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## Document Revision History

| **Version** | **Date** | **Author** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.0** | **November 13, 2022** | **Douglas Buckley** | **Went over vulnerabilities through dependency report (see report below). Provided mitigation plan for initial review of software.** |

## Client



## Instructions

Submit this completed vulnerability assessment report. Replace the bracketed text with the relevant information. In the report, identify your findings of security vulnerabilities and provide recommendations for the next steps to remedy the issues you have found.

* Respond to the five steps outlined below and include your findings.
* Respond using your own words. You may also choose to include images or supporting materials. If you include them, make certain to insert them in all the relevant locations in the document.
* Refer to the Project One Guidelines and Rubric for more detailed instructions about each section of the template.

## Developer

Douglas Buckley

## Interpreting Client Needs

**What is the value of secure communications to the company?**

The value of secure communications to Artemis Financial is crucial if not necessary for it to be a successful company. Since it’s a financial consulting company, there would have to be sensitive information stored and transferred depending on the types of transactions occurring. The client specializes in plans pertaining to savings, retirement, investments, and insurance. Most if not all financial companies store sensitive information about their clients, whether if it’s account information, social security numbers, addresses, and even tax documents just to name a few.

**Does the company make any international transactions?**

There was no specifications about whether or not Artemis Financial works in the United States strictly or if it’s services are on an international scale. I would have to assume that it’s only operational in the United States, however this assumption could be incorrect. Regardless, we will act accordingly, regardless of the scale.

**Are there governmental restrictions about secure communications to consider?**

One restriction to keep in mind is the handling of sensitive information. According to the Oracle secure coding guidelines and the National Conference of State Legislatures, one of the most important things to consider when handling sensitive information is to never store or log it. Another concept to consider is to make sure that the proper connections and transactions are occurring with the authorized machines and users.

**What external threats might be present now and in the immediate future?**

There are a few types of external threats that come to mind when it comes to a company such as Artemis Financial. I would have to imagine the largest threat presence would be attacks that would attempt to steal or at least obtain the client’s sensitive information. Other attacks could consist of Denial of Service attacks or SQL injections. These attacks will also exist in the future, they will only evolve with the times is all.

**What are the modernization requirements that you must consider? For example:**

Ensuring that the frameworks and any other third party applications are up to date would help make sure the company is using the most recent (and implied “secure”) version of their necessary applications and frameworks. Another modernization requirement to consider would making sure to use efficient libraries and data sorting algorithms so that the data is handled in an efficient manner.

## Areas of Security

When referring to the Vulnerability Assessment Process Flow Diagram for the areas of security to apply to Artemis Financial’s application, the following areas are relevant:

* **Input Validation:** This will be needed to make sure that the inputs being put into the system are actually valid. This can also be used implement authentication of users.
* **APIs:** Since Artemis Financial has a REST API, it’s obvious that APIs are going to be relevant towards the program.
* **Cryptography:** Since there is sensitive information being handled throughout this software, it would be essential to make sure that some form of cryptography is implemented to be able to make the sensitive data secure.
* **Code Error:** This will help highlights area of the code that have vulnerabilities. This is essential in order to find and fix the problems that exist within the software. Not implementing this would be risky to not only the integrity of the software but of the client information as well.
* **Code Quality:** Ensures that the best practices are being used in the program. This includes elements such as code readability, organization, proper indentation, and many more.

## Manual Review

Here are my findings during the manual review:

* **POM FILE:**
  + No HTTPS in the Project field. HTTPS needs to be present when handling secure information
* **No authentication methods anywhere in the code**
* **No signs of cryptography anywhere in the code**
* **Code Quality is acceptable as of now**

