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## Client



## Instructions

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

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

## Developer

Steven Mathias

**1. Interpreting Client Needs**

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

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

Artemis Financial has a responsibility to maintain a high level of security for their customers. When dealing with financial plans such as savings, retirement, investments and insurance, customers not only expect their information to be secure, but deserve it. The value of secure communications to Artemis Financial is extreme. First, without proper security, the business cannot obtain new clients or maintain the existing ones. The security element is large in the overall reputation of the company.

Artemis does participate in international transactions. This opens the security field to include citizens of other countries that may not be direct customers of Artemis, but indirectly as they do business with Artemis’ clients.

One of the major factors that Artemis must consider when establishing “modern” operations, is government regulations, that they must abide. There may be government regulations that prevent certain features or operations that they wish to explore. This doesn’t mean they can’t achieve the desired outcome, but the route to get there may be different. In the world of economics and finance, there are many laws that are very detailed and could be easily overlooked.

Some external threats that may be present now and, in the future, consist of; Phishing attacks, where a scam message is sent to the customer disguised as a legitimate source, usually with a link that gives access to the scammer. This can also take the form of ransomware, where once the scammer has access, they can use that information as ransom. Other attacks include DDoS attacks, where a financial systems network or server is flooded with fraudulent traffic, resulting in inaccessibility. Also, data breach and malware pose great threats. Something as simple as a bank employee opening a spam email could result in massive data loss and corruption.

When striving for modern solutions, this includes modern requirements. One of the major ones today is the use of A.I. This field is still highly mysterious, however becoming much more mainstream and ubiquitous by the day. Many companies have already implemented the use of A.I. for efficiency. Therefore, whether you think it a positive or negative venture for a financial institution to implement the use of A.I., in any form, I think the conclusion is that it is inevitable.

**2. Areas of Security**

Refer to the vulnerability assessment process flow diagram. Identify which areas of security apply to Artemis Financial’s software application. Justify your reasoning for why each area is relevant to the software application.

The areas of security that apply to Artemis Financial are Input Validation, APIs, Cryptography, Client/Server and Code Quality.

**Input Validation** – The software will need to verify a user’s input to verify if it meets criteria before passing it through the rest of the program. If this step is incomplete or missed, harmful input could be used to attack the system.

**APIs** – This stands for application programming interface. APIs allow software applications to communicate with each other. An example for Artemis could be the use of authentication methods to verify a user and give certain accesses.

**Cryptography** – This refers to the scrambling or encryption of data to make it less readable. Artemis can use this technique to add an additional security step for exchanging customer information. If the data were to be compromised, encryption could still prevent a threat. It can also prevent threats by making it harder to design attacks if the data is harder to read.

**Client/Server** – The relationship between the client and the businesses server is crucial. You want the client to have a great experience in terms of using the interface, however, you don’t want to limit security for the customer to have a better experience. This can significantly increase the risk of threats and attacks. There is a balance that can be made between giving the clients the best experience while maintaining security and preventing malicious use of the software.

**Code Quality** – This area is more directed toward our team at Global Rain, as it is the specific code used for the application or program. The finance company will not be creating the code but should understand certain qualities of what makes the code secure, to ensure that they are in the right hands with Global Rain.

**3. Manual Review**

Continue working through the vulnerability assessment process flow diagram. Identify all vulnerabilities in the code base by manually inspecting the code.

-The first thing I noticed was that the maven check was not up to date in the pom.xml. The current version is 12.0.1. This should be updated first before anything else, and monitored to be sure it is always up to date.

-A potential vulnerability is in the Greeting.java class. This class does not set parameters for the variables to validate them before passing them through.

-In the CRUDController.java class, the business\_name is established as request parameters without the use of prepared statements to “sanitize” the request, leaving the application at risk.

-Finally, in the DocData.java class, it looks like the comment is stating that the try method has both the username and password the same value. In this method, they are a string “root”. Having the username and password be the same is much easier to guess and puts the system at risk.

**4. Static Testing**

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

* The names or vulnerability codes of the known vulnerabilities
* A brief description and recommended solutions provided by the dependency-check report
* Any attribution that documents how this vulnerability has been identified or documented previously

bcprov-jdk15on-1.46.jar

**CVE-2024-34447**

* bouncycastle - Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch. The software communicates with a host that provides a certificate, but the software does not properly ensure that the certificate is actually associated with that host.

**CVE-2016-1000338**

* In Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the DSA does not fully validate ASN.1 encoding of signature on verification. It is possible to inject extra elements in the sequence making up the signature and still have it validate, which in some cases may allow the introduction of 'invisible' data into a signed structure.

**CVE-2016-1000342**

* In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier ECDSA does not fully validate ASN.1 encoding of signature on verification. It is possible to inject extra elements in the sequence making up the signature and still have it validate, which in some cases may allow the introduction of 'invisible' data into a signed structure.

**CVE-2016-1000343**

* In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the DSA key pair generator generates a weak private key if used with default values. If the JCA key pair generator is not explicitly initialised with DSA parameters, 1.55 and earlier generates a private value assuming a 1024 bit key size. In earlier releases this can be dealt with by explicitly passing parameters to the key pair generator.

**CVE-2024-29857**

* An issue was discovered in ECCurve.java and ECCurve.cs in Bouncy Castle Java (BC Java) before 1.78, BC Java LTS before 2.73.6, BC-FJA before 1.0.2.5, and BC C# .Net before 2.3.1. Importing an EC certificate with crafted F2m parameters can lead to excessive CPU consumption during the evaluation of the curve parameters.

**CVE-2016-1000344**

* In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the DHIES implementation allowed the use of ECB mode. This mode is regarded as unsafe and support for it has been removed from the provider.

**CVE-2016-1000352**

* In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the ECIES implementation allowed the use of ECB mode. This mode is regarded as unsafe and support for it has been removed from the provider.

**CVE-2024-30171**

* An issue was discovered in Bouncy Castle Java TLS API and JSSE Provider before 1.78. Timing-based leakage may occur in RSA based handshakes because of exception processing.

**CVE-2016-1000341**

* In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier DSA signature generation is vulnerable to timing attack. Where timings can be closely observed for the generation of signatures, the lack of blinding in 1.55, or earlier, may allow an attacker to gain information about the signature's k value and ultimately the private value as well.

**CVE-2016-1000345**

* In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the DHIES/ECIES CBC mode vulnerable to padding oracle attack. For BC 1.55 and older, in an environment where timings can be easily observed, it is possible with enough observations to identify when the decryption is failing due to padding.

