

SSO-MONITOR: Fully-Automatic Large-Scale Landscape, Security, and Privacy Analyses of Single Sign-On in the Wild

Maximilian Westers¹, Tobias Wich², Louis Jannett², Vladislav Mladenov², Christian Mainka², Andreas Mayer¹

¹ Heilbronn University of Applied Sciences,

{maximilian.westers, andreas.mayer}@hs-heilbronn.de

² Ruhr University Bochum,

{tobias.wich, louis.jannett, vladislav.mladenov, christian.mainka}@rub.de

Abstract—Single Sign-On (SSO) shifts the crucial authentication process on a website to the underlying SSO protocols and their correct implementation. To strengthen SSO security, organizations, such as IETF and W3C, maintain advisories to address known threats. One could assume that these security best practices are widely deployed on websites. We show that this assumption is a fallacy.

We present SSO-MONITOR, an open-source fully-automatic large-scale SSO landscape, security, and privacy analysis tool. In contrast to all previous work, SSO-MONITOR uses a highly extensible, fully automated workflow with novel visual-based SSO detection techniques, enhanced security and privacy analyses, and continuously updated monitoring results. It receives a list of domains as input to discover the login pages, recognize the supported Identity Providers (IdPs), and execute the SSO. It further reveals the current security level of SSO in the wild compared to the security best practices on paper.

With SSO-MONITOR, we automatically identified 1,632 websites with 3,020 Apple, Facebook, or Google logins within the Tranco 10k. Our continuous monitoring also revealed how quickly these numbers change over time. SSO-MONITOR can automatically login to each SSO website. It records the logins by tracing HTTP and in-browser communication to detect widespread security and privacy issues automatically. We introduce a novel deep-level inspection of HTTP parameters that we call SMARTPARAMS. Using SMARTPARAMS for security analyses, we uncovered URL parameters in 5 Client Application (Client) secret leakages and 337 cases with weak CSRF protection. We additionally identified 447 cases with no CSRF protection, 342 insecure SSO flows and 9 cases with nested URL parameters, leading to an open redirect in one case. On top, SSO-MONITOR reveals privacy leakages that deanonymize users and allow user tracking without user awareness in 200 cases.

1. Introduction

Single Sign-On (SSO) allows websites to quickly register and login users to their accounts by using popular Identity Providers (IdPs) like Apple, Facebook, and Google. The user authentication is provided by implementing two de-facto standards for SSO: OAuth Authorization Framework 2.0 (OAuth) and OpenID Connect 1.0 (OIDC). Both protocols provide a flexible and user-transparent way to share resources, such as profile in-




Figure 1: SSO-MONITOR’s Fully-Automatic Workflow. It starts with the input of a Tranco list and employs search engines to discover a website’s login page. Then, it uses both a visual-based and pattern-based approach to detect the SSO login buttons. It executes SSO and conducts security and privacy analyses on the login traces. SSO-MONITOR outputs landscape, security, and privacy results.

formation, between the website, which acts as a Client Application (Client), and an IdP. For users, this offers the opportunity to handle only one central account at the IdP, but still be able to use multiple Clients. Authentication flaws are among the OWASP Top Ten [34] vulnerabilities and, as such, of prime importance. Previously, passwords played a major role in authentication, but since they are known to be problematic [14, 16, 48], SSO seems to be the promising solution. However, SSO is evolving quickly. For example, among the four proposed OAuth protocol variants (grant types) from 2012 [13], only one (the code grant) is still considered secure if combined with various extensions [28]. Developers can hardly follow and implement the recommendations. To address these issues, researchers investigated SSO repetitively.

Prior Work

The majority of related work [50, 3, 45, 53, 30, 54, 35, 25, 51, 36, 17] implemented SSO security tools that require manual detection and execution of SSO logins. Due to the lack of a fully automated evaluation, researchers often limit the evaluation to a small subset of the most frequently used websites, such as Alexa or Tranco 1k and one IdP. This subset makes it hard to estimate how frequently common vulnerabilities appear and the implementation of security best practices are adopted on

the Internet. Other studies automated the SSO detection and execution but did not investigate SSO security and privacy [57, 18, 5] or only parts of the login flow [32]. Still, some researchers [56, 41, 11, 10] performed large-scale SSO security and privacy analyses. However, many results are not reproducible since the used tools are not publicly available.

Challenges in Monitoring SSO.

Evaluating the security of large-scale SSO-deployments automatically is a challenging task. First, it is hard to quickly and reliably determine which websites support SSO when only its domain is known. In contrast to previous work, we implemented a novel visual-based SSO detection for increased accuracy. Second, large-scale security and privacy evaluations are restricted to passive traffic analyses due to ethical considerations. To gain more information and thus conduct more comprehensive evaluations, we are the first to introduce a new deep parameter inspection technique (SMARTPARAMS). This approach allows for uncovering low-entropy security parameters (CSRF protection), nested parameters inside HTTP traffic (secret leakages), and URL parameters (open redirect), which prior work missed.

Our work answers the following three research questions.

RQ1: How can we continuously monitor the SSO landscape at scale?

We noticed that the SSO support on websites varies over time so that prior surveys cannot represent the current SSO landscape. Websites are frequently adding new IdPs and removing others. The wide deployment of Apple’s IdP proves that introducing new IdPs can entirely revamp the SSO landscape in only three years. Therefore, we see the demand for an automated approach as mandatory before any empirical evaluations of real-world SSO implementations can be conducted. Although automatically monitoring the SSO landscape might seem to be an engineering problem, numerous novel challenges and in-depth research must be conducted. We designed a modular architecture to solve these challenges: (1) We establish a methodology to automatically find the login page for a given domain with search engines. (2) We detect the IdPs that a website supports by recognizing their logos and searching for patterns and keywords. (3) We automatically execute SSO logins, including interactions with IdPs such as consenting. For proofing the correctness of our approach, we conducted a *manual* ground truth analysis on the Tranco 1k and compared the results with our automated approach. We then extended the automated analyses to the Tranco 10k and provide novel insights on the SSO landscape. We identified 3,020 SSO logins in the Tranco 10k and provide details on their supported IdPs and protocol details (see §6).

RQ2: How secure are current SSO logins?

As a result of several discovered vulnerabilities in the recent years, IETF created a constantly updated draft addressing all known security issues [28, 27]. The IETF also created multiple additional documents, such as JWT best practices [40], PKCE [39], and mTLS [4], to strengthen SSO. The question arises if all these security considerations and improvements are implemented to protect the

users relying on SSO. We systematize the current state of the applied security mechanisms on the Internet. In 342 cases Clients transfer sensitive data via the user’s browser, which is deprecated and considered dangerous in SSO. With respect to CSRF, we identified 447 logins with an entirely missing protection. With SMARTPARAMS, we extended the list of vulnerabilities with 337 additional logins due to a recognized weak CSRF protection, for instance, less than 20 bytes entropy. Furthermore, we identified nested URL parameters in 9 cases that could lead to open redirects and 5 Client secret leakages with SMARTPARAMS’s deep inspection.

RQ3: How private are current SSO logins?

To authenticate users, Clients and IdPs exchange sensitive user-related information. This exchange must only happen transparently and after the user’s consent. We are the first to identify that this is not always the case. We estimated 200 cases in which the Clients and IdPs exchange private user information secretly without user awareness.

SSO-MONITOR

SSO-MONITOR is our answer to RQ1, RQ2, and RQ3. It can conduct an automated evaluation of large-scale SSO deployments using the Tranco 10k. We depict its basic idea in Figure 1. Once it detects SSO support on a website, SSO-MONITOR sequentially signs in using Apple, Facebook, and Google. Next, SSO-MONITOR repeats the automated login a second time so that it can distinguish random from static parameters. SSO-MONITOR then automatically identifies security and privacy issues. SSO-MONITOR combines novel insights on how SSO schemes are implemented with state-of-the-art engineering techniques.

Contributions

We make the following key contributions:

- ▶ We systematize known SSO analysis techniques (§3). We compare prior tools in Table 1, and we show how SSO-MONITOR differs to them with novel SSO detection and analysis techniques.
- ▶ We present SSO-MONITOR, our systematic and modular approach for large-scale SSO analyses (§4). SSO-MONITOR is open-source¹ and only requires a list of domains as input. It identifies the login page for each domain, detects which IdPs are supported, and starts the authentication process. SSO-MONITOR records the traffic that it later analyzes on security and privacy issues.
- ▶ We publish an in-depth overview of the usage of SSO in the Tranco 1k (manual ground truth analysis → §5) and Tranco 10k (automated analysis with SSO-MONITOR → §6) to answer RQ1.
- ▶ We use SSO-MONITOR to analyze the security of 3,020 SSO logins across 1,632 websites to answer RQ2 (§7). Besides 337 weak and 447 missing CSRF protections, it uncovers 342 obsolete protocol flows, and 215 protocol mix-ups. Since SSO-MONITOR inspected nested and encoded data structures, it identified 5 Client secret leakages, and an open redirect attack.

1. For the submission, we provide the source code and screenshots of SSO-MONITOR on <https://tinyurl.com/sso-monitor>. For anonymity reasons, we will publish the artifacts after the review phase.




Figure 2: SSO Scheme. The Client website delegates the user’s authentication to the IdP. The user’s browser transfers messages in the front-channel using HTTP or InBCs with JavaScript (1-4, 7). Back-channel messages (5-6) are based on HTTP and invisible in the user’s browser.

- We reveal 200 privacy breaches among 1,632 websites that support SSO to answer RQ3 (§8). We are the first to identify that websites secretly sign in their users using SSO without their knowledge and awareness.

Responsible Disclosure

We notified the affected sites as part of our ongoing responsible disclosure process to achieve a more secure and private SSO landscape. We relied on well-established security reporting mechanisms from prior work [5, 43, 20, 44] to collect the contact emails: (1) the `security.txt` file (2) the WHOIS record (3) off-the-shelf search engine [31] and website [2] email crawlers, and (4) the standard aliases `security@`, `abuse@`, `webmaster@`, and `info@`. We sent the email from our institutional email address to verify our identity and maximize credibility. While we participate in the active discussions with the vendors, some of them have resolved the issues. We appreciate for being acknowledged and rewarded with bug bounties.