## Static Testing

The following information has been directly transferred from the dependency report into this table below. This is to make the reading of the vulnerable dependencies easier for the sake of the report.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dependency** | **Vulnerability** | **Description** |
| bcprov-jdk15on-1.46.jar  CVE Count: 17 | [cpe:2.3:a:bouncycastle:legion-of-the-bouncy-castle-java-crytography-api:1.46:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Abouncycastle&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Abouncycastle%3Alegion-of-the-bouncy-castle-java-crytography-api&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Abouncycastle%3Alegion-of-the-bouncy-castle-java-crytography-api%3A1.46) | The Bouncy Castle Crypto package is a Java implementation of cryptographic algorithms. This jar contains JCE provider and lightweight API for the Bouncy Castle Cryptography APIs for JDK 1.5 to JDK 1.7. |
| hibernate-validator-6.0.18.Final.jar  CVE Count: 1 | [cpe:2.3:a:redhat:hibernate\_validator:6.0.18:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Aredhat&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Aredhat%3Ahibernate_validator&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Aredhat%3Ahibernate_validator%3A6.0.18) | 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. |
| jackson-databind-2.10.2.jar  CVE Count: 4 | [cpe:2.3:a:fasterxml:jackson-databind:2.10.2:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Afasterxml&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Afasterxml%3Ajackson-databind&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Afasterxml%3Ajackson-databind%3A2.10.2) | 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. |
| log4j-api-2.12.1.jar  CVE Count: 1 | [cpe:2.3:a:apache:log4j:2.12.1:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Aapache&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Aapache%3Alog4j&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Aapache%3Alog4j%3A2.12.1) | 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. Fixed in Apache Log4j 2.12.3 and 2.13.1 |
| logback-core-1.2.3.jar  CVE Count: 1 | [cpe:2.3:a:qos:logback:1.2.3:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Aqos&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Aqos%3Alogback&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Aqos%3Alogback%3A1.2.3) | 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. |
| snakeyaml-1.25.jar  CVE Count: 6 | [cpe:2.3:a:snakeyaml\_project:snakeyaml:1.25:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Asnakeyaml_project&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Asnakeyaml_project%3Asnakeyaml&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Asnakeyaml_project%3Asnakeyaml%3A1.25) | The Alias feature in SnakeYAML before 1.26 allows entity expansion during a load operation, a related issue to CVE-2003-1564. |
| spring-boot-2.2.4.RELEASE.jar  CVE Count: 1 | [cpe:2.3:a:vmware:spring\_boot:2.2.4:release:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Avmware&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Avmware%3Aspring_boot&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Avmware%3Aspring_boot%3A2.2.4) | \*\* UNSUPPORTED WHEN ASSIGNED \*\* spring-boot versions prior to version v2.2.11.RELEASE was vulnerable to temporary directory hijacking. This vulnerability impacted the org.springframework.boot.web.server.AbstractConfigurableWebServerFactory.createTempDir method. NOTE: This vulnerability only affects products and/or versions that are no longer supported by the maintainer. |
| spring-core-5.2.3.RELEASE.jar  CVE Count: 9 | [cpe:2.3:a:vmware:spring\_framework:5.2.3:release:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Avmware&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Avmware%3Aspring_framework&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Avmware%3Aspring_framework%3A5.2.3) | A Spring MVC or Spring WebFlux application running on JDK 9+ may be vulnerable to remote code execution (RCE) via data binding. The specific exploit requires the application to run on Tomcat as a WAR deployment. If the application is deployed as a Spring Boot executable jar, i.e. the default, it is not vulnerable to the exploit. However, the nature of the vulnerability is more general, and there may be other ways to exploit it. |
| spring-web-5.2.3.RELEASE.jar  CVE Count: 10 | [cpe:2.3:a:vmware:spring\_framework:5.2.3:release:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Avmware&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Avmware%3Aspring_framework&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Avmware%3Aspring_framework%3A5.2.3) | Pivotal Spring Framework through 5.3.16 suffers from a potential remote code execution (RCE) issue if used for Java deserialization of untrusted data. Depending on how the library is implemented within a product, this issue may or not occur, and authentication may be required. NOTE: the vendor's position is that untrusted data is not an intended use case. The product's behavior will not be changed because some users rely on deserialization of trusted data. |
| tomcat-embed-core-9.0.30.jar  CVE Count: 19 | [cpe:2.3:a:apache:tomcat:9.0.30:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Aapache&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Aapache%3Atomcat&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Aapache%3Atomcat%3A9.0.30) | 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. |
| tomcat-embed-websocket-9.0.30.jar  CVE Count: 20 | [cpe:2.3:a:apache:tomcat:9.0.30:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*:\*](https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/search/results?form_type=Advanced&results_type=overview&search_type=all&cpe_vendor=cpe%3A%2F%3Aapache&cpe_product=cpe%3A%2F%3Aapache%3Atomcat&cpe_version=cpe%3A%2F%3Aapache%3Atomcat%3A9.0.30) | 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. |

## Mitigation Plan

One solution that I have for fixing the list of vulnerabilities would be to view every dependency that was listed and view if the current version of the dependency. If the dependency is outdated, then it would appear that it needs to update to the most recent version. Another fix that needs to occur is that the HTTP needs to be replaces with HTTPS, that way the information is secure. Authentication checks also need to be implemented so that there is a user verification feature in the software.