18 12:49:03 2023 GMT	Oct 16 12:49:02 2023 GMT	+
xmpp.ru	04:9c:2d:af:cc:61:88:d6:67:9f:8b:97:99:ce:ad:c9:b7:e0	Oct 13 11:21:30 2023 GMT	Jan 11 11:21:29 2024 GMT	+
jabber.ru	03:43:75:1f:3d:80:20:7d:11:f5:61:98:5b:87:a7:37:81:c6	Apr 18 10:23:29 2023 GMT	Jul 17 10:23:28 2023 GMT	?
jabber.ru	04:4c:1c:8a:f4:37:a0:5a:dd:83:9c:54:74:89:bd:b9:97:90	Jul 18 12:38:51 2023 GMT	Oct 16 12:38:50 2023 GMT	+
jabber.ru, xmpp.ru	04:d1:d2:5d:09:95:48:9b:d6:14:cc:81:91:df:ac:7f:ec:c6	Apr 25 05:46:23 2023 GMT	Jul 24 05:46:22 2023 GMT	?
jabber.ru, xmpp.ru	04:b7:85:83:9a:fd:df:81:26:48:5b:34:28:08:53:d9:e6:79	Apr 25 06:04:19 2023 GMT	Jul 24 06:04:18 2023 GMT	+

18 July 2023 issuing time is about the same when Hetzner server has lost network link for several seconds.

We have a confirmation from the external network scanner that Linode servers started to serve 04:b7:85... certificate on port 5222 since at least 21 July 2023. Unfortunately, this scanner doesn't process Hetzner ranges.

Network

We decided to run more network tests of Linode VPS from outside of the machine.

All adjacent Linode hosts are reachable by hop 13 from my laptop's internet connection.

lft -d 22 172.104.226.23
Tracing*T
TTL LFT trace to 172-104-226-23.ip.linodeusercontent.com (172.104.226.23):22/tcp
1 _gateway (192.168.100.1) 31.2ms
9 a23-210-52-59.deploy.static.akamaitechnologies.com (23.210.52.59) 67.0ms
10 10.210.32.1 62.1ms
** [neglected] no reply packets received from TTL 11
12 10.210.3.93 67.5ms
13 [target open] 172-104-226-23.ip.linodeusercontent.com (172.104.226.23):22 67.4ms
As well as hijacked port 5222 on dawn.jabber.ru Linode server:
Ift -d 5222 dawn.jabber.ru
Tracing**.T
TTL LFT trace to dawn.jabber.ru (172.104.226.29):5222/tcp
1 _gateway (192.168.100.1) 29.3ms
9 a23-210-52-57.deploy.static.akamaitechnologies.com (23.210.52.57) 64.9ms
10 10 210 32 2 64 7ms

** [neglected] no reply packets received from TTL 11

12 10.210.1.235 60./ms

13 [target open] dawn.jabber.ru (172.104.226.29):5222 60.2ms

However all other non-hijacked ports, such as SSH port 22, is reachable only via additional non-disclosed hop and now reachable only on hop 14:

lft -d 22 dawn.jabber.ru Tracing?*?**.?T

...

TTL LFT trace to dawn.jabber.ru (172.104.226.29):22/tcp

1 _gateway (192.168.100.1) 28.8ms

9 a23-210-52-57.deploy.static.akamaitechnologies.com (23.210.52.57) 65.4ms

10 10.210.32.2 66.2ms

** [neglected] no reply packets received from TTL 11

12 10.210.1.235 61.7ms

** [neglected] no reply packets received from TTL 13

14 [target open] dawn.jabber.ru (172.104.226.29):22 61.1ms

This means that the IP address of Linode VM have been placed behind additional machine which handles TCP port 5222 by itself and routes other ports to the real destination.

From inside the VPS it's not possible to establish new connections using source port 5222. The router does not reply for the packets originating from this source port, as well as doesn't send any ICMP error or Time-to-Live Exceeded for TTL=0 or TTL=1 outgoing packets.

curl -v -4 --max-time 10 --local-port 5222 ifconfig.co

tcpdump:

23:37:46.116991 IP 172.104.226.29.xmpp-client > 172.64.170.5.http: Flags [S], seq 4385521, win 64240, options [mss 1360,sackOK,TS val 758380820 ecr 0,nop,wscale 7], length 0 23:37:47.135972 IP 172.104.226.29.xmpp-client > 172.64.170.5.http: Flags [S], seq 4385521, win 64240, options [mss 1360,sackOK,TS val 758381839 ecr 0,nop,wscale 7], length 0 23:37:49.189189 IP 172.104.226.29.xmpp-client > 172.64.170.5.http: Flags [S], seq 4385521, win 64240, options [mss 1360,sackOK,TS val 758381839 ecr 0,nop,wscale 7], length 0

STARTTLS termination

Using <u>testssl.sh</u> SSL/TLS testing script, it was discovered that the intercepting proxy accepts connections with anonymous ciphers on both Linode (xmpp.ru) and Hetzner (jabber.ru). This is a rare (mis)configuration which could be used as one of the XMPP MiTM detection fingerprint. Regular SSL/TLS libraries are usually compiled without anonymous ciphers support, you won't be able to configure your service to use anonymous ciphers even if you explicitly allow it in configuration file most of the time, and it is confirmed to be not configured on the original server.