2. Background: Single Sign-On Schemes

Figure 2 depicts a basic SSO scheme. It consists of an user who wants to log in on the Client’s website using an IdP. SSO protocols can be divided into front-channel communication, which is exposed to the user’s browser (steps 1-4 and 7), and back-channel communication (steps 5-6), which is invisible to the user. SSO messages in the front-channel can be sent via HTTP or In-Browser Communication (InBC) techniques, such as the `postMessage` API [52, §9.3] and `Channel Messaging` [52, §9.4] API. HTTP communication is standardized in SSO, but recent research [17] showed a strong shift towards the use of InBC techniques in SSO, which rely on JavaScript.

Login Request and Response

The SSO login flow starts with the user requesting access to a restricted resource, for example, to `profile.html`. To authenticate the user, the Client sends the login request to the IdP via the user’s browser. This message contains parameters specific to the particular SSO protocol in use. In OIDC, the login request contains the

identity of the Client (`client_id`), the target to which the IdP must send the login response (`redirect_uri`), and optional security parameters (i.e., `state`, `nonce`, `code_challenge`, ...). The login response contains the tokens (`code`, `access_token`, `id_token`) that the Client uses to authenticate the user.

User Authentication & Consent on the IdP

Before the login response can be sent back to the Client, the user must authenticate to the IdP. Protocols based on OAuth, such as OIDC or Facebook Connect, also ask the user to provide consent on resources to be accessed by the Client.

Token Request and Response

SSO protocols can authenticate the user either by using only the information in the login response, or by using the back-channel. OIDC offers both variants, which can be configured in the login request using dedicated parameters (`response_type`). If the back-channel authentication is used, the Client sends a token request to the IdP. This HTTP message contains authentication information of the Client (e.g., `client_id` and `client_secret`) as well as information from the login response. In OIDC, the login response contains a `code`, a one-time-use token that is bound to the Client. Once the Client redeems the `code` in the token request on the IdP, it retrieves the token response that holds a JSON Web Token (JWT) with the user’s identity.

3. Systematization of Known SSO Tools

We investigated related work on tools performing SSO security and privacy analyses or using SSO for automated account sign-ins and registrations. Table 1 summarizes our comparison grouped into categories that we found useful for answering RQ1-3.

Availability

The minority of SSO analysis tools (6/19) are publicly available. We strongly believe that this attitude prevents the community from proceeding with research and yields the reimplementations of already solved tasks. For instance, all related works implement individual SSO automation pipelines instead of reusing existing ones. Thereby, we provide SSO-MONITOR as an open-source foundation for future large-scale analyses of the Internet’s SSO ecosystem.

SSO Scope

To execute SSO, the authentication and consent steps must be automated for *each* IdP. For this reason, prior tools often support a *single* IdP (5/19). With SSO-MONITOR, we support the three most popular IdPs [32]: Apple, Facebook, and Google. Interestingly, prior tools work best for English websites due to their pattern-based SSO detection. This is mirrored in the selection of top sites lists, for example, Zhou and Evans [56] use the region-specific Alexa list. SSO-MONITOR’s visual-based SSO detection works for websites of all languages and regions. We also consider InBCs on a large scale, which recently got attention in SSO [17].

Availability		SSO Scope					SSO Detection & Execution					SSO Analyses				
Tool & Publication	OS ¹	Clients ²	IdPs	Web / Mobile	OAuth / OIDC?	InBC?	Login Page ^{3,4,5} Detection	SSO ⁶ Det.	SSO Exe.	Acc. Reg. ⁶	Acc. Verif.	Monitor	# SSO Logins	False Negatives	Security	Privacy
BRM Analyzer [50] (S&P'12)	🔴	11	G F +1	🌐	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
AuthScan [3] (NDSS'13)	🔴	8	F +2	🌐	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
SSOScan [56] (USENIX'14)	🟢	QC 20k	F	🌐	🔴	🔴	HP-Prio	🔴	🟢	🟢	🔴	🔴	1,660	3% (5/169)	🟢	🔴
OAuth Detector [41] (DIMVA'15)	🔴	AX 10k	Any IdP	🌐	🔴	🔴	Crawl-DFS-D2	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	302	—	🟢	🔴
MPWA-ZAP [45] (NDSS'16)	🔴	—	F +3	🌐	🔴	🔴	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
OAuthTester [53] (AsiaCCS'16)	🔴	AX 500	F +3	🌐	🔴	🔴	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	405	—	🟢	🔴
ProFESSOS [30] (EuroS&P'17)	🟢	8 libraries	—	🌐	🔴	🔴	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
AuthScope [57] (CCS'17)	🔴	GP 200k	F	🌐	🔴	🔴	Crawl-DFS-D2c-Prio	🔴	🟢	🔴	🔴	🔴	4,838	—	🔴	🔴
Single Sign-Off [11] (USENIX'18)	🔴	AX 1m	G F +61	🌐	🔴	🔴	HP, Crawl-BFS-D2-Select;	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
CPs; SEs-DDG	🔴	—	—	🌐	🔴	57,555	—	🟢	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
S3kvetter [54] (USENIX'18)	🔴	—	10 SDKs	🌐	🔴	—	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
OAUTHLINT [35] (ASE'19)	🔴	GP 600	G F +17	🌐	🔴	—	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	316	—	🟢	🔴
OAuthGuard [25] (SSR'19)	🔴	MJ 1k	G	🌐	🔴	—	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	137	—	🟢	🔴
Shepherd [18] (MADWeb'20)	🔴	AX 10k	F	🌐	🔴	—	HP; Crawl-D2-Select;	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
CPs; SEs-SP, BLASK	🔴	—	—	🌐	🔴	664	18% (9/50)	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
Cookie Hunter [5] (CCS'20)	🔴	AX 1.5m	G F	🌐	🔴	—	[11]; Crawl-BFS-D2-Prio;	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
HP-Top30	🔴	—	—	🌐	🔴	2,066	25% (5/20)	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
OAuthScope [32] (WPES'21)	🔴	AX 500*5	G F +17	🌐	🔴	—	Crawl-Select	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	815	—	🟢	🔴
MoScan [51] (ISSTA'21)	🔴	MZ 26	F	🌐	🔴	—	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	26	—	🟢	🔴
SAAT [10] (S&P'22)	🔴	MJ 100k	F	🌐	🔴	—	SEs-SP, BLDDG; CPs	🔴	🟢	🟢	Email, SMS.	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
CAPTCHA	50 days	2,689	—	🌐	🔴	—	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
Cerberus [36] (CCS'22)	🔴	—	10 libraries	🌐	🔴	—	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	—	—	🟢	🔴
DISTINCT [17] (CCS'22)	🔴	TC 1k	G F +17	🌐	🔴	—	—	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	273	—	🟢	🔴
SSO-Monitor	🟢	TC 10k	G F +17	🌐	🔴	🔴	Crawl-BFS-D2-Prio; SEs-SP, BLDDG	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	Continuous	2,953	3% (in 1k)	🟢	🟢

1 Availability — OS: Open Source;
2 Top Sites / Apps Lists — AX: Alexa; TC: Tranco; MJ: Majestic; MZ: Moz; QC: Quantcast; GP: Google Play;
3 Login Page Sources — HP: Homepage; Crawl: Crawling; CPs: Common Paths; SEs: Search Engines;
4 Crawling Techniques — DFS: Depth-First Search; BFS: Breath-First Search; Prio: Prioritized; Select: Selective; D: Depth;
5 Search Engines — SP: Startpage; BF: Bing; DDG: DuckDuckGo; ASK: Ask.com;
6 Recognition Methods — 🔄: Pattern- and Heuristics-based Recognition; 👁: Visual-based Recognition;

TABLE 1: Systematization of Known SSO Analysis Tools. With the release of SSO-MONITOR, we contribute to the scope, detection, execution, and security and privacy analyses of SSO in the wild.

Login Page Detection

Prior work used different approaches to find the login page. For example, they tested for common paths (i.e., /login) [18, 10], only crawling links including login-related keywords (→ selective), or running a Depth-First Search (DFS) crawl [41, 57, 11, 18, 5, 32]. Others [56] assumed the homepage as login page [56, 11, 18, 5]. In practice, websites can include the SSO button on a deeply nested login page. Thus, starting with the input of a domain, tools first have to aggregate a candidate pool of login pages. Therefore, we assess two techniques: (1) Breath-First Search (BFS) crawling with a depth of 2 visiting links including login-related keywords first (→ prioritized), and (2) querying search engines.

SSO Detection

The login page candidates are scanned for SSO buttons. All prior work followed a programmatic, *pattern-based* detection approach, which uses string-matching algorithms to identify keywords. For instance, if a `<button>` contains the keyword *login*, it is tested for SSO. This approach suffers from False Negatives (FNs), as SSO buttons can take any shape and include arbitrary keywords in any language. For example, they can be `<button>` tags with `onclick` listeners or nested like `<a>`. SSO-MONITOR introduces a novel, *visual-based* detection approach, which identifies the IdPs' logos contained in SSO buttons. We randomly sampled a subset of 50 websites with SSO and found that 49 of them include logos in all of their SSO buttons. SSO-MONITOR combines the keyword-based approach with the novel visual-based approach to maximize the detection rate on any website.

SSO Execution

We found that 5 of 19 tools could execute SSO to login on the Client. However, SSOScan [56] was last updated in 2015 and not adapted to today's SSO logins. AuthScope [57] is for mobile apps. Shepherd [18] and Cookie Hunter [5] both use SSO logins as fallback for generic

post-authentication studies. SSO-MONITOR is the first to automate the Apple login, including its 2FA.

