



**Threagile**

Agile Threat Modeling

---

# Threat Model Report

## IAC Infrastructure

4 January 2024

Shashank Sanap

# Table of Contents

## Results Overview

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Management Summary                                     | 4  |
| Impact Analysis of 54 Initial Risks in 21 Categories   | 5  |
| Risk Mitigation  | 8  |
| Impact Analysis of 54 Remaining Risks in 21 Categories | 9  |
| Application Overview                                   | 12 |
| Data-Flow Diagram                                      | 13 |
| Security Requirements                                  | 15 |
| Abuse Cases  | 16 |
| Tag Listing  | 18 |
| STRIDE Classification of Identified Risks              | 19 |
| Assignment by Function                                 | 22 |
| RAA Analysis   | 25 |
| Data Mapping   | 26 |
| Out-of-Scope Assets: 0 Assets                          | 27 |
| Potential Model Failures: 10 / 10 Risks                | 28 |
| Questions: 0 / 0 Questions                             | 29 |

## Risks by Vulnerability Category

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Identified Risks by Vulnerability Category          | 30 |
| SQL/NoSQL-Injection: 2 / 2 Risks                    | 31 |
| XML External Entity (XXE): 1 / 1 Risk               | 33 |
| Cross-Site Scripting (XSS): 5 / 5 Risks             | 35 |
| Missing Authentication: 1 / 1 Risk                  | 37 |
| Missing Cloud Hardening: 4 / 4 Risks                | 39 |
| Missing File Validation: 1 / 1 Risk                 | 42 |
| Missing Hardening: 1 / 1 Risk                       | 44 |
| Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF): 3 / 3 Risks     | 46 |
| Unencrypted Communication: 2 / 2 Risks              | 48 |
| Unguarded Direct Datastore Access: 1 / 1 Risk       | 50 |
| Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF): 5 / 5 Risks      | 52 |
| DoS-risky Access Across Trust-Boundary: 4 / 4 Risks | 54 |
| Missing Build Infrastructure: 1 / 1 Risk            | 56 |
| Missing Identity Propagation: 1 / 1 Risk            | 58 |
| Missing Two-Factor Authentication (2FA): 1 / 1 Risk | 60 |
| Missing Vault (Secret Storage): 1 / 1 Risk          | 62 |
| Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF): 3 / 3 Risks | 64 |
| Mixed Targets on Shared Runtime: 1 / 1 Risk         | 66 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Unencrypted Technical Assets: 7 / 7 Risks  | 68 |
| Unguarded Access From Internet: 1 / 1 Risk | 70 |
| Unnecessary Data Transfer: 8 / 8 Risks     | 72 |

## Risks by Technical Asset

|                                     |    |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| Identified Risks by Technical Asset | 75 |
| Private Subnet: 12 / 12 Risks       | 76 |
| App Server: 4 / 4 Risks             | 80 |
| Linux Bastion Host: 6 / 6 Risks     | 83 |
| Public Route 1: 9 / 9 Risks         | 86 |
| Public Subnet: 8 / 8 Risks          | 89 |
| RDS Subnet: 8 / 8 Risks             | 92 |
| Db Instance: 2 / 2 Risks            | 95 |
| Internet Gateway: 1 / 1 Risk        | 97 |

## Data Breach Probabilities by Data Asset

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Identified Data Breach Probabilities by Data Asset | 99  |
| App server logs: 15 / 15 Risks                     | 100 |
| Client Application Code: 16 / 16 Risks             | 101 |
| Data Transfer: 15 / 15 Risks                       | 102 |
| Database Customizing and Dumps: 8 / 8 Risks        | 103 |
| Database Data Transfer: 22 / 22 Risks              | 104 |
| Internet Data Transfer: 24 / 24 Risks              | 105 |
| Server Application Code: 5 / 5 Risks               | 107 |

## Trust Boundaries

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| Private Instance    | 108 |
| Public Instance     | 108 |
| Application Network | 108 |
| Dev Network         | 108 |
| Public Route Table  | 109 |

## Shared Runtime

|                                    |     |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Subnet and Instance Virtualization | 110 |
|------------------------------------|-----|

## About Threagile


|                                 |     |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| Risk Rules Checked by Threagile | 111 |
| Disclaimer                      | 124 |

## Management Summary

Threagile toolkit was used to model the architecture of "IAC Infrastructure" and derive risks by analyzing the components and data flows. The risks identified during this analysis are shown in the following chapters. Identified risks during threat modeling do not necessarily mean that the vulnerability associated with this risk actually exists: it is more to be seen as a list of potential risks and threats, which should be individually reviewed and reduced by removing false positives. For the remaining risks it should be checked in the design and implementation of "IAC Infrastructure" whether the mitigation advices have been applied or not.

Each risk finding references a chapter of the OWASP ASVS (Application Security Verification Standard) audit checklist. The OWASP ASVS checklist should be considered as an inspiration by architects and developers to further harden the application in a Defense-in-Depth approach. Additionally, for each risk finding a link towards a matching OWASP Cheat Sheet or similar with technical details about how to implement a mitigation is given.

In total **54 initial risks** in **21 categories** have been identified during the threat modeling process:



IAC CloudFormation facilitates the creation of a AWS architecture consist of VPC with defined public and private subnets across multiple availability zones.

# Impact Analysis of 54 Initial Risks in 21 Categories

The most prevalent impacts of the **54 initial risks** (distributed over **21 risk categories**) are (taking the severity ratings into account and using the highest for each category):

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

**High: [SQL/NoSQL-Injection](#): 2 Initial Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *High* impact. If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to modify SQL/NoSQL queries to steal and modify data and eventually further escalate towards a deeper system penetration via code executions.

**High: [XML External Entity \(XXE\)](#): 1 Initial Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *High* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to read sensitive files (configuration data, key/credential files, deployment files, business data files, etc.) from the filesystem of affected components and/or access sensitive services or files of other components.

**Elevated: [Cross-Site Scripting \(XSS\)](#): 5 Initial Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to access individual victim sessions and steal or modify user data.

**Elevated: [Missing Authentication](#): 1 Initial Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access or modify sensitive data in an unauthenticated way.

**Elevated: [Missing Cloud Hardening](#): 4 Initial Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Very High* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might access cloud components in an unintended way.

**Elevated: [Missing File Validation](#): 1 Initial Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to provide malicious files to the application.

**Elevated: [Missing Hardening](#): 1 Initial Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to easier attack high-value targets.

**Elevated: [Server-Side Request Forgery \(SSRF\)](#): 3 Initial Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access sensitive services or files of network-reachable components by modifying outgoing calls of affected components.

**Elevated: [Unencrypted Communication](#): 2 Initial Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, network attackers might be able to eavesdrop on unencrypted sensitive data sent between components.

**Elevated: Unguarded Direct Datastore Access:** 1 Initial Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to directly attack sensitive datastores without any protecting components in-between.

**Medium: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF):** 5 Initial Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to trick logged-in victim users into unwanted actions within the web application by visiting an attacker controlled web site.

**Medium: DoS-risky Access Across Trust-Boundary:** 4 Initial Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to disturb the availability of important parts of the system.

**Medium: Missing Build Infrastructure:** 1 Initial Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to exploit risks unseen in this threat model due to critical build infrastructure components missing in the model.

**Medium: Missing Identity Propagation:** 1 Initial Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access or modify foreign data after a successful compromise of a component within the system due to missing resource-based authorization checks.

**Medium: Missing Two-Factor Authentication (2FA):** 1 Initial Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access or modify highly sensitive data without strong authentication.

**Medium: Missing Vault (Secret Storage):** 1 Initial Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to easier steal config secrets (like credentials, private keys, client certificates, etc.) once a vulnerability to access files is present and exploited.

**Medium: Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF):** 3 Initial Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to apply standard attack pattern tests at great speed without any filtering.

**Medium: Mixed Targets on Shared Runtime:** 1 Initial Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers successfully attacking other components of the system might have an easy path towards more valuable targets, as they are running on the same shared runtime.

Medium: **Unencrypted Technical Assets:** 7 Initial Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access unencrypted data when successfully compromising sensitive components.

Medium: **Unguarded Access From Internet:** 1 Initial Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.


If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to directly attack sensitive systems without any hardening components in-between due to them being directly exposed on the internet.

Medium: **Unnecessary Data Transfer:** 8 Initial Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to target unnecessarily transferred data.



# Risk Mitigation

The following chart gives a high-level overview of the risk tracking status (including mitigated risks):



After removal of risks with status *mitigated* and *false positive* the following 54 remain unmitigated:

- 0 unmitigated critical risk
- 2 unmitigated high risk
- 18 unmitigated elevated risk
- 28 unmitigated medium risk
- 6 unmitigated low risk
- 1 business side related
- 14 architecture related
- 17 development related
- 22 operations related





# Impact Analysis of 54 Remaining Risks in 21 Categories

The most prevalent impacts of the **54 remaining risks** (distributed over **21 risk categories**) are (taking the severity ratings into account and using the highest for each category):

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

High: **SQL/NoSQL-Injection**: 2 Remaining Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely with High impact*.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to modify SQL/NoSQL queries to steal and modify data and eventually further escalate towards a deeper system penetration via code executions.

High: **XML External Entity (XXE)**: 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely with High impact*.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to read sensitive files (configuration data, key/credential files, deployment files, business data files, etc.) from the filesystem of affected components and/or access sensitive services or files of other components.

Elevated: **Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)**: 5 Remaining Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely with High impact*.

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to access individual victim sessions and steal or modify user data.

Elevated: **Missing Authentication**: 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely with High impact*.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access or modify sensitive data in an unauthenticated way.

Elevated: **Missing Cloud Hardening**: 4 Remaining Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely with Very High impact*.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might access cloud components in an unintended way.

Elevated: **Missing File Validation**: 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely with Medium impact*.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to provide malicious files to the application.

Elevated: **Missing Hardening**: 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely with Medium impact*.

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to easier attack high-value targets.

Elevated: **Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)**: 3 Remaining Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely with Medium impact*.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access sensitive services or files of network-reachable components by modifying outgoing calls of affected components.

Elevated: **Unencrypted Communication**: 2 Remaining Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely with High impact*.

If this risk is unmitigated, network attackers might be able to eavesdrop on unencrypted sensitive data sent between components.

**Elevated: Unguarded Direct Datastore Access:** 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to directly attack sensitive datastores without any protecting components in-between.

**Medium: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF):** 5 Remaining Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to trick logged-in victim users into unwanted actions within the web application by visiting an attacker controlled web site.

**Medium: DoS-risky Access Across Trust-Boundary:** 4 Remaining Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to disturb the availability of important parts of the system.

**Medium: Missing Build Infrastructure:** 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to exploit risks unseen in this threat model due to critical build infrastructure components missing in the model.

**Medium: Missing Identity Propagation:** 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access or modify foreign data after a successful compromise of a component within the system due to missing resource-based authorization checks.

**Medium: Missing Two-Factor Authentication (2FA):** 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access or modify highly sensitive data without strong authentication.

**Medium: Missing Vault (Secret Storage):** 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to easier steal config secrets (like credentials, private keys, client certificates, etc.) once a vulnerability to access files is present and exploited.

**Medium: Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF):** 3 Remaining Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to apply standard attack pattern tests at great speed without any filtering.

**Medium: Mixed Targets on Shared Runtime:** 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers successfully attacking other components of the system might have an easy path towards more valuable targets, as they are running on the same shared runtime.

Medium: **Unencrypted Technical Assets:** 7 Remaining Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access unencrypted data when successfully compromising sensitive components.

Medium: **Unguarded Access From Internet:** 1 Remaining Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to directly attack sensitive systems without any hardening components in-between due to them being directly exposed on the internet.

Medium: **Unnecessary Data Transfer:** 8 Remaining Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to target unnecessarily transferred data.

# Application Overview

## Business Criticality

The overall business criticality of "IAC Infrastructure" was rated as:

( archive | operational | **IMPORTANT** | critical | mission-critical )

## Business Overview

A scalable and secure network is offered by AWS infrastructure on Amazon Web Services (AWS). It guarantees a robust architecture strong enough to support important parts like databases and application servers. This architecture serves companies looking for a stable, flexible, and secure cloud-based environment to support their operations by enabling dependable application hosting and effective database management.


## Technical Overview

AWS network infrastructure configures a Virtual Private Cloud (VPC) with defined CIDR blocks, enabling DNS support and hostnames. The setup includes public and private subnets across multiple availability zones for high availability and fault tolerance. Key components of this setup include an internet gateway for external connectivity, route tables to manage traffic flow within the VPC, and security groups to control access to instances. The infrastructure comprises various instances: a Linux bastion host in the public subnet for secure SSH access, an application server in the private subnet, and a database instance with security group.

## Data-Flow Diagram

The following diagram was generated by Threagile based on the model input and gives a high-level overview of the data-flow between technical assets. The RAA value is the calculated *Relative Attacker Attractiveness* in percent. For a full high-resolution version of this diagram please refer to the PNG image file alongside this report.

## Data-Flow Diagram - IAC Infrastructure



# Security Requirements

This chapter lists the custom security requirements which have been defined for the modeled target.

## **Input Validation**

Strict input validation is required to reduce the overall attack surface.

## **Securing Administrative Access**

Administrative access must be secured with strong encryption and multi-factor authentication.

*This list is not complete and regulatory or law relevant security requirements have to be taken into account as well. Also custom individual security requirements might exist for the project.*

# Abuse Cases

This chapter lists the custom abuse cases which have been defined for the modeled target.

## **AWS-System Compromise**

As a hacker I want to access the VPC System in order to steal/modify sensitive business data.

## **Cross-Site Scripting Attacks**

As a hacker I want to execute Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) and similar attacks in order to takeover victim sessions and cause reputational damage.

## **Database Compromise**

As a hacker I want to access the database backend of the rds-Subnet in order to steal/modify sensitive business data.

## **Denial-of-Service**

As a hacker I want to disturb the functionality of the backend system in order to cause indirect financial damage via unusable features.

## **Denial-of-Service of DB Functionality**

As a hacker I want to disturb the functionality of the Database system to cause indirect financial damage.

## **Denial-of-Service of Enduser Functionality**

As a hacker I want to disturb the functionality of the enduser parts of the application in order to cause direct financial damage.

## **Identity Theft**

As a hacker I want to steal identity data in order to reuse credentials and/or keys on other targets of the same company or outside.

## **PII Theft**

As a hacker I want to steal PII (Personally Identifiable Information) data in order to blackmail the company and/or damage their repudiation by publishing them.

## **Ransomware**

As a hacker I want to encrypt the storage and file systems in order to demand ransom.



*This list is not complete and regulatory or law relevant abuse cases have to be taken into account as well. Also custom individual abuse cases might exist for the project.*

# Tag Listing

This chapter lists what tags are used by which elements.

## **aws:ec2**

Internal Access, Public Subnet, Private Instance, Public Instance

## **aws:rds**

Db Instance

## **aws:vpc**

Application Network

## **linux**

Db Instance, Linux Bastion Host, Private Subnet, Public Subnet, RDS Subnet

## **mysql**

RDS Subnet, Database Customizing and Dumps

## **vmware**

Subnet and Instance Virtualization

# STRIDE Classification of Identified Risks

This chapter clusters and classifies the risks by STRIDE categories: In total **54 potential risks** have been identified during the threat modeling process of which **6 in the Spoofing** category, **16 in the Tampering** category, **0 in the Repudiation** category, **14 in the Information Disclosure** category, **4 in the Denial of Service** category, and **14 in the Elevation of Privilege** category.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

## Spoofing

Elevated: **Missing File Validation**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Medium* impact.

