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## Document Revision History

| **Version** | **Date** | **Author** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.0** | **January 22, 2022** | **John Mullen** |  |

## Client



## Instructions

Deliver this completed vulnerability assessment report, identifying your findings of security vulnerabilities and articulating recommendations for next steps to remedy the issues you have found.

Respond to the five steps outlined below and include your findings. Replace the bracketed text on all pages with your own words. If you choose to include images or supporting materials, be sure to insert them throughout.

## Developer

John Mullen

## 1. Interpreting Client Needs

Determine your client’s needs and potential threats and attacks associated with their application and software security requirements. Consider the following regarding how companies protect against external threats based on the scenario information:

* What is the value of secure communications to the company?
* Are there any international transactions that the company produces?
* Are there governmental restrictions about secure communications to consider?
* What external threats might be present now and in the immediate future?
* What are the “modernization” requirements that must be considered, such as the role of open source libraries and evolving web application technologies?

When dealing with customer information, especially sensitive data such as financial information, security is imperative for success. Making sure that the communication that is occurring between the client and server is secure ensures that there is no risk of data loss or a third-party interception of the information being transmitted. Since we are not looking to set geographic parameters on our user base, we cannot say definitively that we will or will not be handling international transactions. Because of this inability to be sure, we should proceed with the assumption that international transactions will take place.

Since we are operating in the financial market, we will be encountering governmental restrictions within our application that other types of applications may not have to adhere to. While there will be minimal, restrictions on our secure communication formats, the restrictions we see will mostly be in terms of the type of data we will be handling.

Since hackers will often try and attack information that will yield them the best outcomes for their effort, we must assume that personal financial data is near the top of their target list. While external threats always exist, the data our company will require from its users will be largely appealing to those seeking to infiltrate and collect data.

Modernization is key to advancing security techniques and integrating application functionality and security together. Utilizing open source libraries and continuously evolving web applications can help ensure that our client remains on the cutting edge of advancement and relevance, while maintaining their security levels.

## 2. Areas of Security

Referring to the Vulnerability Assessment Process Flow Diagram, identify which areas of security are applicable to Artemis Financial’s software application. Justify your reasoning for why each area is relevant to the software application.

**Input Validation –** While the current input declares the type of input from the customer (i.e. String), it does not set any parameters on the input. This could prompt an exploit in the form of a certain input value or input size that is too large that causes errors within the application. Parameters and limits need to be declared for any input from the customer.

**APIs** – While APIs require secure communication channels on both ends and throughout the communication, we must ensure that the proper certifications are being set and verified throughout the process.

**Cryptography –** With us handling information as important as financial data, we must utilize all security elements we can in order to ensure safety. Cryptography is a feature that we can enable at the application level that can provide an extra level of security for our data.

**Client/Server –** As mentioned with the APIs, certificate verification and establishing and maintaining secure communication channels from our servers to our users is the most important feature that we must maintain. Any lapse in this structure jeopardizes our company, our users, and their data.

**Encapsulation –** Encapsulation will help the program compartmentalize our functionalities, keep the data stored appropriately, and will alleviate duplicate information which could create an area of opportunity for a vulnerability.

## 3. Manual Review

Continue working through the Vulnerability Assessment Process Flow Diagram. Identify all vulnerabilities in the code base by manually inspecting the code.

1. No input validation
2. Minimal data encryption
3. API vulnerabilities found
4. Encapsulation could be more thorough

## 4. Static Testing

Run a dependency check on Artemis Financial’s software application to identify all security vulnerabilities in the code. Record the output from dependency check report. Include the following:

1. The names or vulnerability codes of the known vulnerabilities
2. A brief description and recommended solutions provided by the dependency check report
3. Attribution (if any) that documents how this vulnerability has been identified or documented previously