Account Registration and Verification

Studies focused on post-authentication mechanisms also require post-SSO account registration and verification. For instance, the user is asked to submit additional data that is not provided by the IdP and confirm the email address. Therefore, email verification [5, 10], SMS verification [10], and CAPTCHAs [10] have been automated. For SSO-MONITOR, we consider them as out of scope as we examine the protocol messages that are *always* exchanged during *any* login. Also, SSO-MONITOR is open source and releasing automated account registration tools to the public may raise ethical concerns.

Continuous Monitoring

To the best of our knowledge, SSO-MONITOR is the first to provide a constantly updated top sites list of websites with SSO, similar to Tranco [19]. Only SAAT [10] recently compared the SSO landscape over a period of 50 days. They noticed a dynamic landscape, which SSO-MONITOR is the first to monitor continuously.

Ground Truth Estimation

We compare the automated SSO detection engine of SSO-MONITOR against the Tranco 1k to estimate its accuracy. Prior work [56, 18, 5] randomly sampled only small subsets of websites for such estimations (i.e., 20 [5], 50 [18], and 169 [56]). In sum, SSO-MONITOR detects 97% of all SSO login buttons, and it executes a total of 2,811 SSO logins.

SSO Analyses

SSO-MONITOR runs a comprehensive and systematic study on the real-world adoption of the OAuth security best practices [29]. Prior studies [56, 41, 53, 54, 25, 51] already investigated selected parameters (i.e., `state`) but missed to conduct in-depth parameter inspections. With SMARTPARAMS, we fill this gap. Regarding privacy,




Figure 3: Design and Architecture of SSO-MONITOR. It fully automates the SSO analysis in four steps: (1) ground truth estimation, (2) landscape evaluation, (3) security analysis, and (4) privacy analysis. Only the first step requires user interaction and is executed *once* to estimate its detection accuracy.

SSO-MONITOR first reveals that websites are logging in to their users secretly without their awareness.

4. SSO-MONITOR: Design and Architecture

In this section, we introduce the design and the architecture of SSO-MONITOR, see Figure 3. On input of a domain, SSO-MONITOR finds the login page, the supported IdPs, executes the SSO login, and derives security and privacy results.

Design

SSO-MONITOR can investigate the SSO landscape, its security, and its privacy fully automatically. Figure 3 depicts its general idea that is split into four modules. The *ground truth* is our initial manual investigation of the SSO landscape, see §5. SSO-MONITOR guides the analyst via an interactive interface to configure the SSO support for a specific website. By contrast, the *landscape detection* works fully automatically, see §6. To estimate the automatic detection’s success rate, we compare our results with the ground truth. The remaining two parts, *SSO security* (§7) and *SSO privacy* (§8) conduct multiple automatic sign-ins based on the automatic landscape detection. Both record the HTTP traffic and all InBCs during these sign-ins for their actual analysis.

Architecture

The application architecture of SSO-MONITOR consists of a master node and a variable number of worker nodes. The master distributes all analysis tasks to the workers on a per domain basis. Therefore, SSO-MONITOR scales efficiently by adding new workers. All artifacts and reports are centrally collected and stored on the master node. Additionally, the master provides a web-based management interface. Hence, all administrative tasks and analysis reports can easily be executed and viewed.

5. Ground Truth: Tranco 1k SSO Landscape

We need a ground truth to implement and evaluate our automated discovery and analysis of SSO. We manually analyzed the websites out of the ground truth, and we

	Websites	G	F	A	Σ Logins
Authentication supported	760 (76%)	–	–	–	–
SSO Login supported	278 (28%)	244	214	122	580
Automated SSO possible	223 (22%)	197	167	99	463

TABLE 2: Ground Truth. SSO is supported on 28% of the Tranco 1k. On 22%, we can execute SSO fully automated.

use our analysis results as reference for SSO-MONITOR’s automatic evaluations. In our case, the ground truth allows us to choose proper strategies for the automation of SSO. This process includes choosing appropriate parameters and fine-tuning our automated SSO detection engine for high-level accuracy.

Methodology

We use the Tranco list² [19] generated on 15 November 2021 as the foundation for our manual investigations. For each domain in the list, we manually visited the appropriate website. We looked for login possibilities on the site, and if available, documented the *supported SSO providers* that can be used to sign in. We further noted the *domain*, *login page*, *timestamp*, and *automation hurdles*.

Results

In Table 2, we depict the results of our ground truth analysis. Out of the Tranco 1k, 760 websites (76%) implement a login page and thus support user authentication. The remaining sites do not implement user authentication (106, 11%) or are not reachable (134, 13%). We further found that 278 sites (28%) support SSO with at least one IdP. The most used IdP is Google on 244 websites (24%), strictly followed by Facebook on 214 sites (21%). Apple started its SSO support back in 2019. Since then, its importance has significantly grown, as it is already supported on 122 websites (12%). We determined that the automated detection and execution of SSO is not possible on 55 sites due to technical constraints, such as required user interaction. Thus, we evaluate the success rate of our automated approach against 223 websites and 463 SSO logins, respectively.

6. Automatic Evaluation: SSO Landscape

In this section, we present our SSO landscape evaluation, which contains the methodology (§6.1), login page discovery (§6.2, §6.3), SSO detection (§6.4, §6.5), detection rate and performance (§6.6), continuous monitoring (§6.7), and contemporary Tranco 10k SSO landscape (§6.8).

6.1. Methodology

In this paper, we concentrate on the continuous monitoring of SSO in the wild. The monitoring requires computational resources over a long period. Thus, we define the following requirements for the detection: (1) as few resources as possible as much as needed, (2) high detection rate, and (3) robustness.

². Available at <https://tranco-list.eu/list/6Z2X>.

Available Resources

Our goal is to monitor a large number of websites once a year continuously. Thus, the required resources to discover the login page and analyze the SSO support should not exceed 52 minutes in the worst case:

$$max_{time} = \frac{12(month) * 30(d) * 24(h) * 60(m)}{10.000(websites) * 1(worker)} = 52 \text{ min/site} \quad (1)$$

We also require high detection rates with low False Positives (FPs) and FNs. Our goal is to achieve an at least 90% correct detection of SSO. Many of the websites, however, are not available in English. We should be able to analyze and discover SSO on such websites.

Preparation Steps

(1) We use Selenium to automate the navigation on websites. However, many websites detect when the browser is automatically navigated and activate CAPTCHAs. To circumvent this limitation, we use the `selenium-stealth`³ plugin. (2) We disable the cookie banners by installing the browser extension `I don't care about cookies`⁴ and thus reduce the risks of manual interactions to a minimum. (3) To execute Selenium on headless servers, we use a virtual monitor⁵ and the Google Chrome browser with a pre-configured window size.

6.2. Login Page Discovery: Crawling

Crawling is used by the majority of related work [57, 11, 41, 18, 5] to discover login pages. However, we suggest that this approach suffers from low reliability and cost-benefit ratio.

Methodology

We configured Scrapy⁶ to BFS-crawl the Tranco 1k from our ground truth with a depth of 2. We took advantage of Scrapy's built-in `LinkExtractor` module, which automatically detects and extracts all clickable links on a page. To eliminate FPs, we filtered out third-party links. We followed crawling best practices [6, §5] like the `robots.txt` denylist and adaptive request throttling.

Results

Our crawling dataset contains 515,855 links from 1k websites, averaging to 515 crawled links per site. However, the entire crawling set contains only 146 login pages out of the ground truth (760). Crawling statistics show that 104 (71%) of the login pages are linked on the homepage, while 42 (29%) of them are linked on a subpage. The search engine approach, see §6.3, detects almost three times more login pages. On top, continuous monitoring requires the crawling to be run on a regular basis. This puts excessive load onto the web servers. Due to the ambitious resource load, the approach does not scale and does not satisfy our research goal.

3. <https://pypi.org/project/selenium-stealth/>

4. <https://addons.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/addon/i-dont-care-about-cookies/>

5. <https://pypi.org/project/virtualenv/>

6. <https://scrapy.org/>

6.3. Login Page Discovery: Search Engines

Search engines provide benefits out-of-the-box: (1) they already crawl the web with an indefinite depth, (2) they instantly provide up-to-date results, (3) they make the data accessible and searchable via keywords, and (4) they use internal rankings to provide optimized results.

Prior SSO tools [11, 18, 10] used search engines but did not systematically evaluate their effectiveness. We answer the following questions: (1) Which search engines return the most login pages? (2) Which search query returns the most login pages? (3) How many ranked search results are required to detect the most login pages?

Methodology

According to [42], Google (92.01%), Bing (2.96%), Yahoo (1.51%), Baidu (1.17%), YANDEX (1.06%), and DuckDuckGo (0.68%) are the most popular search engines in 2022. Yahoo uses Bing's search index. Baidu and YANDEX primarily target the Chinese or Russian market. Thus, we included Google, Bing, and DuckDuckGo in our scope. We further replaced Google with Startpage, which proxies the Google Search and does not interfere with CAPTCHAs. To eliminate FPs, we require the website and its login page to be the same site using the `site:` operator. For each resolved domain, we submitted five different search queries to each engine and stored the top 10 returned search results. We selected appropriate search queries to the best of our knowledge ranging from simple to more specific ones: (1) `reddit.com login site:reddit.com` (2) `reddit login site:reddit.com` (3) `log in reddit site:*.reddit.com` (4) `reddit login signin signup register account site:reddit.com` (5) `site:reddit.com (intitle:"login" OR intitle:"log in" OR intitle:"signin" OR intitle:"sign in")`

Results

Surprisingly, the most straightforward search query ($SQ1$) combined with all engines found the most login pages out of the ground truth (434/760), see Table 3. Although we can compare different engines and queries *with each other*, this number only indicates a *lower boundary*. The ground truth only holds a single login page for each website, while in practice, a website can have multiple login pages. Our goal is to provide continuous monitoring of the SSO landscape once a year on a single-threaded machine (cf. §6.7). Thus, performance plays an important role. Our analysis takes 289 seconds for each page (cf. Table 4). The analysis of the top 3 search results from all three engines ($\rightarrow 9$ in total) would require $\frac{289s \cdot 9 \cdot 10,000}{60 \cdot 60 \cdot 24} = 301$ days. By using at least 4 parallel workers, we can scale up the landscape evaluation to a quarterly executed scan with a duration of 75 days.