When a technical asset accepts files, these input files should be strictly validated about filename and type.

Medium: **Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)**: 5 / 5 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

When a web application is accessed via web protocols Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) risks might arise.

## Tampering

High: **SQL/NoSQL-Injection**: 2 / 2 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *High* impact.

When a database is accessed via database access protocols SQL/NoSQL-Injection risks might arise. The risk rating depends on the sensitivity technical asset itself and of the data assets processed or stored.

Elevated: **Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)**: 5 / 5 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

For each web application Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) risks might arise. In terms of the overall risk level take other applications running on the same domain into account as well.

Elevated: **Missing Cloud Hardening**: 4 / 4 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Very High* impact.

Cloud components should be hardened according to the cloud vendor best practices. This affects their configuration, auditing, and further areas.

Elevated: **Missing Hardening**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

Technical assets with a Relative Attacker Attractiveness (RAA) value of 55 % or higher should be explicitly hardened taking best practices and vendor hardening guides into account.

Medium: **Missing Build Infrastructure**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

The modeled architecture does not contain a build infrastructure (devops-client, sourcecode-repo, build-pipeline, etc.), which might be the risk of a model missing critical assets (and thus not seeing their risks). If the architecture contains custom-developed parts, the pipeline where code

gets developed and built needs to be part of the model.

**Medium: Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF): 3 / 3 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.**

To have a first line of filtering defense, security architectures with web-services or web-applications should include a WAF in front of them. Even though a WAF is not a replacement for security (all components must be secure even without a WAF) it adds another layer of defense to the overall system by delaying some attacks and having easier attack alerting through it.

## Repudiation

n/a

## Information Disclosure

**High: XML External Entity (XXE): 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *High* impact.**

When a technical asset accepts data in XML format, XML External Entity (XXE) risks might arise.

**Elevated: Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF): 3 / 3 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.**

When a server system (i.e. not a client) is accessing other server systems via typical web protocols Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) or Local-File-Inclusion (LFI) or Remote-File-Inclusion (RFI) risks might arise.

**Elevated: Unencrypted Communication: 2 / 2 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.**

Due to the confidentiality and/or integrity rating of the data assets transferred over the communication link this connection must be encrypted.

**Medium: Missing Vault (Secret Storage): 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.**

In order to avoid the risk of secret leakage via config files (when attacked through vulnerabilities being able to read files like Path-Traversal and others), it is best practice to use a separate hardened process with proper authentication, authorization, and audit logging to access config secrets (like credentials, private keys, client certificates, etc.). This component is usually some kind of Vault.

**Medium: Unencrypted Technical Assets: 7 / 7 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.**

Due to the confidentiality rating of the technical asset itself and/or the processed data assets this technical asset must be encrypted. The risk rating depends on the sensitivity technical asset itself and of the data assets stored.

## Denial of Service

Medium: **DoS-risky Access Across Trust-Boundary: 4 / 4 Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Assets accessed across trust boundaries with critical or mission-critical availability rating are more prone to Denial-of-Service (DoS) risks.

## Elevation of Privilege

Elevated: **Missing Authentication: 1 / 1 Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

Technical assets (especially multi-tenant systems) should authenticate incoming requests when the asset processes or stores sensitive data.

Elevated: **Unguarded Direct Datastore Access: 1 / 1 Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

Datastores accessed across trust boundaries must be guarded by some protecting service or application.

Medium: **Missing Identity Propagation: 1 / 1 Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Technical assets (especially multi-tenant systems), which usually process data for endusers should authorize every request based on the identity of the enduser when the data flow is authenticated (i.e. non-public). For DevOps usages at least a technical-user authorization is required.

Medium: **Missing Two-Factor Authentication (2FA): 1 / 1 Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Technical assets (especially multi-tenant systems) should authenticate incoming requests with two-factor (2FA) authentication when the asset processes or stores highly sensitive data (in terms of confidentiality, integrity, and availability) and is accessed by humans.

Medium: **Mixed Targets on Shared Runtime: 1 / 1 Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Different attacker targets (like frontend and backend/datastore components) should not be running on the same shared (underlying) runtime.

Medium: **Unguarded Access From Internet: 1 / 1 Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

Internet-exposed assets must be guarded by a protecting service, application, or reverse-proxy.

Medium: **Unnecessary Data Transfer: 8 / 8 Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

When a technical asset sends or receives data assets, which it neither processes or stores this is an indicator for unnecessarily transferred data (or for an incomplete model). When the unnecessarily transferred data assets are sensitive, this poses an unnecessary risk of an increased attack surface.

# Assignment by Function

This chapter clusters and assigns the risks by functions which are most likely able to check and mitigate them: In total **54 potential risks** have been identified during the threat modeling process of which **1 should be checked by Business Side**, **14 should be checked by Architecture**, **17 should be checked by Development**, and **22 should be checked by Operations**.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

## Business Side

Medium: **Missing Two-Factor Authentication (2FA)**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Apply an authentication method to the technical asset protecting highly sensitive data via two-factor authentication for human users.

## Architecture

Elevated: **Missing Authentication**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

Apply an authentication method to the technical asset. To protect highly sensitive data consider the use of two-factor authentication for human users.

Elevated: **Unguarded Direct Datastore Access**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

Encapsulate the datastore access behind a guarding service or application.

Medium: **Missing Build Infrastructure**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Include the build infrastructure in the model.

Medium: **Missing Identity Propagation**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

When processing requests for endusers if possible authorize in the backend against the propagated identity of the enduser. This can be achieved in passing JWTs or similar tokens and checking them in the backend services. For DevOps usages apply at least a technical-user authorization.

Medium: **Missing Vault (Secret Storage)**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Consider using a Vault (Secret Storage) to securely store and access config secrets (like credentials, private keys, client certificates, etc.).

Medium: **Unguarded Access From Internet**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

Encapsulate the asset behind a guarding service, application, or reverse-proxy. For admin maintenance a bastion-host should be used as a jump-server. For file transfer a store-and-forward-host should be used as an indirect file exchange platform.

Medium: **Unnecessary Data Transfer: 8 / 8 Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Try to avoid sending or receiving sensitive data assets which are not required (i.e. neither processed or stored) by the involved technical asset.

## Development

High: **SQL/NoSQL-Injection: 2 / 2 Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *High* impact.

Try to use parameter binding to be safe from injection vulnerabilities. When a third-party product is used instead of custom developed software, check if the product applies the proper mitigation and ensure a reasonable patch-level.

High: **XML External Entity (XXE): 1 / 1 Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *High* impact.

Apply hardening of all XML parser instances in order to stay safe from XML External Entity (XXE) vulnerabilities. When a third-party product is used instead of custom developed software, check if the product applies the proper mitigation and ensure a reasonable patch-level.

Elevated: **Cross-Site Scripting (XSS): 5 / 5 Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

Try to encode all values sent back to the browser and also handle DOM-manipulations in a safe way to avoid DOM-based XSS. When a third-party product is used instead of custom developed software, check if the product applies the proper mitigation and ensure a reasonable patch-level.

Elevated: **Missing File Validation: 1 / 1 Risk** - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Medium* impact.

Filter by file extension and discard (if feasible) the name provided. Whitelist the accepted file types and determine the mime-type on the server-side (for example via "Apache Tika" or similar checks). If the file is retrievable by endusers and/or backoffice employees, consider performing scans for popular malware (if the files can be retrieved much later than they were uploaded, also apply a fresh malware scan during retrieval to scan with newer signatures of popular malware). Also enforce limits on maximum file size to avoid denial-of-service like scenarios.

Elevated: **Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF): 3 / 3 Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

Try to avoid constructing the outgoing target URL with caller controllable values. Alternatively use a mapping (whitelist) when accessing outgoing URLs instead of creating them including caller controllable values. When a third-party product is used instead of custom developed software, check if the product applies the proper mitigation and ensure a reasonable patch-level.

Medium: **Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF): 5 / 5 Risks** - Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

Try to use anti-CSRF tokens or the double-submit patterns (at least for logged-in requests). When your authentication scheme depends on cookies (like session or token cookies), consider marking them with the same-site flag. When a third-party product is used instead of custom developed software, check if the product applies the proper mitigation and ensure a reasonable patch-level.

## Operations

Elevated: **Missing Cloud Hardening**: 4 / 4 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Very High* impact.

Apply hardening of all cloud components and services, taking special care to follow the individual risk descriptions (which depend on the cloud provider tags in the model).

Elevated: **Missing Hardening**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

Try to apply all hardening best practices (like CIS benchmarks, OWASP recommendations, vendor recommendations, DevSec Hardening Framework, DBSAT for Oracle databases, and others).

Elevated: **Unencrypted Communication**: 2 / 2 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

Apply transport layer encryption to the communication link.

Medium: **DoS-risky Access Across Trust-Boundary**: 4 / 4 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Apply anti-DoS techniques like throttling and/or per-client load blocking with quotas. Also for maintenance access routes consider applying a VPN instead of public reachable interfaces. Generally applying redundancy on the targeted technical asset reduces the risk of DoS.

Medium: **Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF)**: 3 / 3 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Consider placing a Web Application Firewall (WAF) in front of the web-services and/or web-applications. For cloud environments many cloud providers offer pre-configured WAFs. Even reverse proxies can be enhanced by a WAF component via ModSecurity plugins.

Medium: **Mixed Targets on Shared Runtime**: 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

Use separate runtime environments for running different target components or apply similar separation styles to prevent load- or breach-related problems originating from one more attacker-facing asset impacts also the other more critical rated backend/datastore assets.

Medium: **Unencrypted Technical Assets**: 7 / 7 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

Apply encryption to the technical asset.



# RAA Analysis

For each technical asset the "**Relative Attacker Attractiveness**" (RAA) value was calculated in percent. The higher the RAA, the more interesting it is for an attacker to compromise the asset. The calculation algorithm takes the sensitivity ratings and quantities of stored and processed data into account as well as the communication links of the technical asset. Neighbouring assets to high-value RAA targets might receive an increase in their RAA value when they have a communication link towards that target ("Pivoting-Factor").

The following lists all technical assets sorted by their RAA value from highest (most attacker attractive) to lowest. This list can be used to prioritize on efforts relevant for the most attacker-attractive technical assets:

Technical asset paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

**RDS Subnet:** RAA 100%

The database behind the private subnet

**Private Subnet:** RAA 39%

Used for database and app server

**Public Route 1:** RAA 32%

Public Route 1

**Public Subnet:** RAA 28%

Public Subnet hosting the client-side code

**App Server:** RAA 16%

App Server

**Internet Gateway:** RAA 15%

Internet Gateway

**Db Instance:** RAA 10%


db instance for storing the application data in mysql database

**Linux Bastion Host:** RAA 1%

Linux bastion host for hosting the application

# Data Mapping

The following diagram was generated by Threagile based on the model input and gives a high-level distribution of data assets across technical assets. The color matches the identified data breach probability and risk level (see the "Data Breach Probabilities" chapter for more details). A solid line stands for *data is stored by the asset* and a dashed one means *data is processed by the asset*. For a full high-resolution version of this diagram please refer to the PNG image file alongside this report.



## Out-of-Scope Assets: 0 Assets

This chapter lists all technical assets that have been defined as out-of-scope. Each one should be checked in the model whether it should better be included in the overall risk analysis:

Technical asset paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

No technical assets have been defined as out-of-scope.

## Potential Model Failures: 10 / 10 Risks

This chapter lists potential model failures where not all relevant assets have been modeled or the model might itself contain inconsistencies. Each potential model failure should be checked in the model against the architecture design:

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

**Medium: Missing Build Infrastructure:** 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

The modeled architecture does not contain a build infrastructure (devops-client, sourcecode-repo, build-pipeline, etc.), which might be the risk of a model missing critical assets (and thus not seeing their risks). If the architecture contains custom-developed parts, the pipeline where code gets developed and built needs to be part of the model.

**Medium: Missing Vault (Secret Storage):** 1 / 1 Risk - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

In order to avoid the risk of secret leakage via config files (when attacked through vulnerabilities being able to read files like Path-Traversal and others), it is best practice to use a separate hardened process with proper authentication, authorization, and audit logging to access config secrets (like credentials, private keys, client certificates, etc.). This component is usually some kind of Vault.

**Medium: Unnecessary Data Transfer:** 8 / 8 Risks - Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

When a technical asset sends or receives data assets, which it neither processes or stores this is an indicator for unnecessarily transferred data (or for an incomplete model). When the unnecessarily transferred data assets are sensitive, this poses an unnecessary risk of an increased attack surface.

## Questions: 0 / 0 Questions

This chapter lists custom questions that arose during the threat modeling process.

No custom questions arose during the threat modeling process.

## Identified Risks by Vulnerability Category

In total **54 potential risks** have been identified during the threat modeling process of which **0 are rated as critical, 2 as high, 18 as elevated, 28 as medium, and 6 as low.**

These risks are distributed across **21 vulnerability categories**. The following sub-chapters of this section describe each identified risk category.

## SQL/NoSQL-Injection: 2 / 2 Risks

**Description** (Tampering): [CWE 89](#)

When a database is accessed via database access protocols SQL/NoSQL-Injection risks might arise. The risk rating depends on the sensitivity technical asset itself and of the data assets processed or stored.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to modify SQL/NoSQL queries to steal and modify data and eventually further escalate towards a deeper system penetration via code executions.

### Detection Logic

Database accessed via typical database access protocols by in-scope clients.

### Risk Rating

The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the data stored inside the database.

### False Positives

Database accesses by queries not consisting of parts controllable by the caller can be considered as false positives after individual review.

### Mitigation (Development): SQL/NoSQL-Injection Prevention

Try to use parameter binding to be safe from injection vulnerabilities. When a third-party product is used instead of custom developed software, check if the product applies the proper mitigation and ensure a reasonable patch-level.

ASVS Chapter: [V5 - Validation, Sanitization and Encoding Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [SQL Injection Prevention Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **SQL/NoSQL-Injection** was found **2 times** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *High Risk Severity*

**SQL/NoSQL-Injection** risk at **Private Subnet** against database **RDS Subnet** via **Database Traffic**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *High* impact.

[sql-nosql-injection@Private-Subnet@sql-database@Private-Subnet>database-traffic](#)

**Unchecked**

### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**SQL/NoSQL-Injection** risk at **RDS Subnet** against database **Db Instance** via **Database Traffic**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Medium* impact.

[sql-nosql-injection@sql-database@db-instance@sql-database>database-traffic](#)

**Unchecked**



## XML External Entity (XXE): 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Information Disclosure): [CWE 611](#)

When a technical asset accepts data in XML format, XML External Entity (XXE) risks might arise.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to read sensitive files (configuration data, key/credential files, deployment files, business data files, etc.) from the filesystem of affected components and/or access sensitive services or files of other components.

### Detection Logic

In-scope technical assets accepting XML data formats.

### Risk Rating

The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored. Also for cloud-based environments the exploitation impact is at least medium, as cloud backend services can be attacked via SSRF (and XXE vulnerabilities are often also SSRF vulnerabilities).

### False Positives

Fully trusted (i.e. cryptographically signed or similar) XML data can be considered as false positives after individual review.

### Mitigation (Development): XML Parser Hardening

Apply hardening of all XML parser instances in order to stay safe from XML External Entity (XXE) vulnerabilities. When a third-party product is used instead of custom developed software, check if the product applies the proper mitigation and ensure a reasonable patch-level.

