|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Threat | Property | Approach |
| Spoofing identity | Authentication | Passwords, login system |
| Tampering | Integrity | Digital signatures, checksums |
| Repudiation | Confirmation | Digital signatures, log-in system, log user activity |
| Information Disclosure | Confidentiality | Encryption |
| Denial of Service | Availability | reCAPTCHA |
| Elevation of Privileges | Authorisation | login system, verification |

In order to make the system secure, possible risks and dangers that come with the project were discussed. All goals, means and powers of attacker were taken under consideration. Matters such as thread frequency and effect, preventive and corrective measures are examined in the next part of the document.

The threat of spoofing identity endangers authentication of the user. A possible goal of the attacker might be to impersonate a different user. This is possible to achieve with preforming the man in the middle attack. The criminal can intercept the packages that two users are exchanging and steal the signature of one of the users. A masquerade attack is a active type of attack (EINOO)!!!! To overcome this threat implementing a login system and encrypting the signature can be a solution. This way the attacker won’t be able to get hold of the users signature, nor send data as this specific user, because of the required password.

Tampering puts the integrity property in danger. A goal of such an attack is to modify the data while it is transferred from one user to another user. That means that the information a user is receiving is not the original that was sent. An external user can modify the message (which is an active attack) either online, offline or on the network. Mechanisms such as signing packets or checksums can prevent tampering. By signing we are sure that the message was sent from the right user, and thanks to checksums, once the information is coded it cannot be reverted. Because of that, the perpetrator either can not access the data to modify it, or he cannot change the signature.

In repudiation threat the confirmation property is put in danger. In such case the attacker is denying the actions which were performed on the system. Such violation can be preformed in case when the system is not keeping track of the users activity. This is a masquerade which is a active attack. It can be preformed by an internal user, either offline, online or on the network. To prevent repudiation digital signatures or log of user activity can be implemented. Thanks to these mechanism the attacker will not be able to deny his/hers action, because all his activity will be associated with this person.

Information disclosure can be an attacker’s goal and threatens the confidentiality property of data used in our system. An attacker being able to disclose information means that they had access to data they should not have been able to see. This goal can be achieved by a number of attacks that our system may be vulnerable to. Some of those attacks could be passive, such as eavesdropping on the information sent, or active, for example blocking a message from arriving and then looking at the information. By using the EINOO model we can determine where and by whom our system could be attacked. External attackers could perform network attacks, such as the ones mentioned above, in order to gain access to unauthorized information and internal attackers which may be able to perform off-line attacks so that they could steal information. A feasible approach to this threat would be to use cryptographic encryption in order to secure the data in our system. This way if the data is intercepted by an external attacker using passive or active attacks or if an internal attacker carries out successfully an off-line attack the information they get is encrypted and therefore secure. However, if an attacker does manage to achieve information disclosure then the mistake we made would be at the Mechanism level, suggesting that the vulnerability comes from what encryption we use.

Denial of service type attacks represent a danger to the availability of the data used in our system. An attacker could be able to deny a user’s access to our system and such a goal could be accomplished through some attacks that the system may be vulnerable to. A denial of service attack is an active one and can be carried out by both external and internal attackers; such attacks usually occurring on the network. A login system is susceptible to DoS attacks by the use of bots that input wrong information for a large amount of times. In order to prevent this the system should ask the user to perform an action only a human would be able to before verifying the login credentials. The most widely used solution for this is the reCAPTCHA security service. However, attacks that have the goal of denying service to the user may take many forms and if such an attack does succeed we should take another look at the Threat Model and see what types of attacks we dismissed or we did not think of.

An attacker may also have elevation of privileges as his goal, such attacks resulting in them being able to receive higher rights in our system than they should. Attacks directed at achieving elevation of privileges could be active ones and may occur on the network; such attacks being most usually carried out by external attackers. In order to prevent unauthorized access a login system and verification of input may be useful in order to deter this threat. Another idea would be to ask for the user’s credentials again before authorizing them to perform an important action (e.g.: permanently deleting some files). Omissions in the Threat Model may, however, permit attackers to succeed in elevating their privileges.