6.4. SSO Detection: Patterns and Keywords

Inspired by previous work [56], we decided to implement a keyword-based analysis. We base our analysis on the extraction of *clickable* elements on a website like links and buttons, but also elements with JavaScript events. To reduce the set of candidates starting SSO, we search for

Login Pages found with	SQ1	SQ2	SQ3	SQ4	SQ5
Startpage	307	329	250	216	150
Bing	331	316	288	272	120
DuckDuckGo	320	315	264	268	132
Startpage & Bing	423	414	370	343	172
Startpage & DuckDuckGo	420	416	363	342	179
Bing & DuckDuckGo	354	340	310	306	144
All Combined (Top 10)	434	431	382	363	182
Top 5 Search Results	385 (-49)	386 (-45)	357 (-25)	333 (-30)	163 (-19)
Top 3 Search Results	357 (-77)	337 (-94)	335 (-47)	292 (-71)	153 (-29)

TABLE 3: Search Query Evaluation. To find a suitable search query and engine, we compare the detection rate of five queries on three engines against our ground truth.

specific keywords inside the elements’ texts and attributes (e.g., *sign in with google*, *login with facebook*). If this does not return valid results, we search for elements including specific IdP names (e.g., *google*, *facebook*, *apple*). We store all candidates in a list to evaluate them later. The limitations of the keyword-based analysis are: (1) The SSO detection is limited to the defined keywords. Different languages or source code without any of the keywords lead to FNs. (2) SSO buttons containing only the IdP logo without any text lead to FNs.

6.5. SSO Detection: Images and Logos

To solve the limitations of the keyword-based approach, we developed an image-based analysis. During our investigations, we discovered that SSO buttons also contain the logo of the corresponding IdP. Thus, we implemented an algorithm for opening a login page candidate, taking a screenshot, highlighting recognized IdP logos, and extracting their coordinates. For the logo recognition, we used a state-of-the-art algorithm that supports pattern matching, is available in Python, and is open source. Thus, we chose the OpenCV algorithm⁷. In the implementation, we solved the following challenges: logo collection, logo scalability, robustness, and high FP rate.

Logo Collection

To establish a set of IdP logos, we carefully analyzed 100 websites and extracted the commonly used logos. In sum, we stored two or three logos for each IdP. This list can be easily extended by storing new logos.

Logo Scalability

One of the main challenges is the variable size of the logos on the websites since the pattern matching algorithm works only if the sizes are similar. A suitable solution is to scale the website’s screenshot with different factors and analyze it repeatedly for each scale factor. We discovered that it is far more efficient to scale the logo instead of the screenshot during our implementation. This approach requires fewer resources, for instance, time, memory, and CPU.

Robustness

The main challenge is to balance a high recognition rate with performance. This requires us to adjust multiple parameters: the number of pre-configured logos, different logo scales, and detection scores. Based on experiments and optimizations, we reduced the logo set to only used

7. https://docs.opencv.org/3.4/d4/dc6/tutorial_py_template_matching.html

Analysis Approach	SSO Logins	FPs	Detection Rates			Duration t_{avg}
			FNs	Recognized	Rate	
Keyword	463	0	20	443	95%	1:26m
Image	463	0	52	411	89%	5:16m
Hybrid	463	0	12	451	97%	4:49m

TABLE 4: By combining the keyword-based and the image-based SSO recognition, we achieve a 97% detection rate.

ones. We also reduced the number of scale iterations to a minimum without sacrificing pattern matching results. Since the OpenCV algorithm outputs a value with a matching score, we implemented upper and lower bounds to determine whether SSO is detected. The algorithm stops if a match is above the upper bound due to the high matching confidence.

High False Positive Rate

On websites without SSO, the algorithm matches areas looking similar to the logos, i.e., *G* for Google, *O* for Apple, and interestingly *t* for Facebook. We eliminate all FPs with a generic approach, see §6.6.

6.6. Detection Rates and Performance

The keyword-based and image-based analyses detect suitable SSO candidates. Still, their FP rates are high. To solve this problem, we designed a reliable and robust verification.

Detection Verification

For each candidate, we store the coordinates on the login page. During their verification, we automatically navigate the browser to these coordinates and click on the area. If the browser sends the login request to an IdP, we know that SSO with the corresponding IdP is supported. This verification eliminates the FP rate. Storing the coordinates leads to an unexpected advantage regarding the automated execution of SSO. Websites are changing their source code, including the HTML elements, quite often. These changes make the automated execution via Selenium impossible since it navigates via element IDs or HTML trees. However, the position of buttons is constant. With the stored coordinates, we can reliably and repeatedly execute SSO.

Hybrid Approach

We decided to chain both, the keyword-based and image-based SSO detection into a *hybrid* approach. First, we execute the less resource-intensive keyword-based analysis. If it is not successful, the more resource-intensive image-based approach is triggered.

Results

In Table 4, we analyze the Tranco 1k sites that have a login page and do not require additional steps to start the SSO. From our ground truth, we expect to recognize 463 SSO logins. The keyword-based approach recognizes 95% of the SSO logins. The image-based approach recognizes 89% of the SSO logins. Areas on the website looking similar to the logos are the main reason for the lower recognition rate. The problem can be solved by marking multiple candidates where the logo *could be*.

IdP	SSO Logins	Broken	Protocol		Flows			
			OAuth	OIDC	Code	Hybrid	Implicit	N/A
	1,399	98	667	634	946	43	276	36
	1,150	73	1,068	9	586	0	314	177
	471	38	212	221	236	197	0	0
Σ	3,020	209	1,947	864	1,768	240	590	213

TABLE 5: SSO-Monitor automatically found 3,020 SSO logins on the Tranco 10k websites but only 2,811 could be further analyzed due to technical constraints. OAuth (69%) and the code flow (63%) are predominantly used in the wild.

Considering the resource and time restraints, we decided to address this improvement in future work. By combining both approaches, we achieve a recognition rate of 97%. Interestingly, 6 of 12 FNs are caused by CAPTCHAs on *ebay.com* and *ebay.de*.

6.7. Continuous Monitoring

SSO-MONITOR runs multiple scans in sequence to monitor the SSO landscape continuously. It then compares the results and presents their differences. There are two ways to continuously monitor the SSO landscape. Both of them require an initial landscape analysis run, which includes the aggregation of login page candidates.

Punctual Monitoring

To determine the SSO landscape at a current timestamp, the analyst creates a continuous monitoring job and selects the first scan as a basis. The next scan uses the login pages candidates from the first scan. If the supported IdPs change, e.g., an IdP was added or removed, the continuous monitoring job will rerun a full detection of login pages and IdPs. Such scans can be repeated arbitrarily and represent the SSO landscape at a specific time.

Constant Monitoring

To monitor the SSO landscape constantly, the analyst creates a constant monitoring task. SSO-MONITOR automatically uses free workers to update the SSO landscape continuously. This way, a large corpus of sites can be monitored fully automated over time. This approach provides an always up-to-date landscape.

6.8. The Tranco Top 10k SSO Landscape

Landscape Overview

With SSO-MONITOR, we ran the SSO detection process on the Tranco 10k list from July to August 2022. We summarize our results in Table 5. Out of 10k websites, 1,389 sites (13,9%) were not reachable during our analysis — most likely due to domain name issues, server errors, or downtime. We excluded these websites from our analysis, leaving a final dataset containing 8,611 sites. In total, we found 1,632 websites (16,3%) offering SSO support with at least one of the three IdPs. Within this group, the most prevalent IdP is Google, which is supported on 1,399 websites (86%), followed by Facebook with 1150 sites (70%). Apple started its SSO service in 2019 and is now supported by 471 sites (29%). Interestingly, 1,040 out of 1,632 sites (64%) offer support for multiple

April vs. July 2022	SSO Logins			Websites
Added	152	144	59	186
Removed	158	125	57	166

TABLE 6: SSO-Support Variance in 4 Months. In total, 186 websites added support for at least one provider. E.g., 152 websites added Google login support, while 158 removed it.

IdPs (: 348, : 576, : 86, : 30). Overall, we identified 3,020 SSO logins out of which 209 could not be further analyzed. Therefore, we excluded them, resulting in a total set of 2,811 SSO logins.

Automated SSO Discovery

The SSO discovery reveals that OAuth, which is designed for authorization, is still the preferred protocol with 1,944 SSO logins (69%). In comparison, OIDC, which allows authentication, is only used in 864 SSO logins (31%). In total, 590 SSO logins still use the deprecated implicit flow for authentication. Interestingly, Apple does not use implicit flows. They may not support legacy flows because their SSO service was released quite recently.

Keyword vs. Image

Out of the 3,020 discovered SSO logins, 2,825 were discovered by the keyword-based approach (§6.4) and 195 were additionally found by the subsequent image analysis (§6.5). Note that the image analysis is only applied if the keyword-based analysis was not successful.

Identification of Unrelated Logins

The automated discovery of login pages with search engines produced promising results. However, we discovered a low rate of FPs in the landscape analysis. We used the operator `site:domain.com` in the search query to ensure that the discovered login pages are on the same (sub)domain of the Tranco entry. Nevertheless, pages can redirect to other domains. For example, the login page `photoshop.com/login` redirects to `auth.services.adobe.com`. This redirect can lead to FPs if a site redirects to another site that supports SSO. To better understand the problem, we looked into the first 500 analysis results. We identified that 3% of the sites with SSO belong to a domain different from its original Tranco entry. Most of these cases are redirects to Twitter profiles. Since Twitter supports SSO, it is identified as a login page for that domain.

Continues Monitoring

We compared our latest SSO landscape results to a different run performed earlier in April 2022. As shown in Table 6, the comparison shows a tremendous variation in SSO support over four months.

7. Automatic Evaluation: SSO Security

7.1. Methodology

The SSO security evaluation consists of three steps, see Figure 3, and takes the landscape analysis results as input.