ASVS Chapter: [V14 - Configuration Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [XML External Entity Prevention Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **XML External Entity (XXE)** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *High Risk Severity*

**XML External Entity (XXE)** risk at **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *High* impact.

[xml-external-entity@Private-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

## Cross-Site Scripting (XSS): 5 / 5 Risks

**Description** (Tampering): [CWE 79](#)

For each web application Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) risks might arise. In terms of the overall risk level take other applications running on the same domain into account as well.

### Impact

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to access individual victim sessions and steal or modify user data.

### Detection Logic

In-scope web applications.

### Risk Rating

The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the data processed or stored in the web application.

### False Positives

When the technical asset is not accessed via a browser-like component (i.e not by a human user initiating the request that gets passed through all components until it reaches the web application) this can be considered a false positive.

### Mitigation (Development): XSS Prevention

Try to encode all values sent back to the browser and also handle DOM-manipulations in a safe way to avoid DOM-based XSS. When a third-party product is used instead of custom developed software, check if the product applies the proper mitigation and ensure a reasonable patch-level.

ASVS Chapter: [V5 - Validation, Sanitization and Encoding Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Cross Site Scripting Prevention Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)** was found **5 times** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) risk at App Server:** Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[cross-site-scripting@app-server](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) risk at Linux Bastion Host:** Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[cross-site-scripting@Linux-Bastion-Host](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) risk at Private Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[cross-site-scripting@Private-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) risk at Public Route 1:** Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[cross-site-scripting@public-route-1](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) risk at Public Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[cross-site-scripting@Public-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

## Missing Authentication: 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Elevation of Privilege): [CWE 306](#)

Technical assets (especially multi-tenant systems) should authenticate incoming requests when the asset processes or stores sensitive data.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access or modify sensitive data in an unauthenticated way.

### Detection Logic

In-scope technical assets (except load-balancer, reverse-proxy, service-registry, waf, ids, and ips and in-process calls) should authenticate incoming requests when the asset processes or stores sensitive data. This is especially the case for all multi-tenant assets (there even non-sensitive ones).

### Risk Rating

The risk rating (medium or high) depends on the sensitivity of the data sent across the communication link. Monitoring callers are exempted from this risk.

### False Positives

Technical assets which do not process requests regarding functionality or data linked to end-users (customers) can be considered as false positives after individual review.

### Mitigation (Architecture): Authentication of Incoming Requests

Apply an authentication method to the technical asset. To protect highly sensitive data consider the use of two-factor authentication for human users.

ASVS Chapter: [V2 - Authentication Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Authentication Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Missing Authentication** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Missing Authentication** covering communication link **Bastion Host Access** from **Internet Gateway** to **Linux Bastion Host**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[missing-authentication@internet-gateway>bastion-host-access@internet-gateway@Linux-Bastion-Host](#)

**Unchecked**

## Missing Cloud Hardening: 4 / 4 Risks

**Description** (Tampering): [CWE 1008](#)

Cloud components should be hardened according to the cloud vendor best practices. This affects their configuration, auditing, and further areas.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might access cloud components in an unintended way.

### Detection Logic

In-scope cloud components (either residing in cloud trust boundaries or more specifically tagged with cloud provider types).

### Risk Rating

The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

### False Positives

Cloud components not running parts of the target architecture can be considered as false positives after individual review.

### Mitigation (Operations): Cloud Hardening

Apply hardening of all cloud components and services, taking special care to follow the individual risk descriptions (which depend on the cloud provider tags in the model).

For **Amazon Web Services (AWS)**: Follow the *CIS Benchmark for Amazon Web Services* (see also the automated checks of cloud audit tools like "PacBot", "CloudSploit", "CloudMapper", "ScoutSuite", or "Prowler AWS CIS Benchmark Tool").

For EC2 and other servers running Amazon Linux, follow the *CIS Benchmark for Amazon Linux* and switch to IMDSv2.

For S3 buckets follow the *Security Best Practices for Amazon S3* at

<https://docs.aws.amazon.com/AmazonS3/latest/dev/security-best-practices.html> to avoid accidental leakage.

Also take a look at some of these tools: <https://github.com/toniblyx/my-arsenal-of-aws-security-tools>

For **Microsoft Azure**: Follow the *CIS Benchmark for Microsoft Azure* (see also the automated checks of cloud audit tools like "CloudSploit" or "ScoutSuite").

For **Google Cloud Platform**: Follow the *CIS Benchmark for Google Cloud Computing Platform* (see also the automated checks of cloud audit tools like "*CloudSploit*" or "*ScoutSuite*").

For **Oracle Cloud Platform**: Follow the hardening best practices (see also the automated checks of cloud audit tools like "*CloudSploit*").

ASVS Chapter: [V1 - Architecture, Design and Threat Modeling Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Attack Surface Analysis Cheat Sheet](#)

## Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?



## Risk Findings

The risk **Missing Cloud Hardening** was found **4 times** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Missing Cloud Hardening (AWS) risk at Application Network:** [CIS Benchmark for AWS:](#)  
Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Very High* impact.

[missing-cloud-hardening@application-network](#)

**Unchecked**

**Missing Cloud Hardening (AWS) risk at Private Instance:** [CIS Benchmark for AWS:](#)  
Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Very High* impact.

[missing-cloud-hardening@Private-Instance](#)

**Unchecked**

**Missing Cloud Hardening (AWS) risk at Public Instance:** [CIS Benchmark for AWS:](#)  
Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Very High* impact.

[missing-cloud-hardening@Public-Instance](#)

**Unchecked**

**Missing Cloud Hardening (EC2) risk at Public Subnet:** [CIS Benchmark for Amazon Linux:](#)  
Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Very High* impact.

[missing-cloud-hardening@Public-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

## Missing File Validation: 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Spoofing): [CWE 434](#)

When a technical asset accepts files, these input files should be strictly validated about filename and type.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to provide malicious files to the application.

### Detection Logic

In-scope technical assets with custom-developed code accepting file data formats.

### Risk Rating

The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

### False Positives

Fully trusted (i.e. cryptographically signed or similar) files can be considered as false positives after individual review.

### Mitigation (Development): File Validation

Filter by file extension and discard (if feasible) the name provided. Whitelist the accepted file types and determine the mime-type on the server-side (for example via "Apache Tika" or similar checks). If the file is retrievable by endusers and/or backoffice employees, consider performing scans for popular malware (if the files can be retrieved much later than they were uploaded, also apply a fresh malware scan during retrieval to scan with newer signatures of popular malware). Also enforce limits on maximum file size to avoid denial-of-service like scenarios.

ASVS Chapter: [V12 - File and Resources Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [File Upload Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Missing File Validation** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Missing File Validation** risk at **Public Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-file-validation@Public-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

## Missing Hardening: 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Tampering): [CWE 16](#)

Technical assets with a Relative Attacker Attractiveness (RAA) value of 55 % or higher should be explicitly hardened taking best practices and vendor hardening guides into account.

### Impact

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to easier attack high-value targets.

### Detection Logic

In-scope technical assets with RAA values of 55 % or higher. Generally for high-value targets like datastores, application servers, identity providers and ERP systems this limit is reduced to 40 %

### Risk Rating

The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the data processed or stored in the technical asset.

### False Positives

Usually no false positives.

### Mitigation (Operations): System Hardening

Try to apply all hardening best practices (like CIS benchmarks, OWASP recommendations, vendor recommendations, DevSec Hardening Framework, DBSAT for Oracle databases, and others).

ASVS Chapter: [V14 - Configuration Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Attack Surface Analysis Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Missing Hardening** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Missing Hardening** risk at **RDS Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-hardening@sql-database](#)

**Unchecked**

## Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF): 3 / 3 Risks

**Description** (Information Disclosure): [CWE 918](#)

When a server system (i.e. not a client) is accessing other server systems via typical web protocols Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) or Local-File-Inclusion (LFI) or Remote-File-Inclusion (RFI) risks might arise.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access sensitive services or files of network-reachable components by modifying outgoing calls of affected components.

### Detection Logic

In-scope non-client systems accessing (using outgoing communication links) targets with either HTTP or HTTPS protocol.

### Risk Rating

The risk rating (low or medium) depends on the sensitivity of the data assets receivable via web protocols from targets within the same network trust-boundary as well on the sensitivity of the data assets receivable via web protocols from the target asset itself. Also for cloud-based environments the exploitation impact is at least medium, as cloud backend services can be attacked via SSRF.

### False Positives

Servers not sending outgoing web requests can be considered as false positives after review.

### Mitigation (Development): SSRF Prevention

Try to avoid constructing the outgoing target URL with caller controllable values. Alternatively use a mapping (whitelist) when accessing outgoing URLs instead of creating them including caller controllable values. When a third-party product is used instead of custom developed software, check if the product applies the proper mitigation and ensure a reasonable patch-level.

ASVS Chapter: [V12 - File and Resources Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Server Side Request Forgery Prevention Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)** was found **3 times** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)** risk at **App Server** server-side web-requesting the target **Private Subnet** via **Internal Access**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

`server-side-request-forgery@app-server@Private-Subnet@app-server>internal-access`

**Unchecked**

**Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)** risk at **Public Subnet** server-side web-requesting the target **Linux Bastion Host** via **Public Subnet Include Bastion Host**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

`server-side-request-forgery@Public-Subnet@Linux-Bastion-Host@Public-Subnet>public-subnet-include-bastion-host`

**Unchecked**

**Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)** risk at **Public Subnet** server-side web-requesting the target **Public Route 1** via **Subnet to Route table connection**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

`server-side-request-forgery@Public-Subnet@public-route-1@Public-Subnet>subnet-to-route-table-connection`

**Unchecked**

## Unencrypted Communication: 2 / 2 Risks

**Description** (Information Disclosure): [CWE 319](#)

Due to the confidentiality and/or integrity rating of the data assets transferred over the communication link this connection must be encrypted.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, network attackers might be able to eavesdrop on unencrypted sensitive data sent between components.

### Detection Logic

Unencrypted technical communication links of in-scope technical assets (excluding monitoring traffic as well as local-file-access and in-process-library-call) transferring sensitive data.

### Risk Rating

Depending on the confidentiality rating of the transferred data-assets either medium or high risk.

### False Positives

When all sensitive data sent over the communication link is already fully encrypted on document or data level. Also intra-container/pod communication can be considered false positive when container orchestration platform handles encryption.

### Mitigation (Operations): Encryption of Communication Links

Apply transport layer encryption to the communication link.

ASVS Chapter: [V9 - Communication Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Transport Layer Protection Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?



## Risk Findings

The risk **Unencrypted Communication** was found **2 times** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Unencrypted Communication** named **Database Traffic** between **Private Subnet** and **RDS Subnet** transferring authentication data (like credentials, token, session-id, etc.): Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

`unencrypted-communication@Private-Subnet>database-traffic@Private-Subnet@sql-database`

**Unchecked**

### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Unencrypted Communication** named **Database Traffic** between **RDS Subnet** and **Db Instance** transferring authentication data (like credentials, token, session-id, etc.): Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

`unencrypted-communication@sql-database>database-traffic@sql-database@db-instance`

**Unchecked**

## Unguarded Direct Datastore Access: 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Elevation of Privilege): [CWE 501](#)

Datastores accessed across trust boundaries must be guarded by some protecting service or application.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to directly attack sensitive datastores without any protecting components in-between.

### Detection Logic

In-scope technical assets of type datastore (except identity-store-ldap when accessed from identity-provider and file-server when accessed via file transfer protocols) with confidentiality rating of confidential (or higher) or with integrity rating of critical (or higher) which have incoming data-flows from assets outside across a network trust-boundary. DevOps config and deployment access is excluded from this risk.

### Risk Rating

The matching technical assets are at low risk. When either the confidentiality rating is strictly-confidential or the integrity rating is mission-critical, the risk-rating is considered medium. For assets with RAA values higher than 40 % the risk-rating increases.

### False Positives

When the caller is considered fully trusted as if it was part of the datastore itself.

### Mitigation (Architecture): Encapsulation of Datastore

Encapsulate the datastore access behind a guarding service or application.

ASVS Chapter: [V1 - Architecture, Design and Threat Modeling Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Attack Surface Analysis Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Unguarded Direct Datastore Access** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Unguarded Direct Datastore Access of RDS Subnet by Private Subnet via Database Traffic:** Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

`unguarded-direct-datastore-access@Private-Subnet>database-traffic@Private-Subnet@sql-database`

**Unchecked**

## Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF): 5 / 5 Risks

**Description** (Spoofing): [CWE 352](#)

When a web application is accessed via web protocols Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) risks might arise.

### Impact

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to trick logged-in victim users into unwanted actions within the web application by visiting an attacker controlled web site.

### Detection Logic

In-scope web applications accessed via typical web access protocols.

### Risk Rating

The risk rating depends on the integrity rating of the data sent across the communication link.

### False Positives

Web applications passing the authentication state via custom headers instead of cookies can eventually be false positives. Also when the web application is not accessed via a browser-like component (i.e not by a human user initiating the request that gets passed through all components until it reaches the web application) this can be considered a false positive.

### Mitigation (Development): CSRF Prevention

Try to use anti-CSRF tokens or the double-submit patterns (at least for logged-in requests). When your authentication scheme depends on cookies (like session or token cookies), consider marking them with the same-site flag. When a third-party product is used instead of custom developed software, check if the product applies the proper mitigation and ensure a reasonable patch-level.

ASVS Chapter: [V4 - Access Control Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Cross-Site Request Forgery Prevention Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)** was found **5 times** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Medium Risk Severity

**Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) risk at Linux Bastion Host via Bastion Host Access from Internet Gateway:** Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[cross-site-request-forgery@Linux-Bastion-Host@internet-gateway>bastion-host-access](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) risk at Linux Bastion Host via Public Subnet Include Bastion Host from Public Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[cross-site-request-forgery@Linux-Bastion-Host@Public-Subnet>public-subnet-include-bastion-host](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) risk at Private Subnet via Internal Access from App Server:** Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[cross-site-request-forgery@Private-Subnet@app-server>internal-access](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) risk at Public Route 1 via Route Table Access from Internet Gateway:** Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[cross-site-request-forgery@public-route-1@internet-gateway>route-table-access](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) risk at Public Route 1 via Subnet to Route table connection from Public Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[cross-site-request-forgery@public-route-1@Public-Subnet>subnet-to-route-table-connection](#)

**Unchecked**

## DoS-risky Access Across Trust-Boundary: 4 / 4 Risks

**Description** (Denial of Service): [CWE 400](#)

Assets accessed across trust boundaries with critical or mission-critical availability rating are more prone to Denial-of-Service (DoS) risks.

### Impact

If this risk remains unmitigated, attackers might be able to disturb the availability of important parts of the system.

### Detection Logic

In-scope technical assets (excluding load-balancer) with availability rating of critical or higher which have incoming data-flows across a network trust-boundary (excluding devops usage).

### Risk Rating

Matching technical assets with availability rating of critical or higher are at low risk. When the availability rating is mission-critical and neither a VPN nor IP filter for the incoming data-flow nor redundancy for the asset is applied, the risk-rating is considered medium.

### False Positives

When the accessed target operations are not time- or resource-consuming.

### Mitigation (Operations): Anti-DoS Measures

Apply anti-DoS techniques like throttling and/or per-client load blocking with quotas. Also for maintenance access routes consider applying a VPN instead of public reachable interfaces. Generally applying redundancy on the targeted technical asset reduces the risk of DoS.

