**Green Pace Developer: Security Policy Guide Template**
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## Overview

Software development at Green Pace requires consistent implementation of secure principles to all developed applications. Consistent approaches and methodologies must be maintained through all policies that are uniformly defined, implemented, governed, and maintained over time.

## Purpose

This policy defines the core security principles; C/C++ coding standards; authorization, authentication, and auditing standards; and data encryption standards. This article explains the differences between policy, standards, principles, and practices (guidelines and procedure): [Understanding the Hierarchy of Principles, Policies, Standards, Procedures, and Guidelines](https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/understanding-hierarchy-principles-policies-standards-wally-beddoe/).

## Scope

This document applies to all staff that create, deploy, or support custom software at Green Pace.

## Module Three Milestone

### Ten Core Security Principles

| **Principles** | Write a short paragraph explaining each of the 10 principles of security. |
| --- | --- |
| 1. ValidateInput Data | Validating all inputs from untrusted data sources, this can help prevent many of the major software vulnerabilities. Always be aware of external data sources as cause for concern such as command line arguments, environmental variables and network interfaces. |
| 1. Heed Compiler Warnings | Always use highest warning levels available when compiling your code and eliminate warnings by modifying the code. To help detect and eliminate additional security flaws, use static and dynamic analysis tools. |
| 1. Architect and Design for Security Policies | Be mindful to make sure that when designing your software architecture that you implement and enforce the proper security policies. |
| 1. Keep It Simple | Keep you coding design small and simple to avoid having to cater to complex systems which are more susceptible to errors and failed security mechanisms. |
| 1. Default Deny | Standardize your access decisions based on permission rather than exclusion. By default access should denied with specific conditions to permit access. |
| 1. Adhere to the Principle of Least Privilege | Process executions should have the least set of privileges to complete the job. Elevated permissions should only be accessed for the time it takes to complete the task. This is to help reduce the chances of attackers use of arbitrary code within those elevated privileges. |
| 1. Sanitize Data Sent to Other Systems | Sanitize the data passed through complex subsystems. To dissuade attackers from using injection attacks to manipulate the components of subsystems. |
| 1. Practice Defense in Depth | Always practice defense in depth with multiple layers of security. So when one layer fails there are other layer there to help prevent security flaws from becoming exploitable vulnerabilities. |
| 1. Use Effective Quality Assurance Techniques | Quality assurance techniques can increase chances of identifying and eliminating vulnerabilities. Using multiple testing phases, independent security reviews and external security reviews can all lead to more secure systems. |
| 1. Adopt a Secure Coding Standard | Always have a secure coding standard for development in whatever language and platform you are using. |

### C/C++ Ten Coding Standards

Complete the coding standards portion of the template according to the Module Three milestone requirements. In Project One, follow the instructions to add a layer of security to the existing coding standards. Please start each standard on a new page, as they may take up more than one page. The first seven coding standards are labeled by category. The last three are blank so you may choose three additional standards. Be sure to label them by category and give them a sequential number for that category. Add compliant and noncompliant sections as needed to each coding standard.

#### Coding Standard 1

| **Coding Standard** | **Label** | **Name of Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Data Type** | [STD-001-CPP] | Do not cast to an out-of-range enumeration value. |

| **Noncompliant Code** |
| --- |
| Checks whether a given value is within range of acceptable enumeration values. After casting the type, it might not be able to represent the given integer value. |
| enum EnumType{  First,  Second,  Third  {;  Void f(int intVar){  EnumType enumVar = static\_cast<EnumType>(intVar);  If (enumVar < First || enumVar > Third){  // Handle error  }  } |

| **Compliant Code** |
| --- |
| The compliant solution checks the value represented by the enumeration type before performing the conversion to guarantee the conversion doesn’t result in an unspecified value. In turn is restricts the converted value to one specific enumerator type. |
| enum EnumType {  First,  Second,  Third  };  void f(int intVar) {  if (intVar < First || intVar > Third) {  // Handle error  }  EnumType enumVar = static\_cast<EnumType>(intVar);  } |

**Note: Stop here for the milestone. Complete this section for Project One in Module Six.**

| **Principles(s):** Unspecified values can result in a buffer overflow. Enumerators are rarely used for indexing into arrays or other forms of pointer arithmetic. |
| --- |

**Threat Level**

| **Severity** | **Likelihood** | **Remediation Cost** | **Priority** | **Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Medium | Unlikely | Medium | P4 | L3 |

**Automation**

| **Tool** | **Version** | **Checker** | **Description Tool** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Axivion Bauhaus Suite | 6.9.0 | CertC++ - INT50 |  |
| Helix QAC | 2021.1 |  |  |
| Parasoft C/C++ test | 2020.2 | CERT\_CPP-INT50-a | An expression with enum underlying type shall only have values corresponding to the enumerators of the enumeration. |
| PRQA QA-C++ | 4.4 | 3013 |  |
| PVS - Studio | 7.07 | V1016 |  |