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Vulnerability** | **Description and Attribution** |
| CVE-2016-1000352 | In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the ECIES implementation allowed the use of ECB mode. This mode is regarded as unsafe and support for it has been removed from the provider. |
| CVE-2016-1000346 | In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the other party DH public key is not fully validated. This can cause issues as invalid keys can be used to reveal details about the other party's private key where static Diffie-Hellman is in use. As of release 1.56 the key parameters are checked on agreement calculation. |
| CVE-2016-1000345 | In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the DHIES/ECIES CBC mode vulnerable to padding oracle attack. For BC 1.55 and older, in an environment where timings can be easily observed, it is possible with enough observations to identify when the decryption is failing due to padding. |
| CVE-2016-1000344 | In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the DHIES implementation allowed the use of ECB mode. This mode is regarded as unsafe and support for it has been removed from the provider. |
| CVE-2016-1000343 | In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the DSA key pair generator generates a weak private key if used with default values. If the JCA key pair generator is not explicitly initialised with DSA parameters, 1.55 and earlier generates a private value assuming a 1024 bit key size. In earlier releases this can be dealt with by explicitly passing parameters to the key pair generator. |
| CVE-2016-1000342 | In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier ECDSA does not fully validate ASN.1 encoding of signature on verification. It is possible to inject extra elements in the sequence making up the signature and still have it validate, which in some cases may allow the introduction of 'invisible' data into a signed structure. |
| CVE-2016-1000341 | In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier DSA signature generation is vulnerable to timing attack. Where timings can be closely observed for the generation of signatures, the lack of blinding in 1.55, or earlier, may allow an attacker to gain information about the signature's k value and ultimately the private value as well. |
| CVE-2016-1000339 | In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the primary engine class used for AES was AESFastEngine. Due to the highly table driven approach used in the algorithm it turns out that if the data channel on the CPU can be monitored the lookup table accesses are sufficient to leak information on the AES key being used. There was also a leak in AESEngine although it was substantially less. AESEngine has been modified to remove any signs of leakage (testing carried out on Intel X86-64) and is now the primary AES class for the BC JCE provider from 1.56. Use of AESFastEngine is now only recommended where otherwise deemed appropriate. |
| CVE-2016-1000338 | In Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the DSA does not fully validate ASN.1 encoding of signature on verification. It is possible to inject extra elements in the sequence making up the signature and still have it validate, which in some cases may allow the introduction of 'invisible' data into a signed structure. |
| CVE-2018-5382 | The default BKS keystore use an HMAC that is only 16 bits long, which can allow an attacker to compromise the integrity of a BKS keystore. Bouncy Castle release 1.47 changes the BKS format to a format which uses a 160 bit HMAC instead. This applies to any BKS keystore generated prior to BC 1.47. For situations where people need to create the files for legacy reasons a specific keystore type "BKS-V1" was introduced in 1.49. It should be noted that the use of "BKS-V1" is discouraged by the library authors and should only be used where it is otherwise safe to do so, as in where the use of a 16 bit checksum for the file integrity check is not going to cause a security issue in itself. |
| CVE-2017-13098 | BouncyCastle TLS prior to version 1.0.3, when configured to use the JCE (Java Cryptography Extension) for cryptographic functions, provides a weak Bleichenbacher oracle when any TLS cipher suite using RSA key exchange is negotiated. An attacker can recover the private key from a vulnerable application. This vulnerability is referred to as "ROBOT." |
| CVE-2013-1624 | The TLS implementation in the Bouncy Castle Java library before 1.48 and C# library before 1.8 does not properly consider timing side-channel attacks on a noncompliant MAC check operation during the processing of malformed CBC padding, which allows remote attackers to conduct distinguishing attacks and plaintext-recovery attacks via statistical analysis of timing data for crafted packets, a related issue to CVE-2013-0169. |
| CVE-2021-42550 | In logback version 1.2.7 and prior versions, an attacker with the required privileges to edit configurations files could craft a malicious configuration allowing to execute arbitrary code loaded from LDAP servers. |
| CVE-2021-44832 | Apache Log4j2 versions 2.0-beta7 through 2.17.0 (excluding security fix releases 2.3.2 and 2.12.4) are vulnerable to a remote code execution (RCE) attack when a configuration uses a JDBC Appender with a JNDI LDAP data source URI when an attacker has control of the target LDAP server. This issue is fixed by limiting JNDI data source names to the java protocol in Log4j2 versions 2.17.1, 2.12.4, and 2.3.2. |