**CVE-2017-13098**

* BouncyCastle TLS prior to version 1.0.3, when configured to use the JCE (Java Cryptography Extension) for cryptographic functions, provides a weak Bleichenbacher oracle when any TLS cipher suite using RSA key exchange is negotiated. An attacker can recover the private key from a vulnerable application. This vulnerability is referred to as "ROBOT."

**CVE-2020-15522**

* Bouncy Castle BC Java before 1.66, BC C# .NET before 1.8.7, BC-FJA before 1.0.1.2, 1.0.2.1, and BC-FNA before 1.0.1.1 have a timing issue within the EC math library that can expose information about the private key when an attacker is able to observe timing information for the generation of multiple deterministic ECDSA signatures.

**CVE-2020-0187**

* In engineSetMode of BaseBlockCipher.java, there is a possible incorrect cryptographic algorithm chosen due to an incomplete comparison. This could lead to local information disclosure with no additional execution privileges needed. User interaction is not needed for exploitation.Product: AndroidVersions: Android-10Android ID: A-148517383

**CVE-2023-33202**

* Bouncy Castle for Java before 1.73 contains a potential Denial of Service (DoS) issue within the Bouncy Castle org.bouncycastle.openssl.PEMParser class. This class parses OpenSSL PEM encoded streams containing X.509 certificates, PKCS8 encoded keys, and PKCS7 objects. Parsing a file that has crafted ASN.1 data through the PEMParser causes an OutOfMemoryError, which can enable a denial of service attack. (For users of the FIPS Java API: BC-FJA 1.0.2.3 and earlier are affected; BC-FJA 1.0.2.4 is fixed.)

**CVE-2020-26939**

* In Legion of the Bouncy Castle BC before 1.61 and BC-FJA before 1.0.1.2, attackers can obtain sensitive information about a private exponent because of Observable Differences in Behavior to Error Inputs. This occurs in org.bouncycastle.crypto.encodings.OAEPEncoding. Sending invalid ciphertext that decrypts to a short payload in the OAEP Decoder could result in the throwing of an early exception, potentially leaking some information about the private exponent of the RSA private key performing the encryption.

**CVE-2023-33201**

* Bouncy Castle For Java before 1.74 is affected by an LDAP injection vulnerability. The vulnerability only affects applications that use an LDAP CertStore from Bouncy Castle to validate X.509 certificates. During the certificate validation process, Bouncy Castle inserts the certificate's Subject Name into an LDAP search filter without any escaping, which leads to an LDAP injection vulnerability.

**CVE-2016-1000339**

* In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the primary engine class used for AES was AESFastEngine. Due to the highly table driven approach used in the algorithm it turns out that if the data channel on the CPU can be monitored the lookup table accesses are sufficient to leak information on the AES key being used. There was also a leak in AESEngine although it was substantially less. AESEngine has been modified to remove any signs of leakage (testing carried out on Intel X86-64) and is now the primary AES class for the BC JCE provider from 1.56. Use of AESFastEngine is now only recommended where otherwise deemed appropriate.

**CVE-2015-7940**

* The Bouncy Castle Java library before 1.51 does not validate a point is withing the elliptic curve, which makes it easier for remote attackers to obtain private keys via a series of crafted elliptic curve Diffie Hellman (ECDH) key exchanges, aka an "invalid curve attack."

**CVE-2018-5382**

* The default BKS keystore use an HMAC that is only 16 bits long, which can allow an attacker to compromise the integrity of a BKS keystore. Bouncy Castle release 1.47 changes the BKS format to a format which uses a 160 bit HMAC instead. This applies to any BKS keystore generated prior to BC 1.47. For situations where people need to create the files for legacy reasons a specific keystore type "BKS-V1" was introduced in 1.49. It should be noted that the use of "BKS-V1" is discouraged by the library authors and should only be used where it is otherwise safe to do so, as in where the use of a 16 bit checksum for the file integrity check is not going to cause a security issue in itself.

**CVE-2013-1624**

* The TLS implementation in the Bouncy Castle Java library before 1.48 and C# library before 1.8 does not properly consider timing side-channel attacks on a noncompliant MAC check operation during the processing of malformed CBC padding, which allows remote attackers to conduct distinguishing attacks and plaintext-recovery attacks via statistical analysis of timing data for crafted packets, a related issue to CVE-2013-0169.

**CVE-2016-1000346**

* In the Bouncy Castle JCE Provider version 1.55 and earlier the other party DH public key is not fully validated. This can cause issues as invalid keys can be used to reveal details about the other party's private key where static Diffie-Hellman is in use. As of release 1.56 the key parameters are checked on agreement calculation.

**CVE-2015-6644**

* Bouncy Castle in Android before 5.1.1 LMY49F and 6.0 before 2016-01-01 allows attackers to obtain sensitive information via a crafted application, aka internal bug 24106146.

hibernate-validator-6.0.18.Final.jar

**CVE-2023-1932**

* A flaw was found in hibernate-validator's 'isValid' method in the org.hibernate.validator.internal.constraintvalidators.hv.SafeHtmlValidator class, which can be bypassed by omitting the tag ending in a less-than character. Browsers may render an invalid html, allowing HTML injection or Cross-Site-Scripting (XSS) attacks.

**CVE-2020-10693**

* A flaw was found in Hibernate Validator version 6.1.2.Final. A bug in the message interpolation processor enables invalid EL expressions to be evaluated as if they were valid. This flaw allows attackers to bypass input sanitation (escaping, stripping) controls that developers may have put in place when handling user-controlled data in error messages.

Jackson-databind-2.10.2.jar

**CVE-2020-25649**

* A flaw was found in FasterXML Jackson Databind, where it did not have entity expansion secured properly. This flaw allows vulnerability to XML external entity (XXE) attacks. The highest threat from this vulnerability is data integrity.

**CVE-2020-36518**

* jackson-databind before 2.13.0 allows a Java StackOverflow exception and denial of service via a large depth of nested objects.

**CVE-2021-46877**

* jackson-databind 2.10.x through 2.12.x before 2.12.6 and 2.13.x before 2.13.1 allows attackers to cause a denial of service (2 GB transient heap usage per read) in uncommon situations involving JsonNode JDK serialization.

**CVE-2022-42003**

* In FasterXML jackson-databind before versions 2.13.4.1 and 2.12.17.1, resource exhaustion can occur because of a lack of a check in primitive value deserializers to avoid deep wrapper array nesting, when the UNWRAP\_SINGLE\_VALUE\_ARRAYS feature is enabled.

