

Alice Jiang

Foundational Technical & Organizational Concepts & Practices in Cybersecurity 298

Professor O'Brien

12/08/25

Module 7: Assignment: Secure Software Supply Chain with SBOMs

1. How many components each tool reported (Syft vs. Trivy)
 - a. For Syft, it has 107 packages, making it 107 components

```
@alicejiang-isds → /workspaces/eng298-fa25-mod7-sbom-lab1/ng911-dev (main) $ syft . -o spdx-json > ../deliverables/sbom_syft_spdx.json
✓ Indexed file system
✓ Cataloged contents
├── ✓ Packages [107 packages]
├── ✓ File metadata [3 locations]
├── Executables [0 executables]
└── ✓ File digests [3 files]
[0000] WARN no explicit name and version provided for directory source, deriving artifact ID from the given path
```

- b. For Trivy, there's 2 language-specific files, making it 2 components

```
@alicejiang-isds → /workspaces/eng298-fa25-mod7-sbom-lab1/ng911-dev (main) $ trivy fs . --format cyclonedx --out
put ../deliverables/sbom_trivy_cdx.json
2025-11-20T07:56:23Z INFO "--format cyclonedx" disables security scanning. Specify "--scanners vuln" explicitly if you want to include vulnerabilities in the "cyclonedx" report.
2025-11-20T07:56:23Z INFO [npm] To collect the license information of packages, "npm install" needs to be performed beforehand dir="test_suite/test_files/_old/TPLan_Config/VS_Code/node_modules"
2025-11-20T07:56:23Z INFO [python] Licenses acquired from one or more METADATA files may be subject to additional terms. Use '--debug' flag to see all affected packages.
2025-11-20T07:56:23Z INFO Number of language-specific files num=2
```

2. One difference you notice between the SPDX SBOM and the CycloneDX SBOM (format, fields, component count, etc.)
 - a. One difference I notice between SPDX SBOM and the CycloneDX SBOM is that the SPDX SBOM is more organized in the format, it tells you the number of packages, file digests, file metadata, and executables there are, and the count is shown on the right side. While for CycloneDX SBOM, it's more compact in the format, there's no table-like field, instead it's separated into lines, but it shows the count, just within a line.

Here is the screenshot of the whole code for the lab:

```

@alicejiang-isds → /workspaces/eng298-fa25-mod7-sbom-lab1 (main) $ git clone https://github.com/tamu-edu/ng911-dev.git
Cloning into 'ng911-dev'...
remote: Enumerating objects: 2357, done.
remote: Counting objects: 100% (1557/1557), done.
remote: Compressing objects: 100% (854/854), done.
remote: Total 2357 (delta 861), reused 1321 (delta 688), pack-reused 800 (from 4)
Receiving objects: 100% (2357/2357), 8.62 MiB | 28.12 MiB/s, done.
Resolving deltas: 100% (1166/1166), done.
@alicejiang-isds → /workspaces/eng298-fa25-mod7-sbom-lab1 (main) $ cd ng911-dev
@alicejiang-isds → /workspaces/eng298-fa25-mod7-sbom-lab1/ng911-dev (main) $ syft . -o spdx-json > ../deliverables/sbom_syft_spdx.json
✓ Indexed file system
✓ Cataloged contents
├── ✓ Packages [107 packages]
├── ✓ File metadata [3 locations]
├── ✓ Executables [0 executables]
└── ✓ File digests [3 files]
[0000] WARN no explicit name and version provided for directory source, deriving artifact ID from the given path
@alicejiang-isds → /workspaces/eng298-fa25-mod7-sbom-lab1/ng911-dev (main) $ trivy fs . --format cyclonedx --out put ../deliverables/sbom_trivy_cdx.json
2025-11-20T07:56:23Z INFO "--format cyclonedx" disables security scanning. Specify "--scanners vuln" explicitly if you want to include vulnerabilities in the "cyclonedx" report.
2025-11-20T07:56:23Z INFO [npm] To collect the license information of packages, "npm install" needs to be performed beforehand dir="test_suite/test_files/_old/TPlan_Config/VS_Code/node_modules"
2025-11-20T07:56:23Z INFO [python] Licenses acquired from one or more METADATA files may be subject to additional terms. Use "--debug" flag to see all affected packages.
2025-11-20T07:56:23Z INFO Number of language-specific files num=2
@alicejiang-isds → /workspaces/eng298-fa25-mod7-sbom-lab1/ng911-dev (main) $ ls ../deliverables/
README.md sbom_syft_spdx.json sbom_trivy_cdx.json
@alicejiang-isds → /workspaces/eng298-fa25-mod7-sbom-lab1/ng911-dev (main) $ gype sbom:../deliverables/sbom_syft_spdx.json -o table > ../deliverables/vuln_analysis_gype.txt
✓ Vulnerability DB [updated]
✓ Scanned for vulnerabilities [8 vulnerability matches]
├─ by severity: 0 critical, 2 high, 5 medium, 1 low, 0 negligible
@alicejiang-isds → /workspaces/eng298-fa25-mod7-sbom-lab1/ng911-dev (main) $ head -20 ../deliverables/vuln_analysis_gype.txt
NAME INSTALLED FIXED IN TYPE VULNERABILITY SEVERITY EPSS RISK
cryptography 43.0.0 44.0.1 python GHSA-79v4-65xg-pq4g Low 1.1% (76th) 0.3
setuptools 72.1.0 78.1.1 python GHSA-5rjg-fvgr-3xxf High < 0.1% (21st) < 0.1
brotli 1.1.0 1.2.0 python GHSA-2qfp-q593-8484 High < 0.1% (13th) < 0.1
requests 2.32.3 2.32.4 python GHSA-9h9j-9r4m-mvj7 Medium < 0.1% (16th) < 0.1
urllib3 2.2.2 2.5.0 python GHSA-pq67-6m6q-mj2v Medium < 0.1% (0th) < 0.1
urllib3 2.2.2 2.5.0 python GHSA-48p4-8xcf-vxj5 Medium < 0.1% (0th) < 0.1
cryptography 43.0.0 43.0.1 python GHSA-h4gh-qq45-vh27 Medium N/A N/A
scapy 2.5.0 python GHSA-cq46-m9x9-j8w2 Medium N/A N/A
@alicejiang-isds → /workspaces/eng298-fa25-mod7-sbom-lab1/ng911-dev (main) $