| CVE-2021-45105 | Apache Log4j2 versions 2.0-alpha1 through 2.16.0 (excluding 2.12.3 and 2.3.1) did not protect from uncontrolled recursion from self-referential lookups. This allows an attacker with control over Thread Context Map data to cause a denial of service when a crafted string is interpreted. This issue was fixed in Log4j 2.17.0, 2.12.3, and 2.3.1. |
| CVE-2021-45046 | It was found that the fix to address CVE-2021-44228 in Apache Log4j 2.15.0 was incomplete in certain non-default configurations. This could allows attackers with control over Thread Context Map (MDC) input data when the logging configuration uses a non-default Pattern Layout with either a Context Lookup (for example, $${ctx:loginId}) or a Thread Context Map pattern (%X, %mdc, or %MDC) to craft malicious input data using a JNDI Lookup pattern resulting in an information leak and remote code execution in some environments and local code execution in all environments. Log4j 2.16.0 (Java 8) and 2.12.2 (Java 7) fix this issue by removing support for message lookup patterns and disabling JNDI functionality by default. |
| CVE-2021-44228 | Apache Log4j2 2.0-beta9 through 2.15.0 (excluding security releases 2.12.2, 2.12.3, and 2.3.1) JNDI features used in configuration, log messages, and parameters do not protect against attacker controlled LDAP and other JNDI related endpoints. An attacker who can control log messages or log message parameters can execute arbitrary code loaded from LDAP servers when message lookup substitution is enabled. From log4j 2.15.0, this behavior has been disabled by default. From version 2.16.0 (along with 2.12.2, 2.12.3, and 2.3.1), this functionality has been completely removed. Note that this vulnerability is specific to log4j-core and does not affect log4net, log4cxx, or other Apache Logging Services projects. |
| CVE-2020-9488 | Improper validation of certificate with host mismatch in Apache Log4j SMTP appender. This could allow an SMTPS connection to be intercepted by a man-in-the-middle attack which could leak any log messages sent through that appender. |
| CVE-2017-18640 | The Alias feature in SnakeYAML 1.18 allows entity expansion during a load operation, a related issue to CVE-2003-1564. |
| CVE-2020-25649 | A flaw was found in FasterXML Jackson Databind, where it did not have entity expansion secured properly. This flaw allows vulnerability to XML external entity (XXE) attacks. The highest threat from this vulnerability is data integrity. |
| CVE-2021-42340 | The fix for bug 63362 present in Apache Tomcat 10.1.0-M1 to 10.1.0-M5, 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.11, 9.0.40 to 9.0.53 and 8.5.60 to 8.5.71 introduced a memory leak. The object introduced to collect metrics for HTTP upgrade connections was not released for WebSocket connections once the connection was closed. This created a memory leak that, over time, could lead to a denial of service via an OutOfMemoryError. |
| CVE-2021-41079 | Apache Tomcat 8.5.0 to 8.5.63, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.43 and 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.2 did not properly validate incoming TLS packets. When Tomcat was configured to use NIO+OpenSSL or NIO2+OpenSSL for TLS, a specially crafted packet could be used to trigger an infinite loop resulting in a denial of service. |
| CVE-2021-33037 | Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.6, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.46 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.66 did not correctly parse the HTTP transfer-encoding request header in some circumstances leading to the possibility to request smuggling when used with a reverse proxy. Specifically: - Tomcat incorrectly ignored the transfer encoding header if the client declared it would only accept an HTTP/1.0 response; - Tomcat honoured the identify encoding; and - Tomcat did not ensure that, if present, the chunked encoding was the final encoding. |
| CVE-2021-30640 | A vulnerability in the JNDI Realm of Apache Tomcat allows an attacker to authenticate using variations of a valid user name and/or to bypass some of the protection provided by the LockOut Realm. This issue affects Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.5; 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.45; 8.5.0 to 8.5.65. |
| CVE-2021-25329 | The fix for CVE-2020-9484 was incomplete. When using Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.41, 8.5.0 to 8.5.61 or 7.0.0. to 7.0.107 with a configuration edge case that was highly unlikely to be used, the Tomcat instance was still vulnerable to CVE-2020-9494. Note that both the previously published prerequisites for CVE-2020-9484 and the previously published mitigations for CVE-2020-9484 also apply to this issue. |
| CVE-2021-25122 | When responding to new h2c connection requests, Apache Tomcat versions 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.41 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.61 could duplicate request headers and a limited amount of request body from one request to another meaning user A and user B could both see the results of user A's request. |
| CVE-2021-24122 | When serving resources from a network location using the NTFS file system, Apache Tomcat versions 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M9, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.39, 8.5.0 to 8.5.59 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.106 were susceptible to JSP source code disclosure in some configurations. The root cause was the unexpected behaviour of the JRE API File.getCanonicalPath() which in turn was caused by the inconsistent behaviour of the Windows API (FindFirstFileW) in some circumstances. |