**CVE-2022-42004**

* In FasterXML jackson-databind before 2.13.4, resource exhaustion can occur because of a lack of a check in BeanDeserializer.\_deserializeFromArray to prevent use of deeply nested arrays. An application is vulnerable only with certain customized choices for deserialization.

**CVE-2023-35116**

* jackson-databind through 2.15.2 allows attackers to cause a denial of service or other unspecified impact via a crafted object that uses cyclic dependencies. NOTE: the vendor's perspective is that this is not a valid vulnerability report, because the steps of constructing a cyclic data structure and trying to serialize it cannot be achieved by an external attacker.

log4j-api-2.12.1.jar

**CVE-2020-9488**

* Improper validation of certificate with host mismatch in Apache Log4j SMTP appender. This could allow an SMTPS connection to be intercepted by a man-in-the-middle attack which could leak any log messages sent through that appender. Fixed in Apache Log4j 2.12.3 and 2.13.1

Logback-classic-1.2.3.jar

**CVE-2023-6378**

* A serialization vulnerability in logback receiver component part of logback version 1.4.11 allows an attacker to mount a Denial-Of-Service attack by sending poisoned data.

**CVE-2021-42550**

* In logback version 1.2.7 and prior versions, an attacker with the required privileges to edit configurations files could craft a malicious configuration allowing to execute arbitrary code loaded from LDAP servers.

logback-core-1.2.3.jar

**CVE-2023-6378**

* A serialization vulnerability in logback receiver component part of logback version 1.4.11 allows an attacker to mount a Denial-Of-Service attack by sending poisoned data.

**CVE-2024-42550**

* In logback version 1.2.7 and prior versions, an attacker with the required privileges to edit configurations files could craft a malicious configuration allowing to execute arbitrary code loaded from LDAP servers.

**CVE-2024-12798**

* ACE vulnerability in JaninoEventEvaluator by QOS.CH logback-core upto including version 0.1 to 1.3.14 and 1.4.0 to 1.5.12 in Java applications allows attacker to execute arbitrary code by compromising an existing logback configuration file or by injecting an environment variable before program execution.

**CVE-2024-12801**

* Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) in SaxEventRecorder by QOS.CH logback version 0.1 to 1.3.14 and 1.4.0 to 1.5.12  on the Java platform, allows an attacker to forge requests by compromising logback configuration files in XML.

Snakeyaml-1.25.jar

**CVE-2022-1471**

* SnakeYaml's Constructor() class does not restrict types which can be instantiated during deserialization. Deserializing yaml content provided by an attacker can lead to remote code execution. We recommend using SnakeYaml's SafeConsturctor when parsing untrusted content to restrict deserialization. We recommend upgrading to version 2.0 and beyond.

**CVE-2017-18640**

* The Alias feature in SnakeYAML before 1.26 allows entity expansion during a load operation, a related issue to CVE-2003-1564.

**CVE-2022-25857**

* The package org.yaml:snakeyaml from 0 and before 1.31 are vulnerable to Denial of Service (DoS) due missing to nested depth limitation for collections.

**CVE-2022-38749**

* Using snakeYAML to parse untrusted YAML files may be vulnerable to Denial of Service attacks (DOS). If the parser is running on user supplied input, an attacker may supply content that causes the parser to crash by stackoverflow.

**CVE-2022-38751**

* Using snakeYAML to parse untrusted YAML files may be vulnerable to Denial of Service attacks (DOS). If the parser is running on user supplied input, an attacker may supply content that causes the parser to crash by stackoverflow.

**CVE-2022-38752**

* Using snakeYAML to parse untrusted YAML files may be vulnerable to Denial of Service attacks (DOS). If the parser is running on user supplied input, an attacker may supply content that causes the parser to crash by stack-overflow.

**CVE-2022-41854**

* Those using Snakeyaml to parse untrusted YAML files may be vulnerable to Denial of Service attacks (DOS). If the parser is running on user supplied input, an attacker may supply content that causes the parser to crash by stack overflow. This effect may support a denial of service attack

**CVE-2022-38750**

* Using snakeYAML to parse untrusted YAML files may be vulnerable to Denial of Service attacks (DOS). If the parser is running on user supplied input, an attacker may supply content that causes the parser to crash by stackoverflow.

Spring-boot-2.2.4.RELEASE.jar

**CVE-2023-20873**

* In Spring Boot versions 3.0.0 - 3.0.5, 2.7.0 - 2.7.10, and older unsupported versions, an application that is deployed to Cloud Foundry could be susceptible to a security bypass. Users of affected versions should apply the following mitigation: 3.0.x users should upgrade to 3.0.6+. 2.7.x users should upgrade to 2.7.11+. Users of older, unsupported versions should upgrade to 3.0.6+ or 2.7.11+.

**CVE-2022-27772**

* spring-boot versions prior to version v2.2.11.RELEASE was vulnerable to temporary directory hijacking. This vulnerability impacted the org.springframework.boot.web.server.AbstractConfigurableWebServerFactory.createTempDir method. NOTE: This vulnerability only affects products and/or versions that are no longer supported by the maintainer

**CVE-2023-20883**

* In Spring Boot versions 3.0.0 - 3.0.6, 2.7.0 - 2.7.11, 2.6.0 - 2.6.14, 2.5.0 - 2.5.14 and older unsupported versions, there is potential for a denial-of-service (DoS) attack if Spring MVC is used together with a reverse proxy cache.

Spring-boot-starter-web-2.2.4.RELEASE.jar

**CVE-2023-20873**

* In Spring Boot versions 3.0.0 - 3.0.5, 2.7.0 - 2.7.10, and older unsupported versions, an application that is deployed to Cloud Foundry could be susceptible to a security bypass. Users of affected versions should apply the following mitigation: 3.0.x users should upgrade to 3.0.6+. 2.7.x users should upgrade to 2.7.11+. Users of older, unsupported versions should upgrade to 3.0.6+ or 2.7.11+.

**CVE-2022-27772**

* spring-boot versions prior to version v2.2.11.RELEASE was vulnerable to temporary directory hijacking. This vulnerability impacted the org.springframework.boot.web.server.AbstractConfigurableWebServerFactory.createTempDir method. NOTE: This vulnerability only affects products and/or versions that are no longer supported by the maintainer

**CVE-2023-20883**

* In Spring Boot versions 3.0.0 - 3.0.6, 2.7.0 - 2.7.11, 2.6.0 - 2.6.14, 2.5.0 - 2.5.14 and older unsupported versions, there is potential for a denial-of-service (DoS) attack if Spring MVC is used together with a reverse proxy cache.