\$./testssl.sh --starttls xmpp --xmpphost jabber.ru --standard --openssl-timeout 15 --connect-timeout 15 jabber.ru:5222

testssl.sh 3.0.8 from https://testssl.sh/ (abdd51d 2022-09-28 09:19:37)

This program is free software. Distribution and modification under GPLv2 permitted. USAGE w/o ANY WARRANTY. USE IT AT YOUR OWN RISK!

Please file bugs @ https://testssl.sh/bugs/

Using "OpenSSL 1.0.2-bad (1.0.2k-dev)" [~179 ciphers] on val:./bin/openssl.Linux.x86_64 (built: "Sep 1 14:03:44 2022", platform: "linux-x86_64")

Start 2023-10-18 23:39:14 -->> 116.202.237.43:5222 (jabber.ru) <<--

rDNS (116.202.237.43): utro.jabber.ru. Service set: STARTTLS via XMPP (XMPP domain=\'jabber.ru\')

Testing cipher categories

•••

NULL ciphers (no encryption)not offered (OK)Anonymous NULL Ciphers (no authentication)offered (NOT ok)←←←

We have tested about 20 other popular XMPP services for the same MiTM method with the same testssl.sh command and discovered no anomalies (no support for Anonymous NULL Ciphers).

Summary and finale

- The attacker managed to issue multiple SSL/TLS certificates via Let's Encrypt for jabber.ru and xmpp.ru domains since 18 Apr 2023
- The Man-in-the-Middle attack for jabber.ru/xmpp.ru client XMPP traffic decryption confirmed to be in place since at least 21 July 2023 for up to 19 Oct 2023, possibly (not confirmed) since 18 Apr 2023, affected 100% of the connections to XMPP STARTTLS port 5222 (not 5223)
- The attacker failed to reissue TLS certificate and MiTM proxy started to serve expired certificate on port 5222 for jabber.ru domain (Hetzner)
- The MiTM attack stopped shortly after we begun our investigation and network tests on 18 Oct 2023, along with tickets to Hetzner and Linode support team, however passive wiretapping (additional routing hop) is still in place at least on a single Linode server
- Neither servers appear to be hacked
- Both Hetzner and Linode network appear to be reconfigured specifically for this kind of attack for the XMPP service IP addresses

All jabber.ru and xmpp.ru communications between these dates should be assumed compromised. Given the nature of the interception, the attacker have been able to execute any action as if it is

executed from the authorized account, without knowing the account password. This means that the attacker could download account's roster, lifetime unencrypted server-side message history, send new messages or alter them in real time.

End-to-end encrypted communications, such as OMEMO, OTR or PGP, are protected from the interception only if both parties have validated the encryption keys. The users are asked to check their accounts for new unauthorized OMEMO and PGP keys in their PEP storage, and change passwords.

We tend to assume this is lawful interception Hetzner and Linode were forced to setup based on German police request.

Another possible, although much more unlikely scenario is an intrusion on the internal networks of both Hetzner and Linode targeting specifically jabber.ru — much harder to believe but not entirely impossible.

As of 20 Oct 2023, we're still waiting for the adequate reply from Hetzner and Linode to our inquiries.

Could you prevent or monitor this kind of attack?

There are several indications which could be used to discover the attack from day 1:

- All issued SSL/TLS certificates are subject to certificate transparency. It is worth configuring certificate transparency monitoring, such as <u>Cert Spotter</u> (source <u>on github</u>), which will notify you by email of new certificates issued for your domain names
- Limit validation methods and set exact account identifier which could issue new certificates with <u>Certification Authority Authorization (CAA) Record Extensions for Account URI and Automatic</u> <u>Certificate Management Environment (ACME) Method Binding (RFC 8657)</u> to prevent certificate issue for your domain using other certificate authorities, ACME accounts or validation methods
- Monitor SSL/TLS certificate changes on all your services using external service
- Monitor MAC address of default gateway for changes
- "Channel binding" is a feature in XMPP which can detect a MiTM even if the interceptor present a valid certificate. Both the client and the server must support SCRAM PLUS authentication mechanisms for this to work. Unfortunately this was not active on jabber.ru at the time of the attack.