



Android in the Healthcare Workplace: A Case Study

Thomas Richards

g13net@gmail.com

OWASP

04/05/12

Copyright © The OWASP Foundation
Permission is granted to copy, distribute and/or modify this document
under the terms of the OWASP License.

The OWASP Foundation
<http://www.owasp.org>

About me

- My name is Tom
- Twitter: @g13net
- Website: www.g13net.com
- Independent Vulnerability Researcher(at night!)
 - ▶ 13 Published vulnerabilities with 5 CVE-IDs assigned
- IT Support Analyst (by day)

Why this talk?

- With the growth of mobile devices, companies are looking to capitalize on this for business purposes
- Very rapidly writing applications for these mobile platforms
- Security is a concern

What this talk is

- This talk is about a security assessment performed on a product my company uses
- This is not about the Android platform itself, or security issues with it

Background

- Home Health Company (visiting nurses)
- Transitioned from Laptop with thick client software to Mobile platform
 - ▶ Flexibility and Mobility are huge for a 75% mobile workforce
- New product, rewritten for Android from Windows Mobile

HIPAA Concerns

- HIPAA is the word in Healthcare
- Need to Protect PHI
- Encryption!
 - ▶ At Rest
 - ▶ In Transit

Deploying Devices

- Deployed 250 Android Tablets
 - ▶ Running Froyo (2.2)
- MDM Solutions
- No Imaging

About the software

- Runs on Android
 - ▶ Not available in the market
- Clinicians sync to get data
 - ▶ Patient data(records) are kept on the device
- Vendor stated data on the device was encrypted as well as data in transit

How did I perform this assessment?

- Android Emulator!

- ▶ Able to observe traffic in real time

- Used OWASP Mobile Top 10 and Web Top 10 as guidelines

Authentication and Authorization

- Only two pieces of information were needed to configure a device: Server name and Agent ID
- Agent IDs are sequential
- No way to validate an approved device is being configured
- Finding Server name and Agent ID would lead to complete compromise

Password

- User's password was configured and stored locally
- No complexity requirements

Data at rest

- I was able to determine that the data in the local database was encrypted (yay!)
- It was protected by the user's password and using built in SQLite APIs for encrypting a database

Data in Transit

- No SSL!
- Using HTTP, they used POST methods to retrieve data from the server
- Now treat this as a web app also

Interesting Side Note

- Going to `sync1.vendor.com/falcon` showed form based login prompt.
- Also not in HTTPs, tried to connect to it via
- Going to:
`sync1.vend.com/falcon/mobiledevicehandler.fal`
 - ▶ Displayed custom encoding

Session Handling

- No Cookies present.
- The server would not know if the request was proper which could lead to Replay attacks.

Insufficient Transport Layer Protection

■ Obvious Issues

■ Custom “encoding”

- ▶ After some RE, not encryption! (no key present)
- ▶ Some Plaintext available
- ▶ I was able to analyze their protocol.

Server name Identification

■ Plaintext!

```
Transmission Control Protocol, Src Port: 101 (2400), Dst Port: http (80), Seq: 1, Len: 1,  
Hypertext Transfer Protocol  
Line-based text data: application/x-www-form-urlencoded  
\252\020\377\377\377\377\000\001\000\000\000\000@P\000\000\000\000\v\201ROCHESTER_A
```

Agent ID Identification

- After observing traffic with different Agent IDs, I was able to determine where in the string it lived

```
Line-based text data: application/x-www-form-urlencoded  
\252\020\377\377\377\377\000\001\001\002c:\020 \000\000\000\000\000\201
```



```
Line-based text data: application/x-www-form-urlencoded  
\252\020\377\377\377\377\000\001\001\002d\356\020 \000\000\000\000\000\201
```

Agent ID Identification Cont.

■ Raw Hex:

- ▶ aa10ffffffff00010102633a10200000000000081
- ▶ aa10ffffffff0001010264ee10200000000000081

■ Converting the hex "633a" and "64ee" to decimal revealed the Agent IDs.

■ This coupled with Server Name in plaintext could lead to complete compromise of data

Server Identification

- No attempts were made to disguise the identity of web server and technology used

```
Hypertext Transfer Protocol
+ HTTP/1.1 200 OK\r\n
  Date: Thu, 06 Oct 2011 12:23:00 GMT\r\n
  Server: Microsoft-IIS/6.0\r\n
  X-Powered-By: ASP.NET\r\n
  X-AspNet-Version: 2.0.50727\r\n
  Transfer-Encoding: chunked\r\n
  Cache-Control: private\r\n
  Content-Type: text/html\r\n
  \r\n
+ HTTP chunked response
```

Notifying the Vendor

- Brought this to the attention of my boss who asked me to write it up
- Submitted write-up to the vendor
- CTO Came and stated they were aware of these issues (they lied to us in the beginning)

Vendor's Plan

■ Setup Codes

- ▶ Unique 8 character string generated on server end before setting up a device

■ SSL (eventually)

- ▶ As of current version, still no SSL present. They stated it would have been in Dec 2011 release

Protecting Ourselves

- Ask vendor if the app has been independently assessed for security issues (companies specialize in this!)
- Assess the software yourself.

Thank you!