Spring-core-5.2.3.RELEASE.jar

**CVE-2022-22965**

* A Spring MVC or Spring WebFlux application running on JDK 9+ may be vulnerable to remote code execution (RCE) via data binding. The specific exploit requires the application to run on Tomcat as a WAR deployment. If the application is deployed as a Spring Boot executable jar, i.e. the default, it is not vulnerable to the exploit. However, the nature of the vulnerability is more general, and there may be other ways to exploit it.

**CVE-2021-22118**

* In Spring Framework, versions 5.2.x prior to 5.2.15 and versions 5.3.x prior to 5.3.7, a WebFlux application is vulnerable to a privilege escalation: by (re)creating the temporary storage directory, a locally authenticated malicious user can read or modify files that have been uploaded to the WebFlux application, or overwrite arbitrary files with multipart request data.

**CVE-2020-5421**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.2.0 - 5.2.8, 5.1.0 - 5.1.17, 5.0.0 - 5.0.18, 4.3.0 - 4.3.28, and older unsupported versions, the protections against RFD attacks from CVE-2015-5211 may be bypassed depending on the browser used through the use of a jsessionid path parameter.

**CVE-2022-22950**

* n Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.16 and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide a specially crafted SpEL expression that may cause a denial of service condition.

**CVE-2022-22971**

* In spring framework versions prior to 5.3.20+ , 5.2.22+ and old unsupported versions, application with a STOMP over WebSocket endpoint is vulnerable to a denial of service attack by an authenticated user.

**CVE-2023-20861**

* In Spring Framework versions 6.0.0 - 6.0.6, 5.3.0 - 5.3.25, 5.2.0.RELEASE - 5.2.22.RELEASE, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide a specially crafted SpEL expression that may cause a denial-of-service (DoS) condition.

**CVE-2023-20863**

* In spring framework versions prior to 5.2.24 release+ ,5.3.27+ and 6.0.8+ , it is possible for a user to provide a specially crafted SpEL expression that may cause a denial-of-service (DoS) condition.

**CVE-2022-22968**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.18, 5.2.0 - 5.2.20, and older unsupported versions, the patterns for disallowedFields on a DataBinder are case sensitive which means a field is not effectively protected unless it is listed with both upper and lower case for the first character of the field, including upper and lower case for the first character of all nested fields within the property path.

**CVE-2022-22970**

* In spring framework versions prior to 5.3.20+ , 5.2.22+ and old unsupported versions, applications that handle file uploads are vulnerable to DoS attack if they rely on data binding to set a MultipartFile or javax.servlet.Part to a field in a model object.

**CVE-2021-22060**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.13, 5.2.0 - 5.2.18, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide malicious input to cause the insertion of additional log entries. This is a follow-up to CVE-2021-22096 that protects against additional types of input and in more places of the Spring Framework codebase.

**CVE-2021-22096**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.10, 5.2.0 - 5.2.17, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide malicious input to cause the insertion of additional log entries.

Spring-expression-5.2.3.RELEASE.jar

**CVE-2022-22965**

* A Spring MVC or Spring WebFlux application running on JDK 9+ may be vulnerable to remote code execution (RCE) via data binding. The specific exploit requires the application to run on Tomcat as a WAR deployment. If the application is deployed as a Spring Boot executable jar, i.e. the default, it is not vulnerable to the exploit. However, the nature of the vulnerability is more general, and there may be other ways to exploit it.

**CVE-2021-22118**

* In Spring Framework, versions 5.2.x prior to 5.2.15 and versions 5.3.x prior to 5.3.7, a WebFlux application is vulnerable to a privilege escalation: by (re)creating the temporary storage directory, a locally authenticated malicious user can read or modify files that have been uploaded to the WebFlux application, or overwrite arbitrary files with multipart request data.

**CVE-2020-5421**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.2.0 - 5.2.8, 5.1.0 - 5.1.17, 5.0.0 - 5.0.18, 4.3.0 - 4.3.28, and older unsupported versions, the protections against RFD attacks from CVE-2015-5211 may be bypassed depending on the browser used through the use of a jsessionid path parameter.

**CVE-2022-22950**

* n Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.16 and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide a specially crafted SpEL expression that may cause a denial of service condition.

**CVE-2022-22971**

* In spring framework versions prior to 5.3.20+ , 5.2.22+ and old unsupported versions, application with a STOMP over WebSocket endpoint is vulnerable to a denial of service attack by an authenticated user.

**CVE-2023-20861**

* In Spring Framework versions 6.0.0 - 6.0.6, 5.3.0 - 5.3.25, 5.2.0.RELEASE - 5.2.22.RELEASE, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide a specially crafted SpEL expression that may cause a denial-of-service (DoS) condition.

**CVE-2023-20863**

* In spring framework versions prior to 5.2.24 release+ ,5.3.27+ and 6.0.8+ , it is possible for a user to provide a specially crafted SpEL expression that may cause a denial-of-service (DoS) condition.

**CVE-2024-38808**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.38 and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide a specially crafted Spring Expression Language (SpEL) expression that may cause a denial of service (DoS) condition.

**CVE-2022-22968**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.18, 5.2.0 - 5.2.20, and older unsupported versions, the patterns for disallowedFields on a DataBinder are case sensitive which means a field is not effectively protected unless it is listed with both upper and lower case for the first character of the field, including upper and lower case for the first character of all nested fields within the property path.

**CVE-2022-22970**

* In spring framework versions prior to 5.3.20+ , 5.2.22+ and old unsupported versions, applications that handle file uploads are vulnerable to DoS attack if they rely on data binding to set a MultipartFile or javax.servlet.Part to a field in a model object

**CVE-2021-22060**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.13, 5.2.0 - 5.2.18, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide malicious input to cause the insertion of additional log entries. This is a follow-up to CVE-2021-22096 that protects against additional types of input and in more places of the Spring Framework codebase.

**CVE-2021-22096**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.10, 5.2.0 - 5.2.17, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide malicious input to cause the insertion of additional log entries.

Spring-web-5.2.3.RELEASE.jar

**CVE-2016-1000027**

* Pivotal Spring Framework through 5.3.16 suffers from a potential remote code execution (RCE) issue if used for Java deserialization of untrusted data. Depending on how the library is implemented within a product, this issue may or not occur, and authentication may be required. NOTE: the vendor's position is that untrusted data is not an intended use case. The product's behavior will not be changed because some users rely on deserialization of trusted data.