ASVS Chapter: [V1 - Architecture, Design and Threat Modeling Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Denial of Service Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **DoS-risky Access Across Trust-Boundary** was found **4 times** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Medium Risk Severity

**Denial-of-Service** risky access of **RDS Subnet** by **Private Subnet** via **Database Traffic**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[dos-risky-access-across-trust-boundary@sql-database@Private-Subnet@Private-Subnet>database-traffic](#)

**Unchecked**

### Low Risk Severity

**Denial-of-Service** risky access of **Private Subnet** by **App Server** via **Internal Access**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

[dos-risky-access-across-trust-boundary@Private-Subnet@app-server@app-server>internal-access](#)

**Unchecked**

**Denial-of-Service** risky access of **Public Route 1** by **Internet Gateway** via **Route Table Access**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

[dos-risky-access-across-trust-boundary@public-route-1@internet-gateway@internet-gateway>route-table-access](#)

**Unchecked**

**Denial-of-Service** risky access of **Public Route 1** by **Public Subnet** via **Subnet to Route table connection**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

[dos-risky-access-across-trust-boundary@public-route-1@Public-Subnet@Public-Subnet>subnet-to-route-table-connection](#)

**Unchecked**

## Missing Build Infrastructure: 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Tampering): [CWE 1127](#)

The modeled architecture does not contain a build infrastructure (devops-client, sourcecode-repo, build-pipeline, etc.), which might be the risk of a model missing critical assets (and thus not seeing their risks). If the architecture contains custom-developed parts, the pipeline where code gets developed and built needs to be part of the model.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to exploit risks unseen in this threat model due to critical build infrastructure components missing in the model.

### Detection Logic

Models with in-scope custom-developed parts missing in-scope development (code creation) and build infrastructure components (devops-client, sourcecode-repo, build-pipeline, etc.).

### Risk Rating

The risk rating depends on the highest sensitivity of the in-scope assets running custom-developed parts.

### False Positives

Models not having any custom-developed parts can be considered as false positives after individual review.

### Mitigation (Architecture): Build Pipeline Hardening

Include the build infrastructure in the model.

ASVS Chapter: [V1 - Architecture, Design and Threat Modeling Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Attack Surface Analysis Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?



## Risk Findings

The risk **Missing Build Infrastructure** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Missing Build Infrastructure** in the threat model (referencing asset **Public Subnet** as an example): Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-build-infrastructure@Public-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

## Missing Identity Propagation: 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Elevation of Privilege): [CWE 284](#)

Technical assets (especially multi-tenant systems), which usually process data for endusers should authorize every request based on the identity of the enduser when the data flow is authenticated (i.e. non-public). For DevOps usages at least a technical-user authorization is required.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access or modify foreign data after a successful compromise of a component within the system due to missing resource-based authorization checks.

### Detection Logic

In-scope service-like technical assets which usually process data based on enduser requests, if authenticated (i.e. non-public), should authorize incoming requests based on the propagated enduser identity when their rating is sensitive. This is especially the case for all multi-tenant assets (there even less-sensitive rated ones). DevOps usages are exempted from this risk.

### Risk Rating

The risk rating (medium or high) depends on the confidentiality, integrity, and availability rating of the technical asset.

### False Positives

Technical assets which do not process requests regarding functionality or data linked to end-users (customers) can be considered as false positives after individual review.

**Mitigation** (Architecture): Identity Propagation and Resource-based Authorization

When processing requests for endusers if possible authorize in the backend against the propagated identity of the enduser. This can be achieved in passing JWTs or similar tokens and checking them in the backend services. For DevOps usages apply at least a technical-user authorization.

ASVS Chapter: [V4 - Access Control Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Access Control Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Missing Identity Propagation** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Missing Enduser Identity Propagation** over communication link **Internal Access** from **App Server** to **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-identity-propagation@app-server>internal-access@app-server@Private-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

## Missing Two-Factor Authentication (2FA): 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Elevation of Privilege): [CWE 308](#)

Technical assets (especially multi-tenant systems) should authenticate incoming requests with two-factor (2FA) authentication when the asset processes or stores highly sensitive data (in terms of confidentiality, integrity, and availability) and is accessed by humans.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access or modify highly sensitive data without strong authentication.

### Detection Logic

In-scope technical assets (except load-balancer, reverse-proxy, waf, ids, and ips) should authenticate incoming requests via two-factor authentication (2FA) when the asset processes or stores highly sensitive data (in terms of confidentiality, integrity, and availability) and is accessed by a client used by a human user.

### Risk Rating

medium

### False Positives

Technical assets which do not process requests regarding functionality or data linked to end-users (customers) can be considered as false positives after individual review.

### Mitigation (Business Side): Authentication with Second Factor (2FA)

Apply an authentication method to the technical asset protecting highly sensitive data via two-factor authentication for human users.

ASVS Chapter: [V2 - Authentication Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Multifactor Authentication Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Missing Two-Factor Authentication (2FA)** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Missing Two-Factor Authentication** covering communication link **Internal Access** from **App Server** to **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-authentication-second-factor@app-server>internal-access@app-server@Private-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

## Missing Vault (Secret Storage): 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Information Disclosure): [CWE 522](#)

In order to avoid the risk of secret leakage via config files (when attacked through vulnerabilities being able to read files like Path-Traversal and others), it is best practice to use a separate hardened process with proper authentication, authorization, and audit logging to access config secrets (like credentials, private keys, client certificates, etc.). This component is usually some kind of Vault.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to easier steal config secrets (like credentials, private keys, client certificates, etc.) once a vulnerability to access files is present and exploited.

### Detection Logic

Models without a Vault (Secret Storage).

### Risk Rating

The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

### False Positives

Models where no technical assets have any kind of sensitive config data to protect can be considered as false positives after individual review.

### Mitigation (Architecture): Vault (Secret Storage)

Consider using a Vault (Secret Storage) to securely store and access config secrets (like credentials, private keys, client certificates, etc.).

ASVS Chapter: [V6 - Stored Cryptography Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Cryptographic Storage Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Is a Vault (Secret Storage) in place?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Missing Vault (Secret Storage)** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Missing Vault (Secret Storage)** in the threat model (referencing asset **Private Subnet** as an example): Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-vault@Private-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

## Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF): 3 / 3 Risks

**Description** (Tampering): [CWE 1008](#)

To have a first line of filtering defense, security architectures with web-services or web-applications should include a WAF in front of them. Even though a WAF is not a replacement for security (all components must be secure even without a WAF) it adds another layer of defense to the overall system by delaying some attacks and having easier attack alerting through it.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to apply standard attack pattern tests at great speed without any filtering.

### Detection Logic

In-scope web-services and/or web-applications accessed across a network trust boundary not having a Web Application Firewall (WAF) in front of them.

### Risk Rating

The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

### False Positives

Targets only accessible via WAFs or reverse proxies containing a WAF component (like ModSecurity) can be considered as false positives after individual review.

### Mitigation (Operations): Web Application Firewall (WAF)

Consider placing a Web Application Firewall (WAF) in front of the web-services and/or web-applications. For cloud environments many cloud providers offer pre-configured WAFs. Even reverse proxies can be enhanced by a WAF component via ModSecurity plugins.

ASVS Chapter: [V1 - Architecture, Design and Threat Modeling Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Virtual Patching Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Is a Web Application Firewall (WAF) in place?



## Risk Findings

The risk **Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF)** was found **3 times** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Medium Risk Severity

**Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF)** risk at **Linux Bastion Host**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-waf@Linux-Bastion-Host](#)

**Unchecked**

**Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF)** risk at **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-waf@Private-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

**Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF)** risk at **Public Route 1**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-waf@public-route-1](#)

**Unchecked**

## Mixed Targets on Shared Runtime: 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Elevation of Privilege): [CWE 1008](#)

Different attacker targets (like frontend and backend/datastore components) should not be running on the same shared (underlying) runtime.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers successfully attacking other components of the system might have an easy path towards more valuable targets, as they are running on the same shared runtime.

### Detection Logic

Shared runtime running technical assets of different trust-boundaries is at risk. Also mixing backend/datastore with frontend components on the same shared runtime is considered a risk.

### Risk Rating

The risk rating (low or medium) depends on the confidentiality, integrity, and availability rating of the technical asset running on the shared runtime.

### False Positives

When all assets running on the shared runtime are hardened and protected to the same extend as if all were containing/processing highly sensitive data.

### Mitigation (Operations): Runtime Separation

Use separate runtime environments for running different target components or apply similar separation styles to prevent load- or breach-related problems originating from one more attacker-facing asset impacts also the other more critical rated backend/datastore assets.

ASVS Chapter: [V1 - Architecture, Design and Threat Modeling Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Attack Surface Analysis Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Mixed Targets on Shared Runtime** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Mixed Targets on Shared Runtime** named **Subnet and Instance Virtualization** might enable attackers moving from one less valuable target to a more valuable one: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[mixed-targets-on-shared-runtime@Instance-virtualization](#)

**Unchecked**

## Unencrypted Technical Assets: 7 / 7 Risks

**Description** (Information Disclosure): [CWE 311](#)

Due to the confidentiality rating of the technical asset itself and/or the processed data assets this technical asset must be encrypted. The risk rating depends on the sensitivity technical asset itself and of the data assets stored.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to access unencrypted data when successfully compromising sensitive components.

### Detection Logic

In-scope unencrypted technical assets (excluding reverse-proxy, load-balancer, waf, ids, ips and embedded components like library) storing data assets rated at least as confidential or critical. For technical assets storing data assets rated as strictly-confidential or mission-critical the encryption must be of type data-with-enduser-individual-key.

### Risk Rating

Depending on the confidentiality rating of the stored data-assets either medium or high risk.

### False Positives

When all sensitive data stored within the asset is already fully encrypted on document or data level.

### Mitigation (Operations): Encryption of Technical Asset

Apply encryption to the technical asset.

ASVS Chapter: [V6 - Stored Cryptography Verification Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Cryptographic Storage Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Unencrypted Technical Assets** was found **7 times** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Medium Risk Severity

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **App Server**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@app-server](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **Internet Gateway**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@internet-gateway](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **Linux Bastion Host**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@Linux-Bastion-Host](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@Private-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **Public Route 1**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@public-route-1](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **Public Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@Public-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **RDS Subnet** missing enduser-individual encryption with data-with-enduser-individual-key: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@sql-database](#)

**Unchecked**

## Unguarded Access From Internet: 1 / 1 Risk

**Description** (Elevation of Privilege): [CWE 501](#)

Internet-exposed assets must be guarded by a protecting service, application, or reverse-proxy.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to directly attack sensitive systems without any hardening components in-between due to them being directly exposed on the internet.

### Detection Logic

In-scope technical assets (excluding load-balancer) with confidentiality rating of confidential (or higher) or with integrity rating of critical (or higher) when accessed directly from the internet. All web-server, web-application, reverse-proxy, waf, and gateway assets are exempted from this risk when they do not consist of custom developed code and the data-flow only consists of HTTP or FTP protocols. Access from monitoring systems as well as VPN-protected connections are exempted.

### Risk Rating

The matching technical assets are at low risk. When either the confidentiality rating is strictly-confidential or the integrity rating is mission-critical, the risk-rating is considered medium. For assets with RAA values higher than 40 % the risk-rating increases.

### False Positives

When other means of filtering client requests are applied equivalent of reverse-proxy, waf, or gateway components.

### Mitigation (Architecture): Encapsulation of Technical Asset

Encapsulate the asset behind a guarding service, application, or reverse-proxy. For admin maintenance a bastion-host should be used as a jump-server. For file transfer a store-and-forward-host should be used as an indirect file exchange platform.

ASVS Chapter: [V1 - Architecture, Design and Threat Modeling Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Attack Surface Analysis Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?

## Risk Findings

The risk **Unguarded Access From Internet** was found **1 time** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Unguarded Access from Internet of Public Route 1 by Internet Gateway via Route Table Access:** Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[unguarded-access-from-internet@public-route-1@internet-gateway@internet-gateway>route-table-access](#)

**Unchecked**

## Unnecessary Data Transfer: 8 / 8 Risks

**Description** (Elevation of Privilege): [CWE 1008](#)

When a technical asset sends or receives data assets, which it neither processes or stores this is an indicator for unnecessarily transferred data (or for an incomplete model). When the unnecessarily transferred data assets are sensitive, this poses an unnecessary risk of an increased attack surface.

### Impact

If this risk is unmitigated, attackers might be able to target unnecessarily transferred data.

### Detection Logic

In-scope technical assets sending or receiving sensitive data assets which are neither processed nor stored by the technical asset are flagged with this risk. The risk rating (low or medium) depends on the confidentiality, integrity, and availability rating of the technical asset. Monitoring data is exempted from this risk.

### Risk Rating

The risk assessment is depending on the confidentiality and integrity rating of the transferred data asset either low or medium.

### False Positives

Technical assets missing the model entries of either processing or storing the mentioned data assets can be considered as false positives (incomplete models) after individual review. These should then be addressed by completing the model so that all necessary data assets are processed and/or stored by the technical asset involved.

**Mitigation** (Architecture): Attack Surface Reduction

Try to avoid sending or receiving sensitive data assets which are not required (i.e. neither processed or stored) by the involved technical asset.

ASVS Chapter: [V1 - Architecture, Design and Threat Modeling Requirements](#)

Cheat Sheet: [Attack Surface Analysis Cheat Sheet](#)

### Check

Are recommendations from the linked cheat sheet and referenced ASVS chapter applied?



## Risk Findings

The risk **Unnecessary Data Transfer** was found **8 times** in the analyzed architecture to be potentially possible. Each spot should be checked individually by reviewing the implementation whether all controls have been applied properly in order to mitigate each risk.

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Medium Risk Severity

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Database Data Transfer data at Db Instance from/to RDS Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[unnecessary-data-transfer@database-data-transfer@db-instance@sql-database](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Internet Data Transfer data at Db Instance from/to RDS Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@db-instance@sql-database](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Internet Data Transfer data at Private Subnet from/to RDS Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@Private-Subnet@sql-database](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Internet Data Transfer data at RDS Subnet from/to Db Instance:** Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@sql-database@db-instance](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Internet Data Transfer data at RDS Subnet from/to Private Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@sql-database@Private-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

### Low Risk Severity

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Data Transfer data at App Server from/to Private Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

[unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@app-server@Private-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Data Transfer data at Public Route 1 from/to Public Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

[unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@public-route-1@Public-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unnecessary Data Transfer** of **Data Transfer** data at **Public Subnet** from/to **Public Route 1**:  
Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@Public-Subnet@public-route-1

**Unchecked**

## Identified Risks by Technical Asset

In total **54 potential risks** have been identified during the threat modeling process of which **0 are rated as critical, 2 as high, 18 as elevated, 28 as medium, and 6 as low.**

These risks are distributed across **8 in-scope technical assets**. The following sub-chapters of this section describe each identified risk grouped by technical asset. The RAA value of a technical asset is the calculated "Relative Attacker Attractiveness" value in percent.

## Private Subnet: 12 / 12 Risks

### Description

Used for database and app server

### Identified Risks of Asset

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

#### High Risk Severity

**SQL/NoSQL-Injection** risk at **Private Subnet** against database **RDS Subnet** via **Database Traffic**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *High* impact.