Scripted Browser Preparation

The browser preparation script creates a fresh browser profile with an active IdP-session and 4 pre-installed browser extensions. We (1) use the *i don't care about cookie* extension⁸ to automatically remove cookie banners, (2) develop *postMessage* and *Fragment* extensions to make InBCs visible to SSO-MONITOR, and (3) develop *Auto Consent Extension (ACE)* to automatically grant user consent and automate the IdP login.

SSO Login Execution

For each IdP, we visit the login pages in a Selenium-driven Chrome with the appropriate profile. Next, we use the coordinates from our landscape analysis to click on the SSO button. If clicking the original coordinates does not lead to the expected IdP, we restart the SSO detection. We capture the HTTP traffic and InBC in HAR files to finally analyze them. Due to our browser extensions and the authenticated IdP sessions, this step is fully automated.

7.2. Security Analysis

Test Selection

We selected our security tests according to the following criteria to match our methodology:

- (1) *Passive* tests that do not involve any active parameter manipulation.
- (2) Tests detecting faulty behaviour in *Clients*. We do not investigate IdPs.
- (3) Tests visible in the *front-channel*. Since the back-channel is inaccessible with our approach, we excluded it.

Given the above criteria, we chose the security tests from consolidated security recommendation documents. Lodderstedt et al. [29] from the IETF OAuth working group collaborate with researchers for consolidating current SSO issues and their best practices in a single document. Since the document is mostly specific for OAuth, we extended our test set with security recommendations section in the OIDC core specification [47]. We implemented tests that detect the requirements resulting in the following attacks:

- Obsolete Flows, Access Token Disclosure, Implicit Flow Threats [29, 47]. Test: `access_token` in front-channel.
- Open Redirect on the Client [29]. Test: Find nested URLs in the `redirect_uri` using SMARTPARAMS.
- CSRF Vulnerability [29, 47] with state, PKCE, nonce. Test: Missing parameters or insufficient entropy identified with SMARTPARAMS.
- Secret Leakages [29]. Test: Check HTTP Referer Headers, Tokens in Browser History, or `client_secret` visible in front-channel identified with SMARTPARAMS.
- HTTPS only requests [29, 47]. Test: Checking all requests for TLS.
- Authorization Code Injection, Token Substitution, Access Token Injection [29, 47]. Test: Missing parameters (PKCE, nonce, `at_hash`).

8. <https://www.i-dont-care-about-cookies.eu/>




Figure 4: The SMARTPARAMS approach parses all HTTP parameters until no further data structure can be extracted. Therefore, we can identify deeply nested values in HTTP parameters, so that further security analyses are possible.

- Token Manufacture/Modification [47]. Test: `id_token` in front-channel signed with symmetric key.

We added tests to identify the following protocol violations:

- Protocol Mix-Up: The Client starts OAuth but the IdP switches to OIDC.
- Flow Mix-Up: The Client started a flow that does not match the IdP's returned flow.

Although our test set is distinctive, more tests matching our criteria can simply be added because of our methodology.

Analysis Methodology

We implemented an *HAR-Analyzer* module to evaluate the recorded HARs. First, it loads the HAR data into an in-memory graph data model by using a standard HAR parser library⁹. Next, it extracts the semantic information related to OAuth and OIDC, and enriches the model with this information. For locating the relevant login requests and login responses, it scans for data that was sent from a Client to the IdP and contains dedicated SSO parameters, for example, `client_id` and `redirect_uri`. Then, *HAR-Analyzer* investigates all further parameters that the Client website and the IdP exchange for detecting security issues. For this purpose, we used our SMARTPARAMS approach that we describe below. Finally, *HAR-Analyzer* produces a report containing the parameters of the SSO messages, the inferred results, and an aggregation of the relevant data.

SMARTPARAMS

We need to inspect structured data for the fully automated security analyses without knowing the exact format. For example, OAuth typically uses a random `state` parameter to protect against CSRF attacks. However, its randomness can be deeply nested in a structured parameter. The in-depth analysis of this parameter is the core idea of SMARTPARAMS and depicted in Figure 4. A SMARTPARAM starts with an initial value, usually a

9. <https://github.com/sdstoehr/har-reader>

	Potential Security Issues				Vulnerabilities		
	Obsolete Flows	Protocol Mix-Up	Flow Mix-Up	Open Redirect	Weak CSRF	Missing Secret Leakage	
G	28	21	39	3	172	162	1
Apple	314	1	3	5	102	270	1
Google	0	193	4	1	63	15	3
Σ	342	215	46	9	337	447	5

TABLE 7: We define four potential security threats violating the specifications or the current best practices. We also automatically discover two critical vulnerabilities based on the SMARTPARAMS-analysis.

string, and provides a set of decoded or parsed values like URL, WWW Form Encoded, JSON, JWT, and more. Another SMARTPARAM object is created for each decoded value, forming a searchable tree. The SMARTPARAMS processing step is applied to all gathered requests and responses. Furthermore, the collected SSO parameters are the foundation for further security analyses.

7.3. The Tranco Top 10K Security Results

In total, we analyzed 131 GB of HAR-Files. It shows that 282 (10%) of the SSO executions failed. We manually investigated these cases and figured out that 219 (8%) are caused by faulty Client configurations, e.g., unregistered `redirect_uris`. Only 63 (2%) Clients executed SSO successfully. Due to the long running scanning process, these sites may not be reachable at the time of execution.

We define six security threats systematized in two categories: potential security issues and vulnerabilities. Potential security issues define four misconfigurations violating either the specification or the security best practices. These misconfigurations do not necessarily mean that the implementation is vulnerable. It is a clear indicator that security analysts should provide further investigations. The second category defines two vulnerabilities, which are considered critical: CSRF and secret leakage. Even though the specification and previous researches address CSRF vulnerabilities clearly, the number of found CSRF vulnerabilities is surprisingly high.

Obsolete Flows

Concerning security, we need to highlight the usage of the deprecated implicit flow. Websites must avoid the transmission of the `access_token` in the front-channel since it increases the risks of its theft [28]. As shown in Table 7, 342 flows are still implicit or the Client uses the hybrid flow with the `access_token` in the front-channel. This makes implicit the second most used flow after the code flow.

Protocol Mix-Up

In Table 7, we analyzed the violations concerning the started SSO protocol – OAuth vs. OIDC. The OIDC conformance is checked for all recordings which contain indicators that the Client uses OIDC rather than plain OAuth. Deviations from the specification are noticed whenever the required `openid` scope value is not present but `id_token` is returned. This behavior can be primarily attributed to Apple (193), as the websites don’t initialize the scope parameter correctly. Even though this is a clear violation of the specification, the security implications are unclear and depend on the corresponding implementation.

The risk occurs if unsolicited tokens are processed, but the corresponding verification is skipped.

Flow Mix-Up

Additionally, we identified threats in which a Client initiates the code flow but the IdP proceeds with the implicit flow, that is, it returns an `id_token` or `access_token`. The same check is performed when a token is requested and an `id_token` or code is additionally returned. Table 7 shows, that 46 flow mix-up occurred – mainly on Google. We assume that this misconfiguration occurs when the IdP is configured to support a specific flow per Client while ignoring the `response_type` in the login request. Such behavior facilitates cut-and-paste attacks and makes the redemption of stolen tokens easier [28, Section 4.6].

Open Redirect

Open redirect attacks provide a means to redirect the victim to an attacker-controlled location. In OAuth, the `redirect_uri` parameter is allowed to contain further query parameters such as URLs. If the URL contained in the `redirect_uri` is followed without any verification on the Client, then the Client is susceptible to an open redirect flaw. In our analysis, we used SMARTPARAMS for deep inspection of the URLs encoded in query parameters, for instance, in `redirect_uri`. Our findings are shown in Table 7 and confirm that the security best practices are well applied. In 9 login SSO flows, we identified nested URL parameters. This occurrence does not necessarily indicate a vulnerability as (1) the Client might have further restrictions implemented and (2) the IdP can strictly validate the `redirect_uri` against an allowlist. Manual verification revealed, that one Client redirected to a manipulated open redirect URL. Other Clients aborted the SSO process when they received the `AuthnRes` or, in fact, the IdP recognized the manipulated `redirect_uri` and denied the login.

Cross-Site-Request-Forgery

CSRF is a common web attack that enables an attacker to execute sensitive operations in the context of a victim. The only requirement for a CSRF attack is that the victim visits a link provided by the attacker. In the context of SSO, two different CSRF attack variants are possible: (1) *Session Swapping* aims to log the victim into an account belonging to the attacker, and (2) *Force Login* is an attack to log the victim into his own account. For mitigating the attack, OAuth and OIDC rely on two parameters – `state` and `nonce` which contains an unpredictable random string. If both parameters are missing or the values are predictable, then CSRF attacks can be executed.¹⁰ The number of vulnerable logins is surprisingly high – 447 logins do not use any of these parameters. In addition, we could find 337 websites implementing an insufficient CSRF protection with low entropy (≤ 96 bit), based on our SMARTPARAMS analysis.

Secret Leakage

In SSO, the Client authenticates on the IdP via the `client_secret`. If attackers obtain the `client_`

¹⁰. Proof Key for Code Exchange (PKCE) can be used instead of `state` and `nonce`. In this case, we do not classify the website as vulnerable.

secret, *Client Impersonation* attacks can be executed [27, Section 5.2.3],[56]. In addition, the `id_token` should not be signed with symmetric cryptography when the implicit flow is used [47, Section 10.1], because the Client cannot verify the token without leaking the key. In Table 7, one can see that only 5 Clients leak secrets. We did not discovered any `id_tokens` using symmetric cryptography. This is motivated by the fact that the IdPs always sign the `id_token` with RSA or elliptic curves.