**CVE-2022-22965**

* A Spring MVC or Spring WebFlux application running on JDK 9+ may be vulnerable to remote code execution (RCE) via data binding. The specific exploit requires the application to run on Tomcat as a WAR deployment. If the application is deployed as a Spring Boot executable jar, i.e. the default, it is not vulnerable to the exploit. However, the nature of the vulnerability is more general, and there may be other ways to exploit it.

**CVE-2024-38809**

* Applications that parse ETags from "If-Match" or "If-None-Match" request headers are vulnerable to DoS attack.

**CVE-2024-22243**

* Applications that use UriComponentsBuilder to parse an externally provided URL (e.g. through a query parameter) AND perform validation checks on the host of the parsed URL may be vulnerable to a open redirect https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/601.html  attack or to a SSRF attack if the URL is used after passing validation checks.

**CVE-2024-22262**

* Applications that use UriComponentsBuilder to parse an externally provided URL (e.g. through a query parameter) AND perform validation checks on the host of the parsed URL may be vulnerable to a open redirect https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/601.html  attack or to a SSRF attack if the URL is used after passing validation checks.

**CVE-2021-22118**

* In Spring Framework, versions 5.2.x prior to 5.2.15 and versions 5.3.x prior to 5.3.7, a WebFlux application is vulnerable to a privilege escalation: by (re)creating the temporary storage directory, a locally authenticated malicious user can read or modify files that have been uploaded to the WebFlux application, or overwrite arbitrary files with multipart request data.

**CVE-2024-38828**

* Spring MVC controller methods with an @RequestBody byte[] method parameter are vulnerable to a DoS attack.

**CVE-2020-5421**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.2.0 - 5.2.8, 5.1.0 - 5.1.17, 5.0.0 - 5.0.18, 4.3.0 - 4.3.28, and older unsupported versions, the protections against RFD attacks from CVE-2015-5211 may be bypassed depending on the browser used through the use of a jsessionid path parameter.

**CVE-2022-22950**

* n Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.16 and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide a specially crafted SpEL expression that may cause a denial of service condition.

**CVE-2022-22971**

* In spring framework versions prior to 5.3.20+ , 5.2.22+ and old unsupported versions, application with a STOMP over WebSocket endpoint is vulnerable to a denial of service attack by an authenticated user.

**CVE-2023-20861**

* In Spring Framework versions 6.0.0 - 6.0.6, 5.3.0 - 5.3.25, 5.2.0.RELEASE - 5.2.22.RELEASE, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide a specially crafted SpEL expression that may cause a denial-of-service (DoS) condition.

**CVE-2023-20863**

* In spring framework versions prior to 5.2.24 release+ ,5.3.27+ and 6.0.8+ , it is possible for a user to provide a specially crafted SpEL expression that may cause a denial-of-service (DoS) condition.

**CVE-2022-22968**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.18, 5.2.0 - 5.2.20, and older unsupported versions, the patterns for disallowedFields on a DataBinder are case sensitive which means a field is not effectively protected unless it is listed with both upper and lower case for the first character of the field, including upper and lower case for the first character of all nested fields within the property path.

**CVE-2022-22970**

* In spring framework versions prior to 5.3.20+ , 5.2.22+ and old unsupported versions, applications that handle file uploads are vulnerable to DoS attack if they rely on data binding to set a MultipartFile or javax.servlet.Part to a field in a model object.

**CVE-2021-22060**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.13, 5.2.0 - 5.2.18, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide malicious input to cause the insertion of additional log entries. This is a follow-up to CVE-2021-22096 that protects against additional types of input and in more places of the Spring Framework codebase.

**CVE-2021-22096**

* In Spring Framework versions 5.3.0 - 5.3.10, 5.2.0 - 5.2.17, and older unsupported versions, it is possible for a user to provide malicious input to cause the insertion of additional log entries.

Tomcat-embed-core-9.0.30.jar

**CVE-2020-1938**

**CVE-2020-1196**

* A specially crafted sequence of HTTP/2 requests sent to Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M5, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.35 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.55 could trigger high CPU usage for several seconds. If a sufficient number of such requests were made on concurrent HTTP/2 connections, the server could become unresponsive.

**CVE-2020-13934**

* An h2c direct connection to Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M6, 9.0.0.M5 to 9.0.36 and 8.5.1 to 8.5.56 did not release the HTTP/1.1 processor after the upgrade to HTTP/2. If a sufficient number of such requests were made, an OutOfMemoryException could occur leading to a denial of service.

**CVE-2020-13935**

* The payload length in a WebSocket frame was not correctly validated in Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M6, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.36, 8.5.0 to 8.5.56 and 7.0.27 to 7.0.104. Invalid payload lengths could trigger an infinite loop. Multiple requests with invalid payload lengths could lead to a denial of service.

**CVE-2020-17527**

* While investigating bug 64830 it was discovered that Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M9, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.39 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.59 could re-use an HTTP request header value from the previous stream received on an HTTP/2 connection for the request associated with the subsequent stream. While this would most likely lead to an error and the closure of the HTTP/2 connection, it is possible that information could leak between requests.

**CVE-2021-25122**

* When responding to new h2c connection requests, Apache Tomcat versions 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.41 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.61 could duplicate request headers and a limited amount of request body from one request to another meaning user A and user B could both see the results of user A's request.

**CVE-2021-41079**

* Apache Tomcat 8.5.0 to 8.5.63, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.43 and 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.2 did not properly validate incoming TLS packets. When Tomcat was configured to use NIO+OpenSSL or NIO2+OpenSSL for TLS, a specially crafted packet could be used to trigger an infinite loop resulting in a denial of service.

**CVE-2022-29885**

* The documentation of Apache Tomcat 10.1.0-M1 to 10.1.0-M14, 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.20, 9.0.13 to 9.0.62 and 8.5.38 to 8.5.78 for the EncryptInterceptor incorrectly stated it enabled Tomcat clustering to run over an untrusted network. This was not correct. While the EncryptInterceptor does provide confidentiality and integrity protection, it does not protect against all risks associated with running over any untrusted network, particularly DoS risks.