```

3. Copy the top 5 rows into your report table. Then select one CVE, locate it in the NVD Database, and summarize its cause or impact in one sentence.

NAME	INSTALLED	FIXED IN	TYPE	VULNERABILITY	SEVERITY	EPSS	RISK
cryptography	43.0.0	44.0.1	python	GHSA-79v4-65xg-pq4g	Low	1.1% (76th)	0.3
setuptools	72.1.0	78.1.1	python	GHSA-5rjg-fvgr-3xxf	High	< 0.1% (21st)	< 0.1
brotli	1.1.0	1.2.0	python	GHSA-2qfp-q593-8484	High	< 0.1% (13th)	< 0.1
requests	2.32.3	2.32.4	python	GHSA-9h9j-9r4m-mvj7	Medium	< 0.1% (16th)	< 0.1
urllib3	2.2.2	2.5.0	python	GHSA-pq67-6m6q-mj2v	Medium	< 0.1% (0th)	< 0.1

NAME	INSTALLED	FIXED IN	TYPE	VULNERABILITY	SEVERITY	EPSS	RISK
cryptograph hy	43.0.0	44.0.1	python	GHSA-79 v4-65xg-p q4g	Low	1.1% (76th)	0.3

setuptools	72.1.0	78.1.1	python	GHSA-5rjg-fvgr-3xxf	High	< 0.1% (22st)	< 0.1
brotli	1.1.0	1.2.0	python	GHSA-2qfp-q593-8484	High	< 0.1% (13th)	< 0.1
requests	2.32.3	2.32.4	python	GHSA-9hjpg-9r4m-mvj7	Medium	< 0.1% (16th)	< 0.1
urllib3	2.2.2	2.5.0	python	GHSA-pq67-6m6q-mj2v	Medium	< 0.1% (0th)	< 0.1

I had to use this website to translate the GHSA IDs to CVE: <https://github.com/advisories> ↴

NAME	INSTALLED	FIXED IN	TYPE	CVE	SEVERITY	EPSS	RISK
cryptograph hy	43.0.0	44.0.1	python	CVE-2024-12797	Low	1.1% (76th)	0.3
setuptools	72.1.0	78.1.1	python	CVE-2025-47273	High	< 0.1% (22st)	< 0.1
brotli	1.1.0	1.2.0	python	CVE-2025-6176	High	< 0.1% (13th)	< 0.1
requests	2.32.3	2.32.4	python	CVE-2024-47081	Medium	< 0.1% (16th)	< 0.1
urllib3	2.2.2	2.5.0	python	CVE-2025-50181	Medium	< 0.1% (0th)	< 0.1

The CVE I chose is this: [CVE-2025-47273](#)

The impact of this specific CVE is that there was a path traversal vulnerability in PackageIndex of the package setuptools, where attackers can write files to arbitrary locations on the filesystem with permission on Python code, which means they can do remote code execution—luckily this got fixed in version 78.1.1.