`sql-nosql-injection@Private-Subnet@sql-database@Private-Subnet>database-traffic`

Unchecked

**XML External Entity (XXE)** risk at **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *High* impact.

`xml-external-entity@Private-Subnet`

Unchecked

#### Elevated Risk Severity

**Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)** risk at **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

`cross-site-scripting@Private-Subnet`

Unchecked

**Unencrypted Communication** named **Database Traffic** between **Private Subnet** and **RDS Subnet** transferring authentication data (like credentials, token, session-id, etc.): Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

`unencrypted-communication@Private-Subnet>database-traffic@Private-Subnet@sql-database`

Unchecked

#### Medium Risk Severity

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

`unencrypted-asset@Private-Subnet`

Unchecked

**Missing Enduser Identity Propagation** over communication link **Internal Access** from **App Server** to **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

missing-identity-propagation@app-server>internal-access@app-server@Private-Subnet

**Unchecked**

**Missing Two-Factor Authentication** covering communication link **Internal Access** from **App Server** to **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

missing-authentication-second-factor@app-server>internal-access@app-server@Private-Subnet

**Unchecked**

**Missing Vault (Secret Storage)** in the threat model (referencing asset **Private Subnet** as an example): Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

missing-vault@Private-Subnet

**Unchecked**

**Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF)** risk at **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

missing-waf@Private-Subnet

**Unchecked**

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Internet Data Transfer** data at **Private Subnet** from/to **RDS Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@Private-Subnet@sql-database

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)** risk at **Private Subnet** via **Internal Access** from **App Server**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

cross-site-request-forgery@Private-Subnet@app-server>internal-access

**Unchecked**

## Low Risk Severity

**Denial-of-Service** risky access of **Private Subnet** by **App Server** via **Internal Access**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

dos-risky-access-across-trust-boundary@Private-Subnet@app-server@app-server>internal-access

**Unchecked**

## Asset Information

|             |                |
|-------------|----------------|
| ID:         | Private-Subnet |
| Type:       | process        |
| Usage:      | business       |
| RAA:        | 39 %           |
| Size:       | application    |
| Technology: | web-server     |
| Tags:       | linux          |

|                   |                                       |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Internet:         | false                                 |
| Machine:          | virtual                               |
| Encryption:       | none                                  |
| Multi-Tenant:     | false                                 |
| Redundant:        | true                                  |
| Custom-Developed: | false                                 |
| Client by Human:  | false                                 |
| Data Processed:   | Data Transfer, Database Data Transfer |
| Data Stored:      | App server logs                       |
| Formats Accepted: | File, XML                             |

## Asset Rating

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Owner:             | shashank  |
| Confidentiality:   | strictly-confidential (rated 5 in scale of 5)               |
| Integrity:         | mission-critical (rated 5 in scale of 5)                    |
| Availability:      | mission-critical (rated 5 in scale of 5)                    |
| CIA-Justification: | The private instance contains sensitive data of application |

## Outgoing Communication Links: 1

Target technical asset names are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Database Traffic (outgoing)

[Link to the RDS Subnet Instance](#)

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Target:         | RDS Subnet                                     |
| Protocol:       | jdbc   |
| Encrypted:      | false  |
| Authentication: | credentials                                    |
| Authorization:  | technical-user                                 |
| Read-Only:      | false  |
| Usage:          | business                                       |
| Tags:           | none   |
| VPN:            | false  |
| IP-Filtered:    | false  |
| Data Sent:      | Database Data Transfer, Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Received:  | Database Data Transfer, Internet Data Transfer |

**Incoming Communication Links: 1**

Source technical asset names are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

Internal Access (incoming)  
Link to the Private system

|                 |                                       |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Source:         | App Server                            |
| Protocol:       | https                                 |
| Encrypted:      | true                                  |
| Authentication: | token                                 |
| Authorization:  | technical-user                        |
| Read-Only:      | false                                 |
| Usage:          | business                              |
| Tags:           | aws:ec2                               |
| VPN:            | true                                  |
| IP-Filtered:    | false                                 |
| Data Received:  | Database Data Transfer                |
| Data Sent:      | Data Transfer, Database Data Transfer |

## App Server: 4 / 4 Risks

### Description

App Server

### Identified Risks of Asset

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

#### Elevated Risk Severity

**Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)** risk at **App Server**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[cross-site-scripting@app-server](#)

Unchecked

**Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)** risk at **App Server** server-side web-requesting the target **Private Subnet** via **Internal Access**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

[server-side-request-forgery@app-server@Private-Subnet@app-server>internal-access](#)

Unchecked

#### Medium Risk Severity

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **App Server**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@app-server](#)

Unchecked

#### Low Risk Severity

**Unnecessary Data Transfer** of **Data Transfer** data at **App Server** from/to **Private Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

[unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@app-server@Private-Subnet](#)

Unchecked

### Asset Information

|        |                 |
|--------|-----------------|
| ID:    | app-server      |
| Type:  | external-entity |
| Usage: | business        |
| RAA:   | 16 %            |



|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Size:             | application  |
| Technology:       | web-server   |
| Tags:             | none   |
| Internet:         | false  |
| Machine:          | virtual  |
| Encryption:       | none   |
| Multi-Tenant:     | false  |
| Redundant:        | false  |
| Custom-Developed: | false  |
| Client by Human:  | true   |
| Data Processed:   | App server logs, Database Data Transfer, Server Application Code |
| Data Stored:      | none   |
| Formats Accepted: | none of the special data formats accepted                        |

## Asset Rating

|                    |   |                         |
|--------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Owner:             | Shashank  |                         |
| Confidentiality:   | confidential  | (rated 4 in scale of 5) |
| Integrity:         | important   | (rated 3 in scale of 5) |
| Availability:      | important   | (rated 3 in scale of 5) |
| CIA-Justification: | The client used by Shashank to administer and use the system. |                         |

## Outgoing Communication Links: 1

Target technical asset names are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Internal Access (outgoing)

Link to the Private system

|                 |                |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Target:         | Private Subnet |
| Protocol:       | https          |
| Encrypted:      | true           |
| Authentication: | token          |
| Authorization:  | technical-user |
| Read-Only:      | false          |
| Usage:          | business       |
| Tags:           | aws:ec2        |
| VPN:            | true           |
| IP-Filtered:    | false          |

Data Sent: Database Data Transfer

Data Received: Data Transfer, Database Data Transfer

## Linux Bastion Host: 6 / 6 Risks

### Description

Linux bastion host for hosting the application

### Identified Risks of Asset

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

#### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)** risk at **Linux Bastion Host**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[cross-site-scripting@Linux-Bastion-Host](#)

**Unchecked**

**Missing Authentication** covering communication link **Bastion Host Access** from **Internet Gateway to Linux Bastion Host**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[missing-authentication@internet-gateway>bastion-host-access@internet-gateway@Linux-Bastion-Host](#)

**Unchecked**

#### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **Linux Bastion Host**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@Linux-Bastion-Host](#)

**Unchecked**

**Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF)** risk at **Linux Bastion Host**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-waf@Linux-Bastion-Host](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)** risk at **Linux Bastion Host** via **Bastion Host Access** from **Internet Gateway**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[cross-site-request-forgery@Linux-Bastion-Host@internet-gateway>bastion-host-access](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)** risk at **Linux Bastion Host** via **Public Subnet Include Bastion Host** from **Public Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[cross-site-request-forgery@Linux-Bastion-Host@Public-Subnet>public-subnet-include-bastion-host](#)

**Unchecked**

## Asset Information

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| ID:               | Linux-Bastion-Host                              |
| Type:             | process   |
| Usage:            | business  |
| RAA:              | 1 %   |
| Size:             | application                                     |
| Technology:       | web-server                                      |
| Tags:             | linux   |
| Internet:         | false   |
| Machine:          | virtual   |
| Encryption:       | none  |
| Multi-Tenant:     | false   |
| Redundant:        | false   |
| Custom-Developed: | true  |
| Client by Human:  | false   |
| Data Processed:   | Client Application Code, Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Stored:      | Client Application Code                         |
| Formats Accepted: | none of the special data formats accepted       |

## Asset Rating

|                    |  |                         |
|--------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Owner:             | shashank   |                         |
| Confidentiality:   | internal   | (rated 2 in scale of 5) |
| Integrity:         | important  | (rated 3 in scale of 5) |
| Availability:      | important  | (rated 3 in scale of 5) |
| CIA-Justification: | The correct configuration and reachability of the web server is mandatory for all customer usages of the portal. |                         |

## Incoming Communication Links: 2

Source technical asset names are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Bastion Host Access (incoming)

Link to the Bastion host

|            |                  |
|------------|------------------|
| Source:    | Internet Gateway |
| Protocol:  | https            |
| Encrypted: | true             |

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Authentication: | none                   |
| Authorization:  | none                   |
| Read-Only:      | false                  |
| Usage:          | business               |
| Tags:           | none                   |
| VPN:            | false                  |
| IP-Filtered:    | false                  |
| Data Received:  | Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Sent:      | none                   |

### Public Subnet Include Bastion Host (incoming)

Link to the bastion host

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Source:         | Public Subnet                                   |
| Protocol:       | https   |
| Encrypted:      | true  |
| Authentication: | session-id                                      |
| Authorization:  | technical-user                                  |
| Read-Only:      | false   |
| Usage:          | business  |
| Tags:           | none  |
| VPN:            | false   |
| IP-Filtered:    | false   |
| Data Received:  | Client Application Code, Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Sent:      | Client Application Code, Internet Data Transfer |

## Public Route 1: 9 / 9 Risks

### Description

#### Public Route 1

### Identified Risks of Asset

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

#### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)** risk at **Public Route 1**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[cross-site-scripting@public-route-1](#)

**Unchecked**

#### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **Public Route 1**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@public-route-1](#)

**Unchecked**

**Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF)** risk at **Public Route 1**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-waf@public-route-1](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)** risk at **Public Route 1** via **Route Table Access** from **Internet Gateway**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[cross-site-request-forgery@public-route-1@internet-gateway>route-table-access](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)** risk at **Public Route 1** via **Subnet to Route table connection** from **Public Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[cross-site-request-forgery@public-route-1@Public-Subnet>subnet-to-route-table-connection](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unguarded Access from Internet of Public Route 1** by **Internet Gateway** via **Route Table Access**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Low* impact.

[unguarded-access-from-internet@public-route-1@internet-gateway@internet-gateway>route-table-access](#)

**Unchecked**

## Low Risk Severity

**Denial-of-Service** risky access of **Public Route 1** by **Internet Gateway** via **Route Table Access**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

dos-risky-access-trust-boundary@public-route-1@internet-gateway@internet-gateway>route-table-access

Unchecked

**Denial-of-Service** risky access of **Public Route 1** by **Public Subnet** via **Subnet to Route table connection**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

dos-risky-access-across-trust-boundary@public-route-1@Public-Subnet@Public-Subnet>subnet-to-route-table-connection

Unchecked

**Unnecessary Data Transfer** of **Data Transfer** data at **Public Route 1** from/to **Public Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@public-route-1@Public-Subnet

Unchecked

## Asset Information

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| ID:               | public-route-1                            |
| Type:             | process                                   |
| Usage:            | business                                  |
| RAA:              | 32 %                                      |
| Size:             | component                                 |
| Technology:       | identity-provider                         |
| Tags:             | none                                      |
| Internet:         | true                                      |
| Machine:          | virtual                                   |
| Encryption:       | none                                      |
| Multi-Tenant:     | false                                     |
| Redundant:        | false                                     |
| Custom-Developed: | false                                     |
| Client by Human:  | false                                     |
| Data Processed:   | Internet Data Transfer                    |
| Data Stored:      | none                                      |
| Formats Accepted: | none of the special data formats accepted |

## Asset Rating

|                  |              |                         |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Owner:           | shashank     |                         |
| Confidentiality: | confidential | (rated 4 in scale of 5) |

Integrity: critical (rated 4 in scale of 5)  
Availability: critical (rated 4 in scale of 5)  
CIA-Justification: The auth data of the application

## Incoming Communication Links: 2

Source technical asset names are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Route Table Access (incoming)

[Link to the public route 1](#)

Source: Internet Gateway  
Protocol: https  
Encrypted: true  
Authentication: credentials  
Authorization: technical-user  
Read-Only: false  
Usage: business  
Tags: none  
VPN: false  
IP-Filtered: false  
Data Received: Internet Data Transfer  
Data Sent: Internet Data Transfer

### Subnet to Route table connection (incoming)

[Link to the Public Route 1](#)

Source: Public Subnet  
Protocol: https  
Encrypted: true  
Authentication: credentials  
Authorization: none  
Read-Only: false  
Usage: business  
Tags: none  
VPN: false  
IP-Filtered: false  
Data Received: Data Transfer  
Data Sent: Data Transfer



## Public Subnet: 8 / 8 Risks

### Description

Public Subnet hosting the client-side code

### Identified Risks of Asset

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

#### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**Missing Cloud Hardening (EC2)** risk at **Public Subnet**: [CIS Benchmark for Amazon Linux](#): Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Very High* impact.

[missing-cloud-hardening@Public-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

**Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)** risk at **Public Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *High* impact.

[cross-site-scripting@Public-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

**Missing File Validation** risk at **Public Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Medium* impact.

[missing-file-validation@Public-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

**Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)** risk at **Public Subnet** server-side web-requesting the target **Linux Bastion Host** via **Public Subnet Include Bastion Host**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

[server-side-request-forgery@Public-Subnet@Linux-Bastion-Host@Public-Subnet>public-subnet-include-bastion-host](#)

**Unchecked**

**Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)** risk at **Public Subnet** server-side web-requesting the target **Public Route 1** via **Subnet to Route table connection**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

[server-side-request-forgery@Public-Subnet@public-route-1@Public-Subnet>subnet-to-route-table-connection](#)

**Unchecked**

#### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **Public Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

[unencrypted-asset@Public-Subnet](#)

**Unchecked**

**Missing Build Infrastructure** in the threat model (referencing asset **Public Subnet** as an example): Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

missing-build-infrastructure@Public-Subnet

**Unchecked**

### Low Risk Severity

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Data Transfer** data at **Public Subnet** from/to **Public Route 1**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Low* impact.

unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@Public-Subnet@public-route-1

**Unchecked**

### Asset Information

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| ID:               | Public-Subnet                                   |
| Type:             | process   |
| Usage:            | business  |
| RAA:              | 28 %  |
| Size:             | application                                     |
| Technology:       | web-server                                      |
| Tags:             | aws:ec2, linux                                  |
| Internet:         | false   |
| Machine:          | virtual   |
| Encryption:       | none  |
| Multi-Tenant:     | false   |
| Redundant:        | false   |
| Custom-Developed: | true  |
| Client by Human:  | false   |
| Data Processed:   | Client Application Code, Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Stored:      | Client Application Code                         |
| Formats Accepted: | File, JSON                                      |

### Asset Rating

|                    |   |                         |
|--------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Owner:             | shashank  |                         |
| Confidentiality:   | internal  | (rated 2 in scale of 5) |
| Integrity:         | critical  | (rated 4 in scale of 5) |
| Availability:      | critical  | (rated 4 in scale of 5) |
| CIA-Justification: | The correct configuration and reachability of the Public subnet is mandatory for all resources. |                         |

## Outgoing Communication Links: 2

Target technical asset names are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Subnet to Route table connection (outgoing)

Link to the Public Route 1

|                 |                |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Target:         | Public Route 1 |
| Protocol:       | https          |
| Encrypted:      | true           |
| Authentication: | credentials    |
| Authorization:  | none           |
| Read-Only:      | false          |
| Usage:          | business       |
| Tags:           | none           |
| VPN:            | false          |
| IP-Filtered:    | false          |
| Data Sent:      | Data Transfer  |
| Data Received:  | Data Transfer  |