**CVE-2022-42252**

* If Apache Tomcat 8.5.0 to 8.5.82, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.67, 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.26 or 10.1.0-M1 to 10.1.0 was configured to ignore invalid HTTP headers via setting rejectIllegalHeader to false (the default for 8.5.x only), Tomcat did not reject a request containing an invalid Content-Length header making a request smuggling attack possible if Tomcat was located behind a reverse proxy that also failed to reject the request with the invalid header.

**CVE-2023-44487**

* The HTTP/2 protocol allows a denial of service (server resource consumption) because request cancellation can reset many streams quickly, as exploited in the wild in August through October 2023.

**CVE-2023-46589**

* Improper Input Validation vulnerability in Apache Tomcat.Tomcat from 11.0.0-M1 through 11.0.0-M10, from 10.1.0-M1 through 10.1.15, from 9.0.0-M1 through 9.0.82 and from 8.5.0 through 8.5.95 did not correctly parse HTTP trailer headers. A trailer header that exceeded the header size limit could cause Tomcat to treat a single request as multiple requests leading to the possibility of request smuggling when behind a reverse proxy.

**CVE-2020-9484**

* When using Apache Tomcat versions 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M4, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.34, 8.5.0 to 8.5.54 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.103 if a) an attacker is able to control the contents and name of a file on the server; and b) the server is configured to use the PersistenceManager with a FileStore; and c) the PersistenceManager is configured with sessionAttributeValueClassNameFilter="null" (the default unless a SecurityManager is used) or a sufficiently lax filter to allow the attacker provided object to be deserialized; and d) the attacker knows the relative file path from the storage location used by FileStore to the file the attacker has control over; then, using a specifically crafted request, the attacker will be able to trigger remote code execution via deserialization of the file under their control. Note that all of conditions a) to d) must be true for the attack to succeed.

**CVE-2021-25329**

* The fix for CVE-2020-9484 was incomplete. When using Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.41, 8.5.0 to 8.5.61 or 7.0.0. to 7.0.107 with a configuration edge case that was highly unlikely to be used, the Tomcat instance was still vulnerable to CVE-2020-9494. Note that both the previously published prerequisites for CVE-2020-9484 and the previously published mitigations for CVE-2020-9484 also apply to this issue.

**CVE-2021-30640**

* A vulnerability in the JNDI Realm of Apache Tomcat allows an attacker to authenticate using variations of a valid user name and/or to bypass some of the protection provided by the LockOut Realm. This issue affects Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.5; 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.45; 8.5.0 to 8.5.65.

**CVE-2022-34305**

* In Apache Tomcat 10.1.0-M1 to 10.1.0-M16, 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.22, 9.0.30 to 9.0.64 and 8.5.50 to 8.5.81 the Form authentication example in the examples web application displayed user provided data without filtering, exposing a XSS vulnerability.

**CVE-2023-41080**

* URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') vulnerability in FORM authentication feature Apache Tomcat.This issue affects Apache Tomcat: from 11.0.0-M1 through 11.0.0-M10, from 10.1.0-M1 through 10.0.12, from 9.0.0-M1 through 9.0.79 and from 8.5.0 through 8.5.92.

**CVE-2021-24122**

* When serving resources from a network location using the NTFS file system, Apache Tomcat versions 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M9, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.39, 8.5.0 to 8.5.59 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.106 were susceptible to JSP source code disclosure in some configurations. The root cause was the unexpected behaviour of the JRE API File.getCanonicalPath() which in turn was caused by the inconsistent behaviour of the Windows API (FindFirstFileW) in some circumstances.

**CVE-2021-33037**

* Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.6, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.46 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.66 did not correctly parse the HTTP transfer-encoding request header in some circumstances leading to the possibility to request smuggling when used with a reverse proxy. Specifically: - Tomcat incorrectly ignored the transfer encoding header if the client declared it would only accept an HTTP/1.0 response; - Tomcat honoured the identify encoding; and - Tomcat did not ensure that, if present, the chunked encoding was the final encoding.

**CVE-2023-42795**

* Incomplete Cleanup vulnerability in Apache Tomcat.When recycling various internal objects in Apache Tomcat from 11.0.0-M1 through 11.0.0-M11, from 10.1.0-M1 through 10.1.13, from 9.0.0-M1 through 9.0.80 and from 8.5.0 through 8.5.93, an error could cause Tomcat to skip some parts of the recycling process leading to information leaking from the current request/response to the next.

**CVE-2023-45648**

* Improper Input Validation vulnerability in Apache Tomcat.Tomcat from 11.0.0-M1 through 11.0.0-M11, from 10.1.0-M1 through 10.1.13, from 9.0.0-M1 through 9.0.81 and from 8.5.0 through 8.5.93 did not correctly parse HTTP trailer headers. A specially crafted, invalid trailer header could cause Tomcat to treat a single request as multiple requests leading to the possibility of request smuggling when behind a reverse proxy.

**CVE-2024-21733**

* Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information vulnerability in Apache Tomcat.This issue affects Apache Tomcat: from 8.5.7 through 8.5.63, from 9.0.0-M11 through 9.0.43.

**CVE-2019-17569**

* The refactoring present in Apache Tomcat 9.0.28 to 9.0.30, 8.5.48 to 8.5.50 and 7.0.98 to 7.0.99 introduced a regression. The result of the regression was that invalid Transfer-Encoding headers were incorrectly processed leading to a possibility of HTTP Request Smuggling if Tomcat was located behind a reverse proxy that incorrectly handled the invalid Transfer-Encoding header in a particular manner. Such a reverse proxy is considered unlikely.

**CVE-2020-1935**

* In Apache Tomcat 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.30, 8.5.0 to 8.5.50 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.99 the HTTP header parsing code used an approach to end-of-line parsing that allowed some invalid HTTP headers to be parsed as valid. This led to a possibility of HTTP Request Smuggling if Tomcat was located behind a reverse proxy that incorrectly handled the invalid Transfer-Encoding header in a particular manner. Such a reverse proxy is considered unlikely.

**CVE-2020-13943**

* If an HTTP/2 client connecting to Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M7, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.37 or 8.5.0 to 8.5.57 exceeded the agreed maximum number of concurrent streams for a connection (in violation of the HTTP/2 protocol), it was possible that a subsequent request made on that connection could contain HTTP headers - including HTTP/2 pseudo headers - from a previous request rather than the intended headers. This could lead to users seeing responses for unexpected resources.

**CVE-2023-28708**

* When using the RemoteIpFilter with requests received from a reverse proxy via HTTP that include the X-Forwarded-Proto header set to https, session cookies created by Apache Tomcat 11.0.0-M1 to 11.0.0.-M2, 10.1.0-M1 to 10.1.5, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.71 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.85 did not include the secure attribute. This could result in the user agent transmitting the session cookie over an insecure channel.