Advanced Security Countermeasures

The IETF aims to reduce the risks against attacks to a minimum. In addition to the standardization of security consideration [27] and security best practices [28], the IETF developed protection mechanisms applied as extensions on the top of OAuth and OIDC. Such protection mechanisms are PKCE [39], Demonstrating Proof-of-Possession (DPoP) [9], and mTLS [4]. While PKCE can be detected by analyzing the network traffic, DPoP and mTLS are executed only in the back-channel communication between the Client and the IdP. Although, it was originally designed for native applications, PKCE can be used to prevent authorization code injection attacks [29]. Our analysis discovered 23 Clients implementing PKCE – 14 (G), 3 (F), and 6 (A). Additionally, OIDC defines the `nonce` parameter and therefore provides another way to prevent authorization code injection attacks. However, the usage of the `nonce` parameter in general is quite low. In total, 493 Clients requested an `id_token` explicitly in the `response_type` but only 42 of them created a related `nonce` parameter. Also, none of the Clients requesting an `id_token` use PKCE.

Similar to the `code`, the `access_token` can also be a target of an injection attack. Unfortunately, there are no ways to detect such an attack on the OAuth protocol level. However, OIDC benefits from the `id_token` which contains the `at_hash`. Hence, the `access_token` can be validated on usage time. From 39 Clients which requested an `id_token` and `access_token` all `id_token` included an `at_hash`.

HTTPS Only Request

As stated in the OAuth security best practices [28], each authorization responses must not be transmitted over unencrypted network connections. However, we found 14 Service Provider (SP)s which try to set an unencrypted plain `http redirect_uri` – 5 (G), 9 (F). Additionally, 4 of them received a valid authorization response. Interestingly, Facebook blocks plain `http redirect_uris` while all authorization responses were send by Google. The only exception for using unencrypted connections are native clients that use loopback interface redirection. None of the aforementioned cases apply to this exception. When looking at the whole `http` traffic, 136 SPs try to send unencrypted `http` requests from which 32 also get a valid response.

8. Automatic Evaluation: SSO Privacy

8.1. Methodology

The SSO privacy evaluation consists of three steps as depicted in Figure 3: (1) For each automated privacy

analysis conducted by SSO-Monitor, we use a script to create a fresh browser profile with an active IdP session. We created profiles for Google, Facebook, and Apple. (2) We use the browser profile from step (1) to load each website from the Tranco 10k list supporting the top three IdPs in a Chrome browser. Again, we use Selenium for automation and to capture traffic in HAR files. (3) Our HAR Analyzer module automatically analyzed the HAR files created in step (2) for possible privacy leaks.

Scripted Browser Preparation

The scripted browser preparation consists of two parts. First, we reused the three profiles we used during the security analyses. This reusing is necessary since we can be confident that each IdP-account was used previously to sign in to a certain Client. Without this reusing, we would not know whether the account provided consent for this particular Client to the IdP. We call them the *consent-given profiles*. Second, we create one new browser profile per IdP using a fresh IdP-account. With this, we can be confident that these accounts have *never* logged into the Client before. Thereby, no consent is given and we call them *no-consent profiles*. Note that the profiles only contain IdP-related cookies. Therefore, we ensure that a user is logged out on all Clients. In summary, our privacy analyses use, thereby, six different browser profiles.

Client Website Visit

For each website that our landscape analyses provides, we start visiting them. For each supported IdP on the website, we open the start page¹¹ twice with the corresponding browser profiles. The first time with the *consent-given profile*, the second time with the *no-consent profile*. In both cases, we interact with the website by clicking on random links which do not claim to require or start any authentication and pressing some keys (e.g., PageUp). In summary, if a website supports all three IdPs (Apple, Google, Facebook), we visit the start page six times, once with each browser profile, and interact with that page. SSO-MONITOR records the traffic of each visit.

8.2. Privacy Analysis

Test Selection

For the selection of privacy tests in SSO, there exists no document summarizing such issues in contrast to security tests. Thereby, our privacy analyses detect whether a website visitor is authenticated in the background, for instance, without explicitly clicking a sign-in button. We additionally search for any identity-related information leaks to the Client. With our *consent-given profile*, the Client can – in theory – log in the user in the background. Our analyses reveal that this is abused in 199 cases. In contrast, the *no-consent profile* should protect users from this behavior since they never agreed to share their identity with the Client. In both cases, an automatically created login attempt, created by the Client, may allow the IdP to track users secretly. Considering users' privacy, we raise the following research questions: (1) Do websites exchange SSO messages revealing privacy information without users' consent? (2) Do the IdPs provide a sufficient

¹¹. In contrast to the security analyses, during which we visited the login page.

level of protection against *honest but curious Clients*? In our threat model, an honest but curious Client acts according to the protocol and establishes a trust relationship with the IdP. Clients can easily gain this relationship because IdPs support the registration of arbitrary Clients.

Leakage Channels

A login attempt signals the beginning of the SSO authentication. The Client initiates the protocol and sends a login request to the IdP along with the IdP’s session cookie. Each message can disclose different private information. Our evaluation considers only messages as a leak if the user has not explicitly started any login. We classify *leakage channels* in two different categories: login attempt and token exchange.

Login Attempt Leak (LAL): Privacy Leak to IdPs

The first leakage occurs if the login request is sent without the user actively navigating to the login page at the Client. If the user is authenticated to the IdP, the IdP learns which website the user is currently navigating.

Token Exchange Leak (TEL): Privacy Leakage to Clients

The second leakage targets the login response. It contains the user’s identity, for example, the email. If the IdP issues the login response without any consent, the Client learns the user’s identity. Therefore, the user’s identity is entirely revealed to both SSO parties.

Cookie-based vs. SSO-based Privacy Leaks

In contrast to cookie-based privacy leaks, our findings are more invasive. Usually, the user visits a Client and actively decides to click on the sign-in button. After successful authentication, the browser stores the session cookies. If the user does not clear the cookie store, the website can re-identify the user based on the cookies. In SSO privacy evaluation, the user visits the Client and the IdP automatically returns user-identifiable tokens. Even if no cookies for the Client are stored, the website can still identify the user at any time. Consider a user starting the browser for the first time. The user authenticates to an IdP, for example, to synchronize the browser settings. If the user afterward visits the Client, the identity automatically leaks to the Client. We claim our privacy leaks as novel. To our best knowledge, no previous work has investigated such token leaks in an automated manner.

8.3. The Tranco Top 10K Privacy Results

We evaluated all websites of the Tranco top 10k list supporting logins with the top three IdPs (Facebook, Google, and Apple) and discovered multiple privacy leakages, which we discuss in this section. In total, we analyzed 135 GB of HAR-Files. We summarize the results in Table 8. Note that among 3,020 detected SSO logins, 24 privacy analyses are missing as the related websites failed to load during the run. We determined two categories with our pre-generated profiles: no consent given and consent given.

Case 1) No-Consent Profiles

We identified 200 login requests being sent transparently to the Google and Facebook IdPs. Interestingly, we did




IdP	SSO Logins	No-Consent Profiles		Consent-Given Profiles	
		LAL	TEL	LAL	TEL
	1,387	161	0	160	22
	1,143	39	0	39	20
	466	0	0	0	0
Σ	2,996	200	0	199	42

TABLE 8: We discovered that in 200 of 2,996 (7%) SSO logins, the login is initiated automatically by visiting the Clients’ starting page. On 42 (1%) of them, the IdP automatically sends authentication tokens and reveals the user’s identity. Our leakage findings must be seen as lower boundaries.

not observe automatic login attempts to Apple, possibly because Apple enforces a user to consent on every login attempt. Also, a positive result is that none of the IdPs generate authentication tokens automatically in this category. This is the correct and expected behavior, since the user should consent at least the first time when an authorization by the Client takes place.

Case 2) Consent-Given Profiles

We observed almost the same amount of login attempts for Google as in the previous category, which is not surprising since the Client does not know a-priori whether a user is authenticated to any IdP. The one missing LAL can be attributed to the client not being available at the time of the scan. Overall, we discovered that in 42 cases, the IdPs automatically generates authentication tokens and send them to the Client in the login response. Thus, the Client observes the user’s identity even if the user never consciously started any authentication on the Client. Regarding Google, all 22 found TELs are due to Google’s *autologin* feature, where the user automatically gets logged in to the Client. Although this behavior is not desirable for the users’ privacy, these cases may be visible to the user. In contrast, Facebook does not transparently show the login process. Our analysis reveals that 20 websites stealthily learn the user’s identity by TELs. Hence, it is up to the Client if they reveal this to the user or not (i.e. via UD).

9. Related Work

Apart from the systematization of known SSO tools in §3, there is more related work on SSO. We divided prior work into three categories to match SSO-MONITOR’s architecture.

Single Sign-On Landscape

In 2020, Alaca and Oorschot [1] developed a framework to compare protocol designs and evaluate 14 different web SSO systems, but they did not compare implementations. In 2021, Morkonda et al. analyzed the Alexa top 500 per country for five countries [33]. They categorized user data provided by Google, Facebook, Apple, and LinkedIn, and identified that Clients request different data for different IdPs. They analyzed the login request, while we investigated the whole login flow.

A considerable amount of literature has been published on the security of OAuth and OIDC web implementations in the wild. A significant amount of researcher concentrate on classical web vulnerabilities in the SSO context, such as CSRF and XSS [46, 21, 41, 24]. Li and Mitchell [22] investigated specific issues in Google’s OIDC implementation. Wang et al. [49] analyzed OAuth protocol implementation on various platforms [49]. Mainka et al. [30] identified issues in official OIDC libraries. Sadqi et al. [37] provided in 2020 a survey of OAuth relevant threats for web clients. Recently, Saito et al. [38] assessed the implementation of social logins on 500 American websites and compared their results to Japanese websites (2021). They found that 76 websites are susceptible to attacks, mainly caused by faulty implementations or insecure design decisions. In 2021, Liu et al. introduced a new threat for SSO authentication [26]. In comparison to our work, the authors did not concentrate on protocol flaws and implementation mistakes, but on a design issue of the SSO ecosystem. They reused abandoned email addresses.

Privacy

Besides a large corpus of literature concerning SSO security, a considerable amount of research has focused on privacy issues in SSO. Various research groups build new or extend existing SSO schemes to tackle their privacy concerns [8, 15, 12, 55]. These issues range from leaking user-specific parameters up to complete identity revelation. Farooqi et al. [7] investigated how leaked Facebook tokens are abused. Li and Mitchell [23] systematically analyzed how IdPs can track users’ interactions with Clients. Despite previous efforts in improving the privacy of OAuth and OIDC, we still do not see these enhancements being implemented.