#### Coding Standard 2

| **Coding Standard** | **Label** | **Name of Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Data Value** | [STD-002-CPP] | Use valid references, pointers, and iterators to reference elements of a container. |

| **Noncompliant Code** |
| --- |
| Pos is invalidated after the first call to insert(), and subsequent loop iterations have undefined behavior. |
| #include <deque>  void f(const double \*items, std::size\_t count) {  std::deque<double> d;  auto pos = d.begin();  for (std::size\_t i = 0; i < count; ++i, ++pos) {  d.insert(pos, items[i] + 41.0);  }  } |

| **Compliant Code** |
| --- |
| Pos is assigned a valid iterator on each insertion, preventing undefined behavior. |
| #include <deque>  void f(const double \*items, std::size\_t count) {  std::deque<double> d;  auto pos = d.begin();  for (std::size\_t i = 0; i < count; ++i, ++pos) {  pos = d.insert(pos, items[i] + 41.0);  }  } |

**Note: Stop here for the milestone. Complete this section for Project One in Module Six.**

| **Principles(s):** Using invalid references, pointers, or iterators to reference elements of a container results in undefined behavior. |
| --- |

**Threat Level**

| **Severity** | **Likelihood** | **Remediation Cost** | **Priority** | **Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High | Probable | High | P6 | L2 |

**Automation**

| **Tool** | **Version** | **Checker** | **Description Tool** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Astree | 20.10 | Overflow\_unpon\_dereference |  |
| Helix QAC | 2021.1 |  |  |
| Parasoft C/C++ test | 2020.2 | CERT\_CPP-CTR51-a | Do not modify container while iterating over it. |
| PVS - Studio | 7.07 | V783 |  |

#### Coding Standard 3

| **Coding Standard** | **Label** | **Name of Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **String Correctness** | [STD-003-CPP] | Do not attempt to create a std::string from a null pointer. |

| **Noncompliant Code** |
| --- |
| A std::string object is created from the results of a call to std::getenv(). However, because std::getenv() returns a null pointer on failure, this code can lead to undefined behavior when the environment variable does not exist (or some other error occurs). |
| #include <cstdlib>  #include <string>  void f() {  std::string tmp(std::getenv("TMP"));  if (!tmp.empty()) {  // ...  }  } |

| **Compliant Code** |
| --- |
| The results from the call to std::getenv() are checked for null before the std::string object is constructed. |
| #include <cstdlib>  #include <string>  void f() {  const char \*tmpPtrVal = std::getenv("TMP");  std::string tmp(tmpPtrVal ? tmpPtrVal : "");  if (!tmp.empty()) {  // ...  }  } |

**Note: Stop here for the milestone. Complete this section for Project One in Module Six.**

| **Principles(s):** Dereferencing a null pointer is undefined behavior, typically abnormal program termination. In some situations, however, dereferencing a null pointer can lead to the execution of arbitrary code. The indicated severity is for this more sever case, on platforms where it is not possible to exploit a null pointer dereference to execute arbitrary code, the actual severity is low. |
| --- |

**Threat Level**

| **Severity** | **Likelihood** | **Remediation Cost** | **Priority** | **Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High | Likely | Medium | P18 | L1 |

**Automation**

| **Tool** | **Version** | **Checker** | **Description Tool** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Astree | 20.10 | Assert\_failure |  |
| Helix QAC | 2021.1 |  |  |
| Parasoft C/C++ test | 2020.1 | CERT\_CPP-STR51-a | Avoid null pointer dereferencing |

#### Coding Standard 4

| **Coding Standard** | **Label** | **Name of Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SQL Injection** | [STD-004-CPP] | Do not store an already owned pointer value in an unrelated smart pointer. |

| **Noncompliant Code** |
| --- |
| Two unrelated smart pointers are constructed from the same underlying pointer value. When the local, automatic variable p2 is destroyed, it deletes the pointer value it manages. Then, when the local, automatic variable p1 is destroyed, it deletes the same pointer value, resulting in a double-free vulnerability. |
| #include <memory>  void f() {  int \*i = new int;  std::shared\_ptr<int> p1(i);  std::shared\_ptr<int> p2(i);  } |

| **Compliant Code** |
| --- |
| The std::shared\_ptr objects are related to one another through copy construction. When the local, automatic variable p2 is destroyed, the use count for the shared pointer value is decremented but still nonzero. Then, when the local, automatic variable p1 is destroyed, the use count for the shared pointer value is decremented to zero, and the managed pointer is destroyed. This compliant solution also calls std::make\_shared() instead of allocating a raw pointer and storing its value in a local variable. |
| #include <memory>  void f() {  std::shared\_ptr<int> p1 = std::make\_shared<int>();  std::shared\_ptr<int> p2(p1);  } |

**Note: Stop here for the milestone. Complete this section for Project One in Module Six.**

| **Principles(s):** Passing a pointer value to a deallocation function that was not previously obtained by the matching allocation function results in undefined behavior, which can lead to exploitable vulnerabilities. |
| --- |

**Threat Level**

| **Severity** | **Likelihood** | **Remediation Cost** | **Priority** | **Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High | Likely | Medium | P18 | L1 |

**Automation**

| **Tool** | **Version** | **Checker** | **Description Tool** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Astree | 20.10 | Dangling\_pointer\_use |  |
| Helix QAC | 2021.1 |  |  |
| Parasoft C/C++ test | 2020.2 | CERT\_CPP