**CVE-2021-43980**

* The simplified implementation of blocking reads and writes introduced in Tomcat 10 and back-ported to Tomcat 9.0.47 onwards exposed a long standing (but extremely hard to trigger) concurrency bug in Apache Tomcat 10.1.0 to 10.1.0-M12, 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.18, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.60 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.77 that could cause client connections to share an Http11Processor instance resulting in responses, or part responses, to be received by the wrong client.

Tomcat-embed-websocket-9.0.30.jar

**CVE-2020-1938**

* When using the Apache JServ Protocol (AJP), care must be taken when trusting incoming connections to Apache Tomcat. Tomcat treats AJP connections as having higher trust than, for example, a similar HTTP connection. If such connections are available to an attacker, they can be exploited in ways that may be surprising. In Apache Tomcat 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.0.30, 8.5.0 to 8.5.50 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.99, Tomcat shipped with an AJP Connector enabled by default that listened on all configured IP addresses. It was expected (and recommended in the security guide) that this Connector would be disabled if not required. This vulnerability report identified a mechanism that allowed: - returning arbitrary files from anywhere in the web application - processing any file in the web application as a JSP Further, if the web application allowed file upload and stored those files within the web application (or the attacker was able to control the content of the web application by some other means) then this, along with the ability to process a file as a JSP, made remote code execution possible. It is important to note that mitigation is only required if an AJP port is accessible to untrusted users. Users wishing to take a defence-in-depth approach and block the vector that permits returning arbitrary files and execution as JSP may upgrade to Apache Tomcat 9.0.31, 8.5.51 or 7.0.100 or later. A number of changes were made to the default AJP Connector configuration in 9.0.31 to harden the default configuration. It is likely that users upgrading to 9.0.31, 8.5.51 or 7.0.100 or later will need to make small changes to their configurations.

**CVE-2020-8022**

* A Incorrect Default Permissions vulnerability in the packaging of tomcat on SUSE Enterprise Storage 5, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP2-BCL, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP2-LTSS, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP3-BCL, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP3-LTSS, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP4, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP5, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 15-LTSS, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 12-SP2, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 12-SP3, SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 15, SUSE OpenStack Cloud 7, SUSE OpenStack Cloud 8, SUSE OpenStack Cloud Crowbar 8 allows local attackers to escalate from group tomcat to root. This issue affects: SUSE Enterprise Storage 5 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP2-BCL tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP2-LTSS tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP3-BCL tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP3-LTSS tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP4 tomcat versions prior to 9.0.35-3.39.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 12-SP5 tomcat versions prior to 9.0.35-3.39.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server 15-LTSS tomcat versions prior to 9.0.35-3.57.3. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 12-SP2 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 12-SP3 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE Linux Enterprise Server for SAP 15 tomcat versions prior to 9.0.35-3.57.3. SUSE OpenStack Cloud 7 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE OpenStack Cloud 8 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1. SUSE OpenStack Cloud Crowbar 8 tomcat versions prior to 8.0.53-29.32.1.

**CVE-2020-11996**

* A specially crafted sequence of HTTP/2 requests sent to Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M5, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.35 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.55 could trigger high CPU usage for several seconds. If a sufficient number of such requests were made on concurrent HTTP/2 connections, the server could become unresponsive.

**CVE-2020-13934**

* An h2c direct connection to Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M6, 9.0.0.M5 to 9.0.36 and 8.5.1 to 8.5.56 did not release the HTTP/1.1 processor after the upgrade to HTTP/2. If a sufficient number of such requests were made, an OutOfMemoryException could occur leading to a denial of service.

**CVE-2020-13935**

* The payload length in a WebSocket frame was not correctly validated in Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M6, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.36, 8.5.0 to 8.5.56 and 7.0.27 to 7.0.104. Invalid payload lengths could trigger an infinite loop. Multiple requests with invalid payload lengths could lead to a denial of service.

**CVE-2020-17527**

* While investigating bug 64830 it was discovered that Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M9, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.39 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.59 could re-use an HTTP request header value from the previous stream received on an HTTP/2 connection for the request associated with the subsequent stream. While this would most likely lead to an error and the closure of the HTTP/2 connection, it is possible that information could leak between requests.

**CVE-2021-25122**

* When responding to new h2c connection requests, Apache Tomcat versions 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.41 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.61 could duplicate request headers and a limited amount of request body from one request to another meaning user A and user B could both see the results of user A's request.

**CVE-2021-41079**

* Apache Tomcat 8.5.0 to 8.5.63, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.43 and 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.2 did not properly validate incoming TLS packets. When Tomcat was configured to use NIO+OpenSSL or NIO2+OpenSSL for TLS, a specially crafted packet could be used to trigger an infinite loop resulting in a denial of service.

**CVE-2022-29885**

* The documentation of Apache Tomcat 10.1.0-M1 to 10.1.0-M14, 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.20, 9.0.13 to 9.0.62 and 8.5.38 to 8.5.78 for the EncryptInterceptor incorrectly stated it enabled Tomcat clustering to run over an untrusted network. This was not correct. While the EncryptInterceptor does provide confidentiality and integrity protection, it does not protect against all risks associated with running over any untrusted network, particularly DoS risks.

**CVE-2023-44487**

* The HTTP/2 protocol allows a denial of service (server resource consumption) because request cancellation can reset many streams quickly, as exploited in the wild in August through October 2023.

**CVE-2023-46589**

* Improper Input Validation vulnerability in Apache Tomcat.Tomcat from 11.0.0-M1 through 11.0.0-M10, from 10.1.0-M1 through 10.1.15, from 9.0.0-M1 through 9.0.82 and from 8.5.0 through 8.5.95 did not correctly parse HTTP trailer headers. A trailer header that exceeded the header size limit could cause Tomcat to treat a single request as multiple requests leading to the possibility of request smuggling when behind a reverse proxy.

**CVE-2020-9484**

* When using Apache Tomcat versions 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M4, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.34, 8.5.0 to 8.5.54 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.103 if a) an attacker is able to control the contents and name of a file on the server; and b) the server is configured to use the PersistenceManager with a FileStore; and c) the PersistenceManager is configured with sessionAttributeValueClassNameFilter="null" (the default unless a SecurityManager is used) or a sufficiently lax filter to allow the attacker provided object to be deserialized; and d) the attacker knows the relative file path from the storage location used by FileStore to the file the attacker has control over; then, using a specifically crafted request, the attacker will be able to trigger remote code execution via deserialization of the file under their control. Note that all of conditions a) to d) must be true for the attack to succeed.