### Public Subnet Include Bastion Host (outgoing)

Link to the bastion host

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Target:         | Linux Bastion Host                              |
| Protocol:       | https   |
| Encrypted:      | true  |
| Authentication: | session-id                                      |
| Authorization:  | technical-user                                  |
| Read-Only:      | false   |
| Usage:          | business  |
| Tags:           | none  |
| VPN:            | false   |
| IP-Filtered:    | false   |
| Data Sent:      | Client Application Code, Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Received:  | Client Application Code, Internet Data Transfer |

## RDS Subnet: 8 / 8 Risks

### Description

The database behind the private subnet

### Identified Risks of Asset

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

#### *Elevated Risk Severity*

**SQL/NoSQL-Injection** risk at **RDS Subnet** against database **Db Instance** via **Database Traffic**: Exploitation likelihood is *Very Likely* with *Medium* impact.

sql-nosql-injection@sql-database@db-instance@sql-database>database-traffic

**Unchecked**

**Missing Hardening** risk at **RDS Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

missing-hardening@sql-database

**Unchecked**

**Unguarded Direct Datastore Access of RDS Subnet** by **Private Subnet** via **Database Traffic**: Exploitation likelihood is *Likely* with *Medium* impact.

unguarded-direct-datastore-access@Private-Subnet>database-traffic@Private-Subnet@sql-database

**Unchecked**

#### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Unencrypted Communication** named **Database Traffic** between **RDS Subnet** and **Db Instance** transferring authentication data (like credentials, token, session-id, etc.): Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

unencrypted-communication@sql-database>database-traffic@sql-database@db-instance

**Unchecked**

**Denial-of-Service** risky access of **RDS Subnet** by **Private Subnet** via **Database Traffic**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

dos-risky-access-across-trust-boundary@sql-database@Private-Subnet@Private-Subnet>database-traffic

**Unchecked**

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **RDS Subnet** missing enduser-individual encryption with data-with-enduser-individual-key: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

unencrypted-asset@sql-database

**Unchecked**

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Internet Data Transfer data at RDS Subnet from/to Db Instance:** Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@sql-database@db-instance

**Unchecked****Unnecessary Data Transfer of Internet Data Transfer data at RDS Subnet from/to Private Subnet:** Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@sql-database@Private-Subnet

**Unchecked****Asset Information**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| ID:               | sql-database   |
| Type:             | datastore  |
| Usage:            | business   |
| RAA:              | 100 %  |
| Size:             | component  |
| Technology:       | database   |
| Tags:             | linux, mysql   |
| Internet:         | false  |
| Machine:          | virtual  |
| Encryption:       | data-with-symmetric-shared-key                         |
| Multi-Tenant:     | false  |
| Redundant:        | false  |
| Custom-Developed: | false  |
| Client by Human:  | false  |
| Data Processed:   | Database Customizing and Dumps, Database Data Transfer |
| Data Stored:      | Database Data Transfer                                 |
| Formats Accepted: | none of the special data formats accepted              |

**Asset Rating**

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Owner:             | shashank                                      |
| Confidentiality:   | strictly-confidential (rated 5 in scale of 5) |
| Integrity:         | mission-critical (rated 5 in scale of 5)      |
| Availability:      | mission-critical (rated 5 in scale of 5)      |
| CIA-Justification: | The rds database subnet can host databases    |

**Outgoing Communication Links: 1**

Target technical asset names are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

**Database Traffic (outgoing)**

[Link to the RDS Subnet Instance](#)

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Target:         | Db Instance                                    |
| Protocol:       | jdbc   |
| Encrypted:      | false  |
| Authentication: | credentials                                    |
| Authorization:  | technical-user                                 |
| Read-Only:      | false  |
| Usage:          | business                                       |
| Tags:           | none   |
| VPN:            | false  |
| IP-Filtered:    | false  |
| Data Sent:      | Database Data Transfer, Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Received:  | Database Data Transfer, Internet Data Transfer |

**Incoming Communication Links: 1**

Source technical asset names are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

**Database Traffic (incoming)**

[Link to the RDS Subnet Instance](#)

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Source:         | Private Subnet                                 |
| Protocol:       | jdbc   |
| Encrypted:      | false  |
| Authentication: | credentials                                    |
| Authorization:  | technical-user                                 |
| Read-Only:      | false  |
| Usage:          | business                                       |
| Tags:           | none   |
| VPN:            | false  |
| IP-Filtered:    | false  |
| Data Received:  | Database Data Transfer, Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Sent:      | Database Data Transfer, Internet Data Transfer |

## Db Instance: 2 / 2 Risks

### Description

db instance for storing the application data in mysql database

### Identified Risks of Asset

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

#### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Database Data Transfer** data at **Db Instance** from/to **RDS Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[unnecessary-data-transfer@database-data-transfer@db-instance@sql-database](#)

**Unchecked**

**Unnecessary Data Transfer of Internet Data Transfer** data at **Db Instance** from/to **RDS Subnet**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *Medium* impact.

[unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@db-instance@sql-database](#)

**Unchecked**

### Asset Information

|                   |                                |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| ID:               | db-instance                    |
| Type:             | datastore                      |
| Usage:            | business                       |
| RAA:              | 10 %                           |
| Size:             | service                        |
| Technology:       | database                       |
| Tags:             | aws:rds, linux                 |
| Internet:         | false                          |
| Machine:          | virtual                        |
| Encryption:       | data-with-symmetric-shared-key |
| Multi-Tenant:     | false                          |
| Redundant:        | false                          |
| Custom-Developed: | false                          |
| Client by Human:  | false                          |
| Data Processed:   | none                           |
| Data Stored:      | Data Transfer                  |
| Formats Accepted: | File                           |

## Asset Rating

|                    |   |                         |
|--------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Owner:             | shashank  |                         |
| Confidentiality:   | confidential  | (rated 4 in scale of 5) |
| Integrity:         | critical  | (rated 4 in scale of 5) |
| Availability:      | important   | (rated 3 in scale of 5) |
| CIA-Justification: | Db Instance might contain database of the application. Database will be the according to the application requirement. |                         |

## Incoming Communication Links: 1

Source technical asset names are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Database Traffic (incoming)

[Link to the RDS Subnet Instance](#)

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Source:         | RDS Subnet                                     |
| Protocol:       | jdbc   |
| Encrypted:      | false  |
| Authentication: | credentials                                    |
| Authorization:  | technical-user                                 |
| Read-Only:      | false  |
| Usage:          | business                                       |
| Tags:           | none   |
| VPN:            | false  |
| IP-Filtered:    | false  |
| Data Received:  | Database Data Transfer, Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Sent:      | Database Data Transfer, Internet Data Transfer |



## Internet Gateway: 1 / 1 Risk

### Description

Internet Gateway

### Identified Risks of Asset

Risk finding paragraphs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

#### *Medium Risk Severity*

**Unencrypted Technical Asset** named **Internet Gateway**: Exploitation likelihood is *Unlikely* with *High* impact.

unencrypted-asset@internet-gateway

**Unchecked**

### Asset Information

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| ID:               | internet-gateway                          |
| Type:             | external-entity                           |
| Usage:            | business                                  |
| RAA:              | 15 %                                      |
| Size:             | service                                   |
| Technology:       | browser                                   |
| Tags:             | none                                      |
| Internet:         | true                                      |
| Machine:          | virtual                                   |
| Encryption:       | none                                      |
| Multi-Tenant:     | false                                     |
| Redundant:        | false                                     |
| Custom-Developed: | false                                     |
| Client by Human:  | false                                     |
| Data Processed:   | Internet Data Transfer                    |
| Data Stored:      | none                                      |
| Formats Accepted: | none of the special data formats accepted |

### Asset Rating

|                  |          |                         |
|------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| Owner:           | Shashank |                         |
| Confidentiality: | public   | (rated 1 in scale of 5) |

Integrity: operational (rated 2 in scale of 5)  
Availability: operational (rated 2 in scale of 5)  
CIA-Justification: The client used by Shashank to administer the system.

## Outgoing Communication Links: 2

Target technical asset names are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

### Route Table Access (outgoing)

[Link to the public route 1](#)

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Target:         | Public Route 1         |
| Protocol:       | https                  |
| Encrypted:      | true                   |
| Authentication: | credentials            |
| Authorization:  | technical-user         |
| Read-Only:      | false                  |
| Usage:          | business               |
| Tags:           | none                   |
| VPN:            | false                  |
| IP-Filtered:    | false                  |
| Data Sent:      | Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Received:  | Internet Data Transfer |

### Bastion Host Access (outgoing)

[Link to the Bastion host](#)

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Target:         | Linux Bastion Host     |
| Protocol:       | https                  |
| Encrypted:      | true                   |
| Authentication: | none                   |
| Authorization:  | none                   |
| Read-Only:      | false                  |
| Usage:          | business               |
| Tags:           | none                   |
| VPN:            | false                  |
| IP-Filtered:    | false                  |
| Data Sent:      | Internet Data Transfer |
| Data Received:  | none                   |

## Identified Data Breach Probabilities by Data Asset

In total **54 potential risks** have been identified during the threat modeling process of which **0 are rated as critical, 2 as high, 18 as elevated, 28 as medium, and 6 as low.**

These risks are distributed across **7 data assets**. The following sub-chapters of this section describe the derived data breach probabilities grouped by data asset.

Technical asset names and risk IDs are clickable and link to the corresponding chapter.

## App server logs: 15 / 15 Risks

Logs generated by the ERP system.

|                    |   |                         |
|--------------------|---|-------------------------|
| ID:                | app-server-logs   |                         |
| Usage:             | devops  |                         |
| Quantity:          | many  |                         |
| Tags:              | none  |                         |
| Origin:            | Shashank  |                         |
| Owner:             | Shashank  |                         |
| Confidentiality:   | restricted  | (rated 3 in scale of 5) |
| Integrity:         | archive   | (rated 1 in scale of 5) |
| Availability:      | archive   | (rated 1 in scale of 5) |
| CIA-Justification: | Logs should not contain PII data and are only required for failure analysis, i.e. they are not considered as hard transactional logs. |                         |
| Processed by:      | App Server  |                         |
| Stored by:         | Private Subnet  |                         |
| Sent via:          | none  |                         |
| Received via:      | none  |                         |
| Data Breach:       | <b>probable</b>   |                         |
| Data Breach Risks: | This data asset has data breach potential because of 15 remaining risks:  |                         |

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@application-network

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@Private-Instance

Probable: xml-external-entity@Private-Subnet

Possible: cross-site-scripting@app-server

Possible: cross-site-scripting@Private-Subnet

Possible: missing-authentication-second-factor@app-server>internal-access@app-server@Private-Subnet

Possible: server-side-request-forgery@app-server@Private-Subnet@app-server>internal-access

Improbable: cross-site-request-forgery@Private-Subnet@app-server>internal-access

Improbable: missing-identity-propagation@app-server>internal-access@app-server@Private-Subnet

Improbable: missing-waf@Private-Subnet

Improbable: mixed-targets-on-shared-runtime@Instance-virtualization

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@app-server

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@Private-Subnet

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@app-server@Private-Subnet

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@Private-Subnet@sql-database

## Client Application Code: 16 / 16 Risks

client-side code delivered by the application.

|                    |  |                         |
|--------------------|--|-------------------------|
| ID:                | client-application-code  |                         |
| Usage:             | devops   |                         |
| Quantity:          | very-few   |                         |
| Tags:              | none   |                         |
| Origin:            | shashank   |                         |
| Owner:             | shashank   |                         |
| Confidentiality:   | public   | (rated 1 in scale of 5) |
| Integrity:         | critical   | (rated 4 in scale of 5) |
| Availability:      | important  | (rated 3 in scale of 5) |
| CIA-Justification: | The integrity of the public data is critical to avoid reputational damage and the availability is important on the long-term scale (but not critical) to keep the growth rate of the customer base steady. |                         |
| Processed by:      | Linux Bastion Host, Public Subnet  |                         |
| Stored by:         | Linux Bastion Host, Public Subnet  |                         |
| Sent via:          | Public Subnet Include Bastion Host   |                         |
| Received via:      | Public Subnet Include Bastion Host   |                         |
| Data Breach:       | <b>probable</b>  |                         |
| Data Breach Risks: | This data asset has data breach potential because of 16 remaining risks:   |                         |

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@application-network

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@Public-Instance

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@Public-Subnet

Probable: missing-file-validation@Public-Subnet

Possible: cross-site-scripting@Linux-Bastion-Host

Possible: cross-site-scripting@Public-Subnet

Possible: missing-authentication@internet-gateway>bastion-host-access@internet-gateway@Linux-Bastion-Host

Possible: server-side-request-forgery@Public-Subnet@Linux-Bastion-Host@Public-Subnet>public-subnet-include-bastion-host

Possible: server-side-request-forgery@Public-Subnet@public-route-1@Public-Subnet>subnet-to-route-table-connection

Improbable: cross-site-request-forgery@Linux-Bastion-Host@internet-gateway>bastion-host-access

Improbable: cross-site-request-forgery@Linux-Bastion-Host@Public-Subnet>public-subnet-include-bastion-host

Improbable: missing-waf@Linux-Bastion-Host

Improbable: mixed-targets-on-shared-runtime@Instance-virtualization

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@Linux-Bastion-Host

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@Public-Subnet

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@Public-Subnet@public-route-1

## Data Transfer: 15 / 15 Risks

### Data Transfer

|                    |  |                         |
|--------------------|--|-------------------------|
| ID:                | data-transfer  |                         |
| Usage:             | business   |                         |
| Quantity:          | many   |                         |
| Tags:              | none   |                         |
| Origin:            | Customer   |                         |
| Owner:             | Shashank   |                         |
| Confidentiality:   | confidential   | (rated 4 in scale of 5) |
| Integrity:         | critical   | (rated 4 in scale of 5) |
| Availability:      | operational  | (rated 2 in scale of 5) |
| CIA-Justification: | data transfer might contain financial data as well as personally identifiable information (PII). |                         |
| Processed by:      | Private Subnet   |                         |
| Stored by:         | Db Instance  |                         |
| Sent via:          | Subnet to Route table connection   |                         |
| Received via:      | Subnet to Route table connection, Internal Access  |                         |
| Data Breach:       | <b>probable</b>  |                         |
| Data Breach Risks: | This data asset has data breach potential because of 15 remaining risks:                         |                         |

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@application-network

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@Private-Instance

Probable: sql-nosql-injection@sql-database@db-instance@sql-database>database-traffic

Probable: xml-external-entity@Private-Subnet

Possible: cross-site-scripting@Private-Subnet

Possible: missing-authentication-second-factor@app-server>internal-access@app-server@Private-Subnet

Possible: unencrypted-communication@sql-database>database-traffic@sql-database@db-instance

Improbable: cross-site-request-forgery@Private-Subnet@app-server>internal-access

Improbable: missing-identity-propagation@app-server>internal-access@app-server@Private-Subnet

Improbable: missing-waf@Private-Subnet

Improbable: mixed-targets-on-shared-runtime@Instance-virtualization

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@Private-Subnet

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@database-data-transfer@db-instance@sql-database

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@db-instance@sql-database

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@Private-Subnet@sql-database

## Database Customizing and Dumps: 8 / 8 Risks

Data for customizing of the DB system, which might include full database dumps.