| CVE-2020-17527 | While investigating bug 64830 it was discovered that Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M9, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.39 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.59 could re-use an HTTP request header value from the previous stream received on an HTTP/2 connection for the request associated with the subsequent stream. While this would most likely lead to an error and the closure of the HTTP/2 connection, it is possible that information could leak between requests. |
| CVE-2020-13943 | If an HTTP/2 client connecting to Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M7, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.37 or 8.5.0 to 8.5.57 exceeded the agreed maximum number of concurrent streams for a connection (in violation of the HTTP/2 protocol), it was possible that a subsequent request made on that connection could contain HTTP headers - including HTTP/2 pseudo headers - from a previous request rather than the intended headers. This could lead to users seeing responses for unexpected resources. |
| CVE-2020-13935 | The payload length in a WebSocket frame was not correctly validated in Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M6, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.36, 8.5.0 to 8.5.56 and 7.0.27 to 7.0.104. Invalid payload lengths could trigger an infinite loop. Multiple requests with invalid payload lengths could lead to a denial of service. |
| CVE-2020-13934 | An h2c direct connection to Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M6, 9.0.0.M5 to 9.0.36 and 8.5.1 to 8.5.56 did not release the HTTP/1.1 processor after the upgrade to HTTP/2. If a sufficient number of such requests were made, an OutOfMemoryException could occur leading to a denial of service. |
| CVE-2020-8022 | A Incorrect Default Permissions vulnerability in the packaging of tomcat on SUSE Enterprise Storage 5, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP2-BCL, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP2-LTSS, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP3-BCL, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP3-LTSS, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP4, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP5, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 15-LTSS, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 12-SP2, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 12-SP3, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 15, SUSE OpenStack Cloud 7, SUSE OpenStack Cloud 8, SUSE OpenStack Cloud Crowbar 8 allows local attackers to escalate from group tomcat to root. This issue affects: SUSE Enterprise Storage 5 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP2-BCL tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP2-LTSS tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP3-BCL tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP3-LTSS tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP4 tomcat versions prior to 9.0.35-3.39.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP5 tomcat versions prior to 9.0.35-3.39.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 15-LTSS tomcat versions prior to 9.0.35-3.57.3. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 12-SP2 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 12-SP3 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 15 tomcat versions prior to 9.0.35-3.57.3. SUSE OpenStack Cloud 7 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE OpenStack Cloud 8 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE OpenStack Cloud Crowbar 8 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. |
| CVE-2020-11996 | A specially crafted sequence of HTTP/2 requests sent to Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M5, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.35 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.55 could trigger high CPU usage for several seconds. If a sufficient number of such requests were made on concurrent HTTP/2 connections, the server could become unresponsive. |
| CVE-2020-9484 | When using Apache Tomcat versions 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M4, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.34, 8.5.0 to 8.5.54 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.103 if a) an attacker is able to control the contents and name of a file on the server; and b) the server is configured to use the PersistenceManager with a FileStore; and c) the PersistenceManager is configured with sessionAttributeValueClassNameFilter="null" (the default unless a SecurityManager is used) or a sufficiently lax filter to allow the attacker provided object to be deserialized; and d) the attacker knows the relative file path from the storage location used by FileStore to the file the attacker has control over; then, using a specifically crafted request, the attacker will be able to trigger remote code execution via deserialization of the file under their control. Note that all of conditions a) to d) must be true for the attack to succeed. |