**CVE-2021-25329**

* The fix for CVE-2020-9484 was incomplete. When using Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.41, 8.5.0 to 8.5.61 or 7.0.0. to 7.0.107 with a configuration edge case that was highly unlikely to be used, the Tomcat instance was still vulnerable to CVE-2020-9494. Note that both the previously published prerequisites for CVE-2020-9484 and the previously published mitigations for CVE-2020-9484 also apply to this issue.

**CVE-2021-30640**

* A vulnerability in the JNDI Realm of Apache Tomcat allows an attacker to authenticate using variations of a valid user name and/or to bypass some of the protection provided by the LockOut Realm. This issue affects Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.5; 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.45; 8.5.0 to 8.5.65.

**CVE-2022-34305**

* In Apache Tomcat 10.1.0-M1 to 10.1.0-M16, 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.22, 9.0.30 to 9.0.64 and 8.5.50 to 8.5.81 the Form authentication example in the examples web application displayed user provided data without filtering, exposing a XSS vulnerability.

**CVE-2023-41080**

* URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') vulnerability in FORM authentication feature Apache Tomcat.This issue affects Apache Tomcat: from 11.0.0-M1 through 11.0.0-M10, from 10.1.0-M1 through 10.0.12, from 9.0.0-M1 through 9.0.79 and from 8.5.0 through 8.5.92.

**CVE-2021-24122**

* When serving resources from a network location using the NTFS file system, Apache Tomcat versions 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M9, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.39, 8.5.0 to 8.5.59 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.106 were susceptible to JSP source code disclosure in some configurations. The root cause was the unexpected behaviour of the JRE API File.getCanonicalPath() which in turn was caused by the inconsistent behaviour of the Windows API (FindFirstFileW) in some circumstances.

**CVE-2021-33037**

* Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.6, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.46 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.66 did not correctly parse the HTTP transfer-encoding request header in some circumstances leading to the possibility to request smuggling when used with a reverse proxy. Specifically: - Tomcat incorrectly ignored the transfer encoding header if the client declared it would only accept an HTTP/1.0 response; - Tomcat honoured the identify encoding; and - Tomcat did not ensure that, if present, the chunked encoding was the final encoding.

**CVE-2023-42795**

* Incomplete Cleanup vulnerability in Apache Tomcat.When recycling various internal objects in Apache Tomcat from 11.0.0-M1 through 11.0.0-M11, from 10.1.0-M1 through 10.1.13, from 9.0.0 M1 through 9.0.80 and from 8.5.0 through 8.5.93, an error could cause Tomcat to skip some parts of the recycling process leading to information leaking from the current request/response to the next.

**CVE-2023-45648**

* Improper Input Validation vulnerability in Apache Tomcat.Tomcat from 11.0.0-M1 through 11.0.0-M11, from 10.1.0-M1 through 10.1.13, from 9.0.0-M1 through 9.0.81 and from 8.5.0 through 8.5.93 did not correctly parse HTTP trailer headers. A specially crafted, invalid trailer header could cause Tomcat to treat a single request as multiple requests leading to the possibility of request smuggling when behind a reverse proxy.

**CVE-2024-21733**

* Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information vulnerability in Apache Tomcat.This issue affects Apache Tomcat: from 8.5.7 through 8.5.63, from 9.0.0-M11 through 9.0.43.

**CVE-2019-17569**

* The refactoring present in Apache Tomcat 9.0.28 to 9.0.30, 8.5.48 to 8.5.50 and 7.0.98 to 7.0.99 introduced a regression. The result of the regression was that invalid Transfer-Encoding headers were incorrectly processed leading to a possibility of HTTP Request Smuggling if Tomcat was located behind a reverse proxy that incorrectly handled the invalid Transfer-Encoding header in a particular manner. Such a reverse proxy is considered unlikely.

**CVE-2020-1935**

* In Apache Tomcat 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.30, 8.5.0 to 8.5.50 and 7.0.0 to 7.0.99 the HTTP header parsing code used an approach to end-of-line parsing that allowed some invalid HTTP headers to be parsed as valid. This led to a possibility of HTTP Request Smuggling if Tomcat was located behind a reverse proxy that incorrectly handled the invalid Transfer-Encoding header in a particular manner. Such a reverse proxy is considered unlikely.

**CVE-2020-13943**

* If an HTTP/2 client connecting to Apache Tomcat 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.0-M7, 9.0.0.M1 to 9.0.37 or 8.5.0 to 8.5.57 exceeded the agreed maximum number of concurrent streams for a connection (in violation of the HTTP/2 protocol), it was possible that a subsequent request made on that connection could contain HTTP headers - including HTTP/2 pseudo headers - from a previous request rather than the intended headers. This could lead to users seeing responses for unexpected resources.

**CVE-2023-28708**

* When using the RemoteIpFilter with requests received from a reverse proxy via HTTP that include the X-Forwarded-Proto header set to https, session cookies created by Apache Tomcat 11.0.0-M1 to 11.0.0.-M2, 10.1.0-M1 to 10.1.5, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.71 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.85 did not include the secure attribute. This could result in the user agent transmitting the session cookie over an insecure channel.

**CVE-2021-43980**

* The simplified implementation of blocking reads and writes introduced in Tomcat 10 and back-ported to Tomcat 9.0.47 onwards exposed a long standing (but extremely hard to trigger) concurrency bug in Apache Tomcat 10.1.0 to 10.1.0-M12, 10.0.0-M1 to 10.0.18, 9.0.0-M1 to 9.0.60 and 8.5.0 to 8.5.77 that could cause client connections to share an Http11Processor instance resulting in responses, or part responses, to be received by the wrong client.

**5. Mitigation Plan**

Interpret the results from the manual review and static testing report. Then identify the steps to mitigate the identified security vulnerabilities for Artemis Financial’s software application.

The first step in mitigating the identified security vulnerabilities is to update to the latest program version to ensure everything is running the best it can. Usually updates contain considerable amounts of bug fixes and performance fixes. Next, many of the vulnerabilities revolve around information not being validated or sanitized before moving it onto the next piece of the code. When the user inputs information, and the classes communicate by sharing that information, if it’s not efficiently validated, it can open the program to security threats. By taking both steps, the overall security will greatly increase, while the vulnerabilities will dramatically decrease.