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| ID:                | db-dumps  |
| Usage:             | business  |
| Quantity:          | very-few  |
| Tags:              | mysql   |
| Origin:            | Shashank  |
| Owner:             | Shashank  |
| Confidentiality:   | strictly-confidential (rated 5 in scale of 5)                                   |
| Integrity:         | critical (rated 4 in scale of 5)  |
| Availability:      | critical (rated 4 in scale of 5)  |
| CIA-Justification: | Data for customizing of the DB system, which might include full database dumps. |
| Processed by:      | RDS Subnet  |
| Stored by:         | none  |
| Sent via:          | none  |
| Received via:      | none  |
| Data Breach:       | <b>probable</b>   |

Data Breach Risks: This data asset has data breach potential because of 8 remaining risks:

Probable: sql-nosql-injection@Private-Subnet@sql-database@Private-Subnet>database-traffic

Possible: unencrypted-communication@Private-Subnet>database-traffic@Private-Subnet@sql-database

Improbable: missing-hardening@sql-database

Improbable: mixed-targets-on-shared-runtime@Instance-virtualization

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@sql-database

Improbable: unguarded-direct-datastore-access@Private-Subnet>database-traffic@Private-Subnet@sql-database

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@sql-database@db-instance

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@sql-database@Private-Subnet

## Database Data Transfer: 22 / 22 Risks

Database data transfer of the system used to the transfer data between resources.

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| ID:                | database-data-transfer   |
| Usage:             | business   |
| Quantity:          | few  |
| Tags:              | none   |
| Origin:            | Shashank   |
| Owner:             | Shashank   |
| Confidentiality:   | strictly-confidential (rated 5 in scale of 5)                                |
| Integrity:         | critical (rated 4 in scale of 5)   |
| Availability:      | critical (rated 4 in scale of 5)   |
| CIA-Justification: | Data used and/or generated when application running like db-instance - mysql |
| Processed by:      | App Server, Private Subnet, RDS Subnet                                       |
| Stored by:         | RDS Subnet   |
| Sent via:          | Internal Access, Database Traffic, Database Traffic                          |
| Received via:      | Internal Access, Database Traffic, Database Traffic                          |
| Data Breach:       | <b>probable</b>  |
| Data Breach Risks: | This data asset has data breach potential because of 22 remaining risks:     |

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@application-network

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@Private-Instance

Probable: sql-nosql-injection@Private-Subnet@sql-database@Private-Subnet>database-traffic

Probable: xml-external-entity@Private-Subnet

Possible: cross-site-scripting@app-server

Possible: cross-site-scripting@Private-Subnet

Possible: missing-authentication-second-factor@app-server>internal-access@app-server@Private-Subnet

Possible: server-side-request-forgery@app-server@Private-Subnet@app-server>internal-access

Possible: unencrypted-communication@Private-Subnet>database-traffic@Private-Subnet@sql-database

Improbable: cross-site-request-forgery@Private-Subnet@app-server>internal-access

Improbable: missing-identity-propagation@app-server>internal-access@app-server@Private-Subnet

Improbable: missing-hardening@sql-database

Improbable: missing-waf@Private-Subnet

Improbable: mixed-targets-on-shared-runtime@Instance-virtualization

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@app-server

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@Private-Subnet

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@sql-database

Improbable: unguarded-direct-datastore-access@Private-Subnet>database-traffic@Private-Subnet@sql-database

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@app-server@Private-Subnet

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@Private-Subnet@sql-database

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@sql-database@db-instance

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@internet-data-transfer@sql-database@Private-Subnet



## Internet Data Transfer: 24 / 24 Risks

### Internet Data Transfer

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| ID:                | internet-data-transfer  |
| Usage:             | business  |
| Quantity:          | many  |
| Tags:              | none  |
| Origin:            | Customer  |
| Owner:             | Shashank  |
| Confidentiality:   | strictly-confidential (rated 5 in scale of 5)   |
| Integrity:         | critical (rated 4 in scale of 5)  |
| Availability:      | critical (rated 4 in scale of 5)  |
| CIA-Justification: | Internet data transfer used to be available to offer the internet functionality.                                |
| Processed by:      | Internet Gateway, Linux Bastion Host, Public Route 1, Public Subnet   |
| Stored by:         | none  |
| Sent via:          | Route Table Access, Public Subnet Include Bastion Host, Database Traffic, Database Traffic, Bastion Host Access |
| Received via:      | Route Table Access, Public Subnet Include Bastion Host, Database Traffic, Database Traffic                      |
| Data Breach:       | <b>probable</b>   |
| Data Breach Risks: | This data asset has data breach potential because of 24 remaining risks:  |

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@application-network

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@Public-Instance

Probable: missing-cloud-hardening@Public-Subnet

Probable: missing-file-validation@Public-Subnet

Possible: cross-site-scripting@Linux-Bastion-Host

Possible: cross-site-scripting@public-route-1

Possible: cross-site-scripting@Public-Subnet

Possible: missing-authentication@internet-gateway>bastion-host-access@internet-gateway@Linux-Bastion-Host

Possible: server-side-request-forgery@Public-Subnet@Linux-Bastion-Host@Public-Subnet>public-subnet-include-bastion-host

Possible: server-side-request-forgery@Public-Subnet@public-route-1@Public-Subnet>subnet-to-route-table-connection

Possible: unguarded-access-from-internet@public-route-1@internet-gateway@internet-gateway>route-table-access

Improbable: cross-site-request-forgery@Linux-Bastion-Host@internet-gateway>bastion-host-access

Improbable: cross-site-request-forgery@Linux-Bastion-Host@Public-Subnet>public-subnet-include-bastion-host

Improbable: cross-site-request-forgery@public-route-1@internet-gateway>route-table-access

Improbable: cross-site-request-forgery@public-route-1@Public-Subnet>subnet-to-route-table-connection

Improbable: missing-waf@Linux-Bastion-Host

Improbable: missing-waf@public-route-1

Improbable: mixed-targets-on-shared-runtime@Instance-virtualization

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@internet-gateway

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@Linux-Bastion-Host

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@public-route-1

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@Public-Subnet

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@public-route-1@Public-Subnet

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@Public-Subnet@public-route-1

## Server Application Code: 5 / 5 Risks

API and other server-side code of the application.

|                    |   |                         |
|--------------------|---|-------------------------|
| ID:                | server-application-code   |                         |
| Usage:             | devops  |                         |
| Quantity:          | very-few  |                         |
| Tags:              | none  |                         |
| Origin:            | shashank  |                         |
| Owner:             | shashank  |                         |
| Confidentiality:   | internal  | (rated 2 in scale of 5) |
| Integrity:         | mission-critical  | (rated 5 in scale of 5) |
| Availability:      | important   | (rated 3 in scale of 5) |
| CIA-Justification: | The integrity of the API code is critical to avoid reputational damage and the availability is important. |                         |
| Processed by:      | App Server  |                         |
| Stored by:         | none  |                         |
| Sent via:          | none  |                         |
| Received via:      | none  |                         |
| Data Breach:       | <b>possible</b>   |                         |
| Data Breach Risks: | This data asset has data breach potential because of 5 remaining risks:                                   |                         |

Possible: cross-site-scripting@app-server

Possible: server-side-request-forgery@app-server@Private-Subnet@app-server>internal-access

Improbable: mixed-targets-on-shared-runtime@Instance-virtualization

Improbable: unencrypted-asset@app-server

Improbable: unnecessary-data-transfer@data-transfer@app-server@Private-Subnet

# Trust Boundaries

In total **5 trust boundaries** have been modeled during the threat modeling process.

## Application Network

### Virtual-Private-Cloud

ID: application-network  
Type: [network-cloud-provider](#)  
Tags: aws:vpc  
Assets inside: none  
Boundaries nested: Private Instance, Public Instance, Public Route Table

## Dev Network

### Development Network

ID: dev-network  
Type: [network-on-prem](#)  
Tags: none  
Assets inside: App Server, Internet Gateway  
Boundaries nested: none

## Private Instance

### Private Instance

ID: Private-Instance  
Type: [network-cloud-security-group](#)  
Tags: aws:ec2  
Assets inside: Private Subnet  
Boundaries nested: none

## Public Instance

### Public Instance

ID: Public-Instance  
Type: [network-cloud-security-group](#)

Tags: aws:ec2  
Assets inside: Linux Bastion Host, Public Subnet  
Boundaries nested: none

## Public Route Table

Public Route Table

ID: public-route-table  
Type: execution-environment  
Tags: none  
Assets inside: Public Route 1  
Boundaries nested: none

# Shared Runtimes

In total **1 shared runtime** has been modeled during the threat modeling process.

## Subnet and Instance Virtualization

### Instance Virtualization

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| ID:             | Instance-virtualization  |
| Tags:           | vmware   |
| Assets running: | Public Subnet, Linux Bastion Host, Private Subnet, Db Instance, RDS Subnet, App Server |

# Risk Rules Checked by Threagile

**Threagile Version:** 1.0.0

**Threagile Build Timestamp:** 20231104141112

**Threagile Execution Timestamp:** 20240109141500

**Model Filename:** /github/workspace/threagile.yaml

**Model Hash (SHA256):** cf763a94d671d087c1fe5dcae0b46f0e810a82b902f53ba78207babdd77234e5

Threagile (see <https://threagile.io> for more details) is an open-source toolkit for agile threat modeling, created by Christian Schneider (<https://christian-schneider.net>): It allows to model an architecture with its assets in an agile fashion as a YAML file directly inside the IDE. Upon execution of the Threagile toolkit all standard risk rules (as well as individual custom rules if present) are checked against the architecture model. At the time the Threagile toolkit was executed on the model input file the following risk rules were checked:

## Accidental Secret Leak

accidental-secret-leak

**STRIDE:** Information Disclosure

**Description:** Sourcecode repositories (including their histories) as well as artifact registries can accidentally contain secrets like checked-in or packaged-in passwords, API tokens, certificates, crypto keys, etc.

**Detection:** In-scope sourcecode repositories and artifact registries.

**Rating:** The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

## Code Backdooring

code-backdooring

**STRIDE:** Tampering

**Description:** For each build-pipeline component Code Backdooring risks might arise where attackers compromise the build-pipeline in order to let backdoored artifacts be shipped into production. Aside from direct code backdooring this includes backdooring of dependencies and even of more lower-level build infrastructure, like backdooring compilers (similar to what the XcodeGhost malware did) or dependencies.

**Detection:** In-scope development relevant technical assets which are either accessed by out-of-scope unmanaged developer clients and/or are directly accessed by any kind of internet-located (non-VPN) component or are themselves directly located on the internet.

**Rating:** The risk rating depends on the confidentiality and integrity rating of the code being handled and deployed as well as the placement/calling of this technical asset on/from the internet.

## Container Base Image Backdooring

container-baseimage-backdooring

**STRIDE:** Tampering

**Description:** When a technical asset is built using container technologies, Base Image Backdooring risks might arise where base images and other layers used contain vulnerable components or backdoors.

**Detection:** In-scope technical assets running as containers.

**Rating:** The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets.

### **Container Platform Escape**

container-platform-escape

**STRIDE:** Elevation of Privilege

**Description:** Container platforms are especially interesting targets for attackers as they host big parts of a containerized runtime infrastructure. When not configured and operated with security best practices in mind, attackers might exploit a vulnerability inside an container and escape towards the platform as highly privileged users. These scenarios might give attackers capabilities to attack every other container as owning the container platform (via container escape attacks) equals to owning every container.

**Detection:** In-scope container platforms.

**Rating:** The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

### **Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)**

cross-site-request-forgery

**STRIDE:** Spoofing

**Description:** When a web application is accessed via web protocols Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) risks might arise.

**Detection:** In-scope web applications accessed via typical web access protocols.

**Rating:** The risk rating depends on the integrity rating of the data sent across the communication link.

### **Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)**

cross-site-scripting

**STRIDE:** Tampering

**Description:** For each web application Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) risks might arise. In terms of the overall risk level take other applications running on the same domain into account as well.

**Detection:** In-scope web applications.

**Rating:** The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the data processed or stored in the web application.

### **DoS-risky Access Across Trust-Boundary**



**dos-risky-access-across-trust-boundary**

**STRIDE:** Denial of Service

**Description:** Assets accessed across trust boundaries with critical or mission-critical availability rating are more prone to Denial-of-Service (DoS) risks.

**Detection:** In-scope technical assets (excluding load-balancer) with availability rating of critical or higher which have incoming data-flows across a network trust-boundary (excluding devops usage).

**Rating:** Matching technical assets with availability rating of critical or higher are at low risk. When the availability rating is mission-critical and neither a VPN nor IP filter for the incoming data-flow nor redundancy for the asset is applied, the risk-rating is considered medium.

**Incomplete Model****incomplete-model**

**STRIDE:** Information Disclosure

**Description:** When the threat model contains unknown technologies or transfers data over unknown protocols, this is an indicator for an incomplete model.

**Detection:** All technical assets and communication links with technology type or protocol type specified as unknown.

**Rating:** low

**LDAP-Injection****ldap-injection**

**STRIDE:** Tampering

**Description:** When an LDAP server is accessed LDAP-Injection risks might arise. The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the LDAP server itself and of the data assets processed or stored.

**Detection:** In-scope clients accessing LDAP servers via typical LDAP access protocols.

**Rating:** The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the LDAP server itself and of the data assets processed or stored.

**Missing Authentication****missing-authentication**

**STRIDE:** Elevation of Privilege

**Description:** Technical assets (especially multi-tenant systems) should authenticate incoming requests when the asset processes or stores sensitive data.

**Detection:** In-scope technical assets (except load-balancer, reverse-proxy, service-registry, waf, ids, and ips and in-process calls) should authenticate incoming requests when the asset processes or stores sensitive data. This is especially the case for all multi-tenant assets (there even non-sensitive ones).

**Rating:** The risk rating (medium or high) depends on the sensitivity of the data sent across

the communication link. Monitoring callers are exempted from this risk.

### Missing Two-Factor Authentication (2FA)

missing-authentication-second-factor

STRIDE: Elevation of Privilege

Description: Technical assets (especially multi-tenant systems) should authenticate incoming requests with two-factor (2FA) authentication when the asset processes or stores highly sensitive data (in terms of confidentiality, integrity, and availability) and is accessed by humans.

Detection: In-scope technical assets (except load-balancer, reverse-proxy, waf, ids, and ips) should authenticate incoming requests via two-factor authentication (2FA) when the asset processes or stores highly sensitive data (in terms of confidentiality, integrity, and availability) and is accessed by a client used by a human user.

Rating: medium

### Missing Build Infrastructure

missing-build-infrastructure

STRIDE: Tampering

Description: The modeled architecture does not contain a build infrastructure (devops-client, sourcecode-repo, build-pipeline, etc.), which might be the risk of a model missing critical assets (and thus not seeing their risks). If the architecture contains custom-developed parts, the pipeline where code gets developed and built needs to be part of the model.

Detection: Models with in-scope custom-developed parts missing in-scope development (code creation) and build infrastructure components (devops-client, sourcecode-repo, build-pipeline, etc.).

Rating: The risk rating depends on the highest sensitivity of the in-scope assets running custom-developed parts.

### Missing Cloud Hardening

missing-cloud-hardening

STRIDE: Tampering

Description: Cloud components should be hardened according to the cloud vendor best practices. This affects their configuration, auditing, and further areas.

Detection: In-scope cloud components (either residing in cloud trust boundaries or more specifically tagged with cloud provider types).

Rating: The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

### Missing File Validation

missing-file-validation

STRIDE: Spoofing

- Description:** When a technical asset accepts files, these input files should be strictly validated about filename and type.
- Detection:** In-scope technical assets with custom-developed code accepting file data formats.
- Rating:** The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

## Missing Hardening

missing-hardening

- STRIDE:** Tampering
- Description:** Technical assets with a Relative Attacker Attractiveness (RAA) value of 55 % or higher should be explicitly hardened taking best practices and vendor hardening guides into account.
- Detection:** In-scope technical assets with RAA values of 55 % or higher. Generally for high-value targets like datastores, application servers, identity providers and ERP systems this limit is reduced to 40 %
- Rating:** The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the data processed or stored in the technical asset.