10. Conclusion & Discussion

We conclude with lessons learned and present new directions for future SSO research.

Further IdPs

Parts of SSO-MONITOR, for instance, the landscape analyses, already support LinkedIn, Microsoft, Twitter, and Baidu. However, the integration for security tests requires more complex adaptations. SSO-MONITOR needs support for the IdP specific consent pages and the automatic login. Also, the browser profile generation is challenging. Additionally, when running the analyses, each analyzed IdP extends the processing time. Therefore, we decided first to analyze the top three IdPs and provide landscape, security, and privacy insights. Data for more IdP will be provided in the future.

Developers vs. Specifications

Any deviation from the specification makes an automated analysis searching for SSO patterns hard. As a result, we developed multiple strategies to recognize SSO flows even if they are not compliant to the specification. We also observed a disregard for the security best practices. Security problems that are well-studied and documented still exist.

Our research reveals for one more time that existing security best practices are often ignored and not implemented in the Tranco 10k. The question arises of how this situation could be improved. For example, the deployment of TLS on websites has tremendously improved since browsers penalize websites not supporting TLS. Similarly, this would be possible for IdPs. For example, they could drop login requests not following best practices. Future research should concentrate on how secure by default configurations can be deployed more efficiently.

References

- [1] Furkan Alaca and Paul C. Van Oorschot. Comparative Analysis and Framework Evaluating Web Single Sign-on Systems. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 53(5): 112:1–112:34, September 2020. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3409452. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3409452>.
- [2] arifszn. email-scraper, October 2022. URL <https://github.com/arifszn/email-scraper>. [Online; accessed 8. Oct. 2022].
- [3] Guangdong Bai, Jike Lei, Guozhu Meng, Sai Sathyanarayan Venkatraman, Prateek Saxena, Jun Sun, Yang Liu, and Jin Song Dong. Authscan: Automatic extraction of web authentication protocols from implementations. *20th Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2013.
- [4] B. Campbell, J. Bradley, N. Sakimura, and T. Lodderstedt. OAuth 2.0 Mutual-TLS Client Authentication and Certificate-Bound Access Tokens. RFC 8705, IETF, February 2020. URL <http://tools.ietf.org/rfc/rfc8705.txt>.
- [5] Kostas Drakonakis, Sotiris Ioannidis, and Jason Polakis. The cookie hunter: Automated black-box auditing for web authentication and authorization flaws. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1953–1970, 2020.
- [6] Zakir Durumeric, Eric Wustrow, and J. Alex Halderman. ZMap: Fast internet-wide scanning and its security applications. In *22nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 13)*, pages 605–620, Washington, D.C., August 2013. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-931971-03-4. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity13/technical-sessions/paper/durumeric>.
- [7] Shehroze Farooqi, Fareed Zaffar, Nektarios Leontiadis, and Zubair Shafiq. Measuring and mitigating oauth access token abuse by collusion networks. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Internet Measurement Conference, IMC ’17*, page 355–368, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450351188. doi: 10.1145/3131365.3131404. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3131365.3131404>.
- [8] Daniel Fett, Ralf Küsters, and Guido Schmitz. Spresso: A secure, privacy-respecting single sign-on system for the web. In *22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, pages 1358–1369. ACM, 2015.

- [9] Daniel Fett, Brian Campbell, John Bradley, Torsten Lodderstedt, Michael Jones, and David Waite. OAuth 2.0 Demonstrating Proof-of-Possession at the Application Layer (DPoP). Internet-Draft draft-ietf-oauth-dpop-07, Internet Engineering Task Force, March 2022. URL <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-oauth-dpop-07>. Work in Progress.
- [10] M. Ghasemisharif, C. Kanich, and J. Polakis. Towards Automated Auditing for Account and Session Management Flaws in Single Sign-On Deployments. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1524–1524. IEEE Computer Society, 2022. doi: 10.1109/SP46214.2022.9833753. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP46214.2022.9833753>.
- [11] Mohammad Ghasemisharif, Amruta Ramesh, Stephen Checkoway, Chris Kanich, and Jason Polakis. O Single Sign-Off, Where Art Thou? An Empirical Analysis of Single Sign-On Account Hijacking and Session Management on the Web. In *USENIX*, page 19. USENIX Association, 2018.
- [12] Sven Hammann, Ralf Sasse, and David Basin. Privacy-Preserving OpenID Connect. In *ASIA CCS '20*, October 2020.
- [13] D. Hardt. The oauth 2.0 authorization framework, October 2012. URL <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc6749>.
- [14] Cormac Herley and Paul Van Oorschot. A research agenda acknowledging the persistence of passwords. *IEEE Security Privacy*, 10(1):28–36, 2012. doi: 10.1109/MSP.2011.150.
- [15] Marios Isaakidis, Harry Halpin, and George Danezis. Unlimitid: Privacy-preserving federated identity management using algebraic macs. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM on Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*, pages 139–142, 2016.
- [16] Markus Jakobsson and Mayank Dhiman. The benefits of understanding passwords. In *Proceedings of the 7th USENIX Conference on Hot Topics in Security*, HotSec'12, page 10, USA, 2012. USENIX Association.
- [17] Louis Jannett, Vladislav Mladenov, Christian Mainka, and Jörg Schwenk. DISTINCT: Identity Theft using In-Browser Communications in Dual-Window Single Sign-On. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2022. ISBN 978-1-4503-9450-5. doi: 10.1145/3548606.3560692.
- [18] Hugo Jonker, Jelmer Kalkman, Benjamin Krumnow, Marc Slegers, and Alan Verresen. Shepherd: Enabling automatic and large-scale login security studies. *CoRR*, abs/1808.00840, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1808.00840>.
- [19] Victor Le Pochat, Tom Van Goethem, Samaneh Tajalizadehkhoob, Maciej Korczyński, and Wouter Joosen. Tranco: A research-oriented top sites ranking hardened against manipulation. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*, NDSS 2019, February 2019. doi: 10.14722/ndss.2019.23386. URL <https://tranco-list.eu/list/6Z2X>.
- [20] Frank Li, Zakir Durumeric, Jakub Czyw, Mohammad Karami, Michael Bailey, Damon McCoy, Stefan Savage, and Vern Paxson. You've got vulnerability: Exploring effective vulnerability notifications. In *25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 16)*, pages 1033–1050, Austin, TX, August 2016. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-931971-32-4. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity16/technical-sessions/presentation/li>.
- [21] Wanpeng Li and Chris J Mitchell. Security issues in oauth 2.0 sso implementations. In *International Conference on Information Security*, pages 529–541. Springer, 2014.
- [22] Wanpeng Li and Chris J Mitchell. Analysing the security of google's implementation of openid connect. In *International Conference on Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment*, pages 357–376. Springer, 2016.
- [23] Wanpeng Li and Chris J Mitchell. User access privacy in oauth 2.0 and openid connect. In *2020 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS PW)*, pages 664–6732, 2020. doi: 10.1109/EuroSPW51379.2020.00095.
- [24] Wanpeng Li, Chris J Mitchell, and Thomas Chen. Mitigating csrf attacks on oauth 2.0 and openid connect. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.07983*, 2018.
- [25] Wanpeng Li, Chris J Mitchell, and Thomas Chen. Oauthguard: Protecting user security and privacy with oauth 2.0 and openid connect. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Workshop on Security Standardisation Research Workshop*, pages 35–44, 2019.
- [26] Guannan Liu, Xing Gao, and Haining Wang. An Investigation of Identity-Account Inconsistency in Single Sign-On. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, pages 105–117, New York, NY, USA, apr 2021. ACM. ISBN 9781450383127. doi: 10.1145/3442381.3450085. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3442381.3450085>.
- [27] T. Lodderstedt, M. McGloin, and P. Hunt. OAuth 2.0 Threat Model and Security Considerations. RFC 6819, IETF, January 2013. URL <http://tools.ietf.org/rfc/rfc6819.txt>.
- [28] Torsten Lodderstedt, John Bradley, Andrey Labunets, and Daniel Fett. OAuth 2.0 security best current practice. Internet-Draft draft-ietf-oauth-security-topics-15, IETF Secretariat, April 2020. URL <http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-oauth-security-topics-15.txt>. <http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-oauth-security-topics-15.txt>.
- [29] Torsten Lodderstedt, John Bradley, Andrey Labunets, and Daniel Fett. OAuth 2.0 Security Best Current Practice, 2022. URL <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-oauth-security-topics-19>.
- [30] Christian Mainka, Vladislav Mladenov, Tobias Wich, and Jörg Schwenk. Sok: Single sign-on security – an evaluation of openid connect. In *IEEE 2nd European Symposium on Security and Privacy (Euro S&P)*, April 2017.
- [31] maldevel. maldevel/EmailHarvester: Email addresses harvester. <https://github.com/maldevel/EmailHarvester>, 2022. (Accessed on 10/08/2022).
- [32] Srivathsan G Morkonda, Sonia Chiasson, and Paul C van Oorschot. Empirical Analysis and Privacy Implications in OAuth-based Single Sign-On Systems. In *Proceedings of the 20th Workshop on Workshop*