| CVE-2020-1938 | When using the Apache JServ Protocol (AJP), care must be taken when trusting incoming connections to Apache Tomcat. Tomcat treats AJP connections as having higher trust than, for example, a similar HTTP connection. If such connections are available to an attacker, they can be exploited in ways that may be surprising. In Apache Tomcat 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.0.30, 8.5.0 to 8.5.50 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.99, Tomcat shipped with an AJP Connector enabled by default that listened on all configured IP addresses. It was expected (and recommended in the security guide) that this Connector would be disabled if not required. This vulnerability report identified a mechanism that allowed: - returning arbitrary files from anywhere in the web application - processing any file in the web application as a JSP Further, if the web application allowed file upload and stored those files within the web application (or the attacker was able to control the content of the web application by some other means) then this, along with the ability to process a file as a JSP, made remote code execution possible. It is important to note that mitigation is only required if an AJP port is accessible to untrusted users. Users wishing to take a defence-in-depth approach and block the vector that permits returning arbitrary files and execution as JSP may upgrade to Apache Tomcat 9.0.31, 8.5.51 or 7.0.100 or later. A number of changes were made to the default AJP Connector configuration in 9.0.31 to harden the default configuration. It is likely that users upgrading to 9.0.31, 8.5.51 or 7.0.100 or later will need to make small changes to their configurations. |
| CVE-2020-1935 | In Apache Tomcat 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.30, 8.5.0 to 8.5.50 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.99 the HTTP header parsing code used an approach to end-of-line parsing that allowed some invalid HTTP headers to be parsed as valid. This led to a possibility of HTTP Request Smuggling if Tomcat was located behind a reverse proxy that incorrectly handled the invalid Transfer-Encoding header in a particular manner. Such a reverse proxy is considered unlikely. |
| CVE-2019-17569 | The refactoring present in Apache Tomcat 9.0.28 to 9.0.30, 8.5.48 to 8.5.50 and 7.0.98 to 7.0.99 introduced a regression. The result of the regression was that invalid Transfer-Encoding headers were incorrectly processed leading to a possibility of HTTP Request Smuggling if Tomcat was located behind a reverse proxy that incorrectly handled the invalid Transfer-Encoding header in a particular manner. Such a reverse proxy is considered unlikely. |
| CVE-2020-10693 | A flaw was found in Hibernate Validator version 6.1.2.Final. A bug in the message interpolation processor enables invalid EL expressions to be evaluated as if they were valid. This flaw allows attackers to bypass input sanitation (escaping, stripping) controls that developers may have put in place when handling user-controlled data in error messages. |
| CVE-2020-5421 | In Spring Framework versions 5.2.0 - 5.2.8, 5.1.0 - 5.1.17, 5.0.0 - 5.0.18, 4.3.0 - 4.3.28, and older unsupported versions, the protections against RFD attacks from CVE-2015-5211 may be bypassed depending on the browser used through the use of a jsessionid path parameter. |
| CVE-2021-22060 | In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.13, 5.2.0 - 5.2.18, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide malicious input to cause the insertion of additional log entries. This is a follow-up to CVE-2021-22096 that protects against additional types of input and in more places of the Spring Framework codebase. |
| CVE-2021-22096 | In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.10, 5.2.0 - 5.2.17, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide malicious input to cause the insertion of additional log entries. |
| CVE-2021-22118 | In Spring Framework, versions 5.2.x prior to 5.2.15 and versions 5.3.x prior to 5.3.7, a WebFlux application is vulnerable to a privilege escalation: by (re)creating the temporary storage directory, a locally authenticated malicious user can read or modify files that have been uploaded to the WebFlux application, or overwrite arbitrary files with multipart request data. |

## 5. Mitigation Plan

After interpreting your results from the manual review and static testing, identify the steps to remedy the identified security vulnerabilities for Artemis Financial’s software application.

1. Since first interaction with our application will most likely come via the log-in function, I will focus on resolving those vulnerabilities first. Input validation will help alleviate many of the vulnerabilities found via our static testing. Restricting user input size and known problematic combinations can create a first line of defense for our application.
2. Next, implementing an up-to-date certification system can ensure that we are not dealing with vulnerabilities that have already been patched. Out of date systems can mean we are fighting exploits that have already been resolved so that we don’t have to. This can ensure that our APIs and our client/server communications are operating on a high level of security.
3. Finally, I feel as though a focus on encapsulation will help the program operate quickly, efficiently, and minimize duplication which can be used to exploit our system. Encapsulation and cryptography can secure the data within our system so even if our communication channels get compromised, we still have another level of security to protect our users.