## Missing Identity Propagation

missing-identity-propagation

- STRIDE:** Elevation of Privilege
- Description:** Technical assets (especially multi-tenant systems), which usually process data for endusers should authorize every request based on the identity of the enduser when the data flow is authenticated (i.e. non-public). For DevOps usages at least a technical-user authorization is required.
- Detection:** In-scope service-like technical assets which usually process data based on enduser requests, if authenticated (i.e. non-public), should authorize incoming requests based on the propagated enduser identity when their rating is sensitive. This is especially the case for all multi-tenant assets (there even less-sensitive rated ones). DevOps usages are exempted from this risk.
- Rating:** The risk rating (medium or high) depends on the confidentiality, integrity, and availability rating of the technical asset.

## Missing Identity Provider Isolation

missing-identity-provider-isolation

- STRIDE:** Elevation of Privilege
- Description:** Highly sensitive identity provider assets and their identity datastores should be isolated from other assets by their own network segmentation trust-boundary (execution-environment boundaries do not count as network isolation).
- Detection:** In-scope identity provider assets and their identity datastores when surrounded by other (not identity-related) assets (without a network trust-boundary in-between).

This risk is especially prevalent when other non-identity related assets are within the same execution environment (i.e. same database or same application server).

Rating: Default is high impact. The impact is increased to very-high when the asset missing the trust-boundary protection is rated as strictly-confidential or mission-critical.

### Missing Identity Store

missing-identity-store

STRIDE: Spoofing

Description: The modeled architecture does not contain an identity store, which might be the risk of a model missing critical assets (and thus not seeing their risks).

Detection: Models with authenticated data-flows authorized via enduser-identity missing an in-scope identity store.

Rating: The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the enduser-identity authorized technical assets and their data assets processed and stored.

### Missing Network Segmentation

missing-network-segmentation

STRIDE: Elevation of Privilege

Description: Highly sensitive assets and/or datastores residing in the same network segment than other lower sensitive assets (like webserver or content management systems etc.) should be better protected by a network segmentation trust-boundary.

Detection: In-scope technical assets with high sensitivity and RAA values as well as datastores when surrounded by assets (without a network trust-boundary in-between) which are of type client-system, web-server, web-application, cms, web-service-rest, web-service-soap, build-pipeline, sourcecode-repository, monitoring, or similar and there is no direct connection between these (hence no requirement to be so close to each other).

Rating: Default is low risk. The risk is increased to medium when the asset missing the trust-boundary protection is rated as strictly-confidential or mission-critical.

### Missing Vault (Secret Storage)

missing-vault

STRIDE: Information Disclosure

Description: In order to avoid the risk of secret leakage via config files (when attacked through vulnerabilities being able to read files like Path-Traversal and others), it is best practice to use a separate hardened process with proper authentication, authorization, and audit logging to access config secrets (like credentials, private keys, client certificates, etc.). This component is usually some kind of Vault.

Detection: Models without a Vault (Secret Storage).

Rating: The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

## Missing Vault Isolation

missing-vault-isolation

STRIDE: Elevation of Privilege

Description: Highly sensitive vault assets and their datastores should be isolated from other assets by their own network segmentation trust-boundary (execution-environment boundaries do not count as network isolation).

Detection: In-scope vault assets when surrounded by other (not vault-related) assets (without a network trust-boundary in-between). This risk is especially prevalent when other non-vault related assets are within the same execution environment (i.e. same database or same application server).

Rating: Default is medium impact. The impact is increased to high when the asset missing the trust-boundary protection is rated as strictly-confidential or mission-critical.

## Missing Web Application Firewall (WAF)

missing-waf

STRIDE: Tampering

Description: To have a first line of filtering defense, security architectures with web-services or web-applications should include a WAF in front of them. Even though a WAF is not a replacement for security (all components must be secure even without a WAF) it adds another layer of defense to the overall system by delaying some attacks and having easier attack alerting through it.

Detection: In-scope web-services and/or web-applications accessed across a network trust boundary not having a Web Application Firewall (WAF) in front of them.

Rating: The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

## Mixed Targets on Shared Runtime

mixed-targets-on-shared-runtime

STRIDE: Elevation of Privilege

Description: Different attacker targets (like frontend and backend/datastore components) should not be running on the same shared (underlying) runtime.

Detection: Shared runtime running technical assets of different trust-boundaries is at risk. Also mixing backend/datastore with frontend components on the same shared runtime is considered a risk.

Rating: The risk rating (low or medium) depends on the confidentiality, integrity, and availability rating of the technical asset running on the shared runtime.

## Path-Traversal

path-traversal

STRIDE: Information Disclosure

Description: When a filesystem is accessed Path-Traversal or Local-File-Inclusion (LFI) risks might arise. The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself

and of the data assets processed or stored.

Detection: Filesystems accessed by in-scope callers.

Rating: The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the data stored inside the technical asset.

## Push instead of Pull Deployment

push-instead-of-pull-deployment

STRIDE: Tampering

Description: When comparing push-based vs. pull-based deployments from a security perspective, pull-based deployments improve the overall security of the deployment targets. Every exposed interface of a production system to accept a deployment increases the attack surface of the production system, thus a pull-based approach exposes less attack surface relevant interfaces.

Detection: Models with build pipeline components accessing in-scope targets of deployment (in a non-readonly way) which are not build-related components themselves.

Rating: The risk rating depends on the highest sensitivity of the deployment targets running custom-developed parts.

## Search-Query Injection

search-query-injection

STRIDE: Tampering

Description: When a search engine server is accessed Search-Query Injection risks might arise.

Detection: In-scope clients accessing search engine servers via typical search access protocols.

Rating: The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the search engine server itself and of the data assets processed or stored.

## Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)

server-side-request-forgery

STRIDE: Information Disclosure

Description: When a server system (i.e. not a client) is accessing other server systems via typical web protocols Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) or Local-File-Inclusion (LFI) or Remote-File-Inclusion (RFI) risks might arise.

Detection: In-scope non-client systems accessing (using outgoing communication links) targets with either HTTP or HTTPS protocol.

Rating: The risk rating (low or medium) depends on the sensitivity of the data assets receivable via web protocols from targets within the same network trust-boundary as well on the sensitivity of the data assets receivable via web protocols from the target asset itself. Also for cloud-based environments the exploitation impact is at least medium, as cloud backend services can be attacked via SSRF.

## Service Registry Poisoning

**service-registry-poisoning****STRIDE:** Spoofing**Description:** When a service registry used for discovery of trusted service endpoints Service Registry Poisoning risks might arise.**Detection:** In-scope service registries.**Rating:** The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical assets accessing the service registry as well as the data assets processed or stored.**SQL/NoSQL-Injection****sql-nosql-injection****STRIDE:** Tampering**Description:** When a database is accessed via database access protocols SQL/NoSQL-Injection risks might arise. The risk rating depends on the sensitivity technical asset itself and of the data assets processed or stored.**Detection:** Database accessed via typical database access protocols by in-scope clients.**Rating:** The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the data stored inside the database.**Unchecked Deployment****unchecked-deployment****STRIDE:** Tampering**Description:** For each build-pipeline component Unchecked Deployment risks might arise when the build-pipeline does not include established DevSecOps best-practices. DevSecOps best-practices scan as part of CI/CD pipelines for vulnerabilities in source- or byte-code, dependencies, container layers, and dynamically against running test systems. There are several open-source and commercial tools existing in the categories DAST, SAST, and IAST.**Detection:** All development-relevant technical assets.**Rating:** The risk rating depends on the highest rating of the technical assets and data assets processed by deployment-receiving targets.**Unencrypted Technical Assets****unencrypted-asset****STRIDE:** Information Disclosure**Description:** Due to the confidentiality rating of the technical asset itself and/or the processed data assets this technical asset must be encrypted. The risk rating depends on the sensitivity technical asset itself and of the data assets stored.**Detection:** In-scope unencrypted technical assets (excluding reverse-proxy, load-balancer, waf, ids, ips and embedded components like library) storing data assets rated at least as confidential or critical. For technical assets storing data assets rated as strictly-confidential or mission-critical the encryption must be of type data-with-enduser-individual-key.



Rating: Depending on the confidentiality rating of the stored data-assets either medium or high risk.

### Unencrypted Communication

unencrypted-communication

STRIDE: Information Disclosure

Description: Due to the confidentiality and/or integrity rating of the data assets transferred over the communication link this connection must be encrypted.

Detection: Unencrypted technical communication links of in-scope technical assets (excluding monitoring traffic as well as local-file-access and in-process-library-call) transferring sensitive data.

Rating: Depending on the confidentiality rating of the transferred data-assets either medium or high risk.

### Unguarded Access From Internet

unguarded-access-from-internet

STRIDE: Elevation of Privilege

Description: Internet-exposed assets must be guarded by a protecting service, application, or reverse-proxy.

Detection: In-scope technical assets (excluding load-balancer) with confidentiality rating of confidential (or higher) or with integrity rating of critical (or higher) when accessed directly from the internet. All web-server, web-application, reverse-proxy, waf, and gateway assets are exempted from this risk when they do not consist of custom developed code and the data-flow only consists of HTTP or FTP protocols. Access from monitoring systems as well as VPN-protected connections are exempted.

Rating: The matching technical assets are at low risk. When either the confidentiality rating is strictly-confidential or the integrity rating is mission-critical, the risk-rating is considered medium. For assets with RAA values higher than 40 % the risk-rating increases.

### Unguarded Direct Datastore Access

unguarded-direct-datastore-access

STRIDE: Elevation of Privilege

Description: Datastores accessed across trust boundaries must be guarded by some protecting service or application.

Detection: In-scope technical assets of type datastore (except identity-store-ldap when accessed from identity-provider and file-server when accessed via file transfer protocols) with confidentiality rating of confidential (or higher) or with integrity rating of critical (or higher) which have incoming data-flows from assets outside across a network trust-boundary. DevOps config and deployment access is excluded from this risk.



**Rating:** The matching technical assets are at low risk. When either the confidentiality rating is strictly-confidential or the integrity rating is mission-critical, the risk-rating is considered medium. For assets with RAA values higher than 40 % the risk-rating increases.

### Unnecessary Communication Link

unnecessary-communication-link

**STRIDE:** Elevation of Privilege

**Description:** When a technical communication link does not send or receive any data assets, this is an indicator for an unnecessary communication link (or for an incomplete model).

**Detection:** In-scope technical assets' technical communication links not sending or receiving any data assets.

**Rating:** low

### Unnecessary Data Asset

unnecessary-data-asset

**STRIDE:** Elevation of Privilege

**Description:** When a data asset is not processed or stored by any data assets and also not transferred by any communication links, this is an indicator for an unnecessary data asset (or for an incomplete model).

**Detection:** Modelled data assets not processed or stored by any data assets and also not transferred by any communication links.

**Rating:** low

### Unnecessary Data Transfer

unnecessary-data-transfer

**STRIDE:** Elevation of Privilege

**Description:** When a technical asset sends or receives data assets, which it neither processes or stores this is an indicator for unnecessarily transferred data (or for an incomplete model). When the unnecessarily transferred data assets are sensitive, this poses an unnecessary risk of an increased attack surface.

**Detection:** In-scope technical assets sending or receiving sensitive data assets which are neither processed nor stored by the technical asset are flagged with this risk. The risk rating (low or medium) depends on the confidentiality, integrity, and availability rating of the technical asset. Monitoring data is exempted from this risk.

**Rating:** The risk assessment is depending on the confidentiality and integrity rating of the transferred data asset either low or medium.

### Unnecessary Technical Asset

unnecessary-technical-asset

**STRIDE:** Elevation of Privilege

**Description:** When a technical asset does not process or store any data assets, this is an

indicator for an unnecessary technical asset (or for an incomplete model). This is also the case if the asset has no communication links (either outgoing or incoming).

Detection: Technical assets not processing or storing any data assets.

Rating: low

## Untrusted Deserialization

untrusted-deserialization

STRIDE: Tampering

Description: When a technical asset accepts data in a specific serialized form (like Java or .NET serialization), Untrusted Deserialization risks might arise.

Detection: In-scope technical assets accepting serialization data formats (including EJB and RMI protocols).

Rating: The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data assets processed and stored.

## Wrong Communication Link Content

wrong-communication-link-content

STRIDE: Information Disclosure

Description: When a communication link is defined as readonly, but does not receive any data asset, or when it is defined as not readonly, but does not send any data asset, it is likely to be a model failure.

Detection: Communication links with inconsistent data assets being sent/received not matching their readonly flag or otherwise inconsistent protocols not matching the target technology type.

Rating: low

## Wrong Trust Boundary Content

wrong-trust-boundary-content

STRIDE: Elevation of Privilege

Description: When a trust boundary of type network-policy-namespace-isolation contains non-container assets it is likely to be a model failure.

Detection: Trust boundaries which should only contain containers, but have different assets inside.

Rating: low

## XML External Entity (XXE)

xml-external-entity

STRIDE: Information Disclosure

Description: When a technical asset accepts data in XML format, XML External Entity (XXE) risks might arise.

Detection: In-scope technical assets accepting XML data formats.

Rating: The risk rating depends on the sensitivity of the technical asset itself and of the data

assets processed and stored. Also for cloud-based environments the exploitation impact is at least medium, as cloud backend services can be attacked via SSRF (and XXE vulnerabilities are often also SSRF vulnerabilities).

# Disclaimer

Shashank Sanap conducted this threat analysis using the open-source Threagile toolkit on the applications and systems that were modeled as of this report's date. Information security threats are continually changing, with new vulnerabilities discovered on a daily basis, and no application can ever be 100% secure no matter how much threat modeling is conducted. It is recommended to execute threat modeling and also penetration testing on a regular basis (for example yearly) to ensure a high ongoing level of security and constantly check for new attack vectors.

This report cannot and does not protect against personal or business loss as the result of use of the applications or systems described. Shashank Sanap and the Threagile toolkit offers no warranties, representations or legal certifications concerning the applications or systems it tests. All software includes defects: nothing in this document is intended to represent or warrant that threat modeling was complete and without error, nor does this document represent or warrant that the architecture analyzed is suitable to task, free of other defects than reported, fully compliant with any industry standards, or fully compatible with any operating system, hardware, or other application. Threat modeling tries to analyze the modeled architecture without having access to a real working system and thus cannot and does not test the implementation for defects and vulnerabilities. These kinds of checks would only be possible with a separate code review and penetration test against a working system and not via a threat model.

By using the resulting information you agree that Shashank Sanap and the Threagile toolkit shall be held harmless in any event.

This report is confidential and intended for internal, confidential use by the client. The recipient is obligated to ensure the highly confidential contents are kept secret. The recipient assumes responsibility for further distribution of this document.

In this particular project, a timebox approach was used to define the analysis effort. This means that the author allotted a prearranged amount of time to identify and document threats. Because of this, there is no guarantee that all possible threats and risks are discovered. Furthermore, the analysis applies to a snapshot of the current state of the modeled architecture (based on the architecture information provided by the customer) at the examination time.

## Report Distribution

Distribution of this report (in full or in part like diagrams or risk findings) requires that this disclaimer as well as the chapter about the Threagile toolkit and method used is kept intact as part of the distributed report or referenced from the distributed parts.