- on *Privacy in the Electronic Society*, pages 195–208, New York, NY, USA, nov 2021. ACM. ISBN 9781450385275. doi: 10.1145/3463676.3485600. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.02579>.
- [33] Srivathsan G. Morkonda, Paul C. van Oorschot, and Sonia Chiasson. Exploring Privacy Implications in OAuth Deployments. *arXiv:2103.02579 [cs]*, March 2021.
- [34] OWASP. Owasp Top Ten, 2022. URL <https://owasp.org/www-project-top-ten/>.
- [35] Tamjid Al Rahat, Yu Feng, and Yuan Tian. OAUTH-LINT: An Empirical Study on OAuth Bugs in Android Applications. In *2019 34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 293–304, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ASE.2019.00036.
- [36] Tamjid Al Rahat, Yu Feng, and Yuan Tian. Cerberus: Query-driven Scalable Security Checking for OAuth Service Provider Implementations, 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2110.01005>.
- [37] Yassine Sadqi, Yousra Belfaik, and Said Safi. Web OAuth-based SSO Systems Security. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Networking, Information Systems & Security*, pages 1–7, New York, NY, USA, mar 2020. ACM. ISBN 9781450376341. doi: 10.1145/3386723.3387888. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3386723.3387888>.
- [38] Takamichi Saito, Satoshi Shibata, and Tsubasa Kikuta. Comparison of OAuth/OpenID Connect Security in America and Japan. In Leonard Barolli, Kin Fun Li, Tomoya Enokido, and Makoto Takizawa, editors, *Advances in Networked-Based Information Systems*, volume 1264, pages 200–210, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-030-57810-7 978-3-030-57811-4. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-57811-4_19. URL http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-57811-4_19. Series Title: Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing.
- [39] N. Sakimura, J. Bradley, and N. Agarwal. Proof Key for Code Exchange by OAuth Public Clients. RFC 7636, IETF, September 2015. URL <http://tools.ietf.org/rfc/rfc7636.txt>.
- [40] Y. Sheffer, D. Hardt, and M. Jones. JSON Web Token Best Current Practices. RFC 8725, IETF, February 2020. URL <http://tools.ietf.org/rfc/rfc8725.txt>.
- [41] Ethan Sherman, Henry Carter, Dave Tian, Patrick Traynor, and Kevin Butler. More guidelines than rules: CsrF vulnerabilities from noncompliant oauth 2.0 implementations. In *Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment*, pages 239–260. Springer, 2015.
- [42] StatCounter. Search Engine Market Share Worldwide, 2022. URL <https://gs.statcounter.com/search-engine-market-share>.
- [43] Ben Stock, Giancarlo Pellegrino, Christian Rossow, Martin Johns, and Michael Backes. Hey, You Have a Problem: On the Feasibility of Large-Scale Web Vulnerability Notification. In *25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 16)*, pages 1015–1032. USENIX Association, 2016. ISBN 978-1-931971-32-4. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity16/technical-sessions/presentation/stock>.
- [44] Ben Stock, Giancarlo Pellegrino, Frank Li, Michael Backes, and Christian Rossow. Didn’t You Hear Me? – Towards More Successful Web Vulnerability Notifications. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Symposium on Network and Distributed System Security (NDSS ’18)*, February 2018. URL <https://publications.cispa.saarland/1190/>.
- [45] Avinash Sudhodanan, Alessandro Armando, Roberto Carbone, and Luca Compagna. Attack patterns for black-box security testing of multi-party web applications. In *23rd Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*. The Internet Society, 2016. URL <https://www.ndss-symposium.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/attack-patterns-black-box-security-testing-multi-party-web-applications.pdf>.
- [46] San-Tsai Sun and Konstantin Beznosov. The devil is in the (implementation) details: an empirical analysis of oauth sso systems. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security*, pages 378–390. ACM, 2012.
- [47] The OpenID Foundation (OIDF). OpenID Connect Core 1.0, February 2014. URL http://openid.net/specs/openid-connect-core-1_0.html.
- [48] Rafael Veras, Christopher Collins, and Julie Thorpe. On the semantic patterns of passwords and their security impact. In *NDSS*, 01 2014. ISBN 1-891562-35-5. doi: 10.14722/ndss.2014.23103.
- [49] Hui Wang, Yuanyuan Zhang, Juanru Li, and Dawu Gu. The Achilles heel of OAuth: a multi-platform study of OAuth-based authentication. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Conference on Computer Security Applications*, pages 167–176, 2016.
- [50] Rui Wang, Shuo Chen, and XiaoFeng Wang. Signing me onto your accounts through facebook and google: A traffic-guided security study of commercially deployed single-sign-on web services. In *33th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*, pages 365–379. IEEE, 2012.
- [51] Hanlin Wei, Behnaz Hassanshahi, Guangdong Bai, Padmanabhan Krishnan, and Kostyantyn Vorobyov. MoScan: A Model-Based Vulnerability Scanner for Web Single Sign-On Services. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, pages 678–681. ACM, 2021. ISBN 978-1-4503-8459-9. doi: 10.1145/3460319.3469081. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3460319.3469081>.
- [52] WHATWG. HTML Living Standard, 2022. URL <https://html.spec.whatwg.org/>.
- [53] Ronghai Yang, Guanchen Li, Wing Cheong Lau, Kehuan Zhang, and Pili Hu. Model-based security testing: An empirical study on oauth 2.0 implementations. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 651–662, 2016.
- [54] Ronghai Yang, Wing Cheong Lau, Jiongyi Chen, and Kehuan Zhang. Vetting Single Sign-On SDK Implementations via Symbolic Reasoning. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*, pages 1459–1474. USENIX Association, 2018. ISBN 978-1-939133-04-5. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity18/>.

org/conference/usenixsecurity18/presentation/yang.

- [55] Zhiyi Zhang, Michal Król, Alberto Sonnino, Lixia Zhang, and Etienne Rivière. El passo: Efficient and lightweight privacy-preserving single sign on. *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, 2021(2):70–87, 2021.
- [56] Yuchen Zhou and David Evans. Automated testing of web applications for single sign-on vulnerabilities. In *23rd USENIX Security Symposium*, San Diego, CA, August 2014. USENIX Association. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity14/technical-sessions/presentation/zhou>.
- [57] Chaoshun Zuo, Qingchuan Zhao, and Zhiqiang Lin. AUTHSCOPE: Towards Automatic Discovery of Vulnerable Authorizations in Online Services. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 799–813, New York, NY, USA, oct 2017. ACM. ISBN 9781450349468. doi: 10.1145/3133956.3134089. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3133956.3134089>.

Appendix

Figure 5 enriches SSO-MONITOR as depicted in Figure 3) with more details.

The following lists shows all attacks described in OAuth Security Topics from July 2022 (Draft Version 20) and the OIDC core spec 1.0.

- (1) **Obsolete Flows, Access Token Disclosure, Implicit Flow Threats**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 2.1.2; OIDC Core, Sec. 16.5 and 16.16
Implementation note Check for implicit flow.
- (2) **Open Redirect**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.10
Implementation note Find nested URLs in the `redirect_uri` using SMARTPARAMS.
- (3) **CSRF**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.7
Implementation note Check if PKCE and/or state, nonce is used.
- (4) **Secret Leakage**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.2 and 4.3
Implementation note Check if secrets are present in any request or referrer header and check if a referrer policy is set or PKCE is used.
- (5) **TLS only**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 2.6; OIDC Core, Sec. 16.1 and 16.17
Implementation note Check that all requests use TLS.
- (6) **Authorization Code Injection, Token Substitution**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.5; OIDC Core, Sec. 16.11
Implementation note Check if PKCE or nonce is used.
- (7) **Access Token Injection, Token Substitution**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.6; OIDC Core, Sec. 16.11




Figure 5: SSO-MONITOR's workflow

Implementation note No check for OAuth, in OIDC check `at_hash` in `id_token`. Only applies to implicit.

- (8) **307 Redirect**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.11
Implementation note Check if 307 Redirect is used for Authorization Responses.
- (9) **Token Manufacture/Modification**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.3
Implementation note Check that `id_token` is signed with asymmetric key.
- (10) **Idp Mixup**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.4; OIDC Core, Sec. 16.15
Implementation note Not implemented as this requires an active attack.
- (11) **Need for Signed/ Encrypted Requests**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.20 and 16.21
Implementation note Not implemented as requirements of the clients are not known.
- (12) **Insufficient Redirect URI Validation**

- Definition** Security Topics, Sec. 4.1
Implementation note Not implemented as patterns can only be found by actively trying different `redirect_urls`.
- (13) **PKCE Downgrade**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.8
Implementation note Not implemented as an active attack is necessary to detect whether countermeasures are in place.
- (14) **Access Token Phishing by Counterfeit Resource Server**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.9.1
Implementation note Not implemented as attack assumes control some control over the client over secondary configuration.
- (15) **TLS Terminating Reverse Proxies**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.12
Implementation note Not implemented as it is not detectable without trying certain headers in an active attack.
- (16) **Refresh Token Protection, Lifetimes of Access Tokens and Refresh Tokens**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.13; OIDC Core, Sec. 16.18
Implementation note Not implemented as it can only be checked when auditing client and AS implementation or configuration parameters.
- (17) **Client Impersonating Resource Owner**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.14
Implementation note Not implemented as resource server access is needed.
- (18) **Clickjacking**
Definition Security Topics, Sec. 4.15
Implementation note Not implemented as this only affects the AS, not clients.
- (19) **Server Masquerading**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.2
Implementation note Not implemented as this requires access to server to server communication.
- (20) **Access Token Disclosure**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.4
Implementation note Check that no implicit flow is used.
- (21) **Server Response Disclosure**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.5
Implementation note Check that no implicit or hybrid flow is used.
- (22) **Access Token Redirect**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.8
Implementation note Not implemented as mitigation can only be checked server side.
- (23) **Token Reuse**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.9
Implementation note Not implemented as this requires an active attack.
- (24) **Eavesdropping or Leaking Authorization Codes (Secondary Authenticator Capture)**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.10
Implementation note Not implemented as the attack vector is compromised User Agent.
- (25) **Timing Attack**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.12
Implementation note Not implemented as this requires a timing analysis of valid and erroneous responses.
- (26) **Other Crypto Related Attacks**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.13
Implementation note Not implemented as this requires an active attack.
- (27) **Signing and Encryption Order**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.14
Implementation note Not implemented as this is a legal issue which is not security relevant.
- (28) **Issuer Identifier**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.15
Implementation note Not implemented as this requires a check against the OIDC discovery document.
- (29) **Symmetric Key Entropy**
Definition OIDC Core, Sec. 16.19
Implementation note Not implemented as this requires access to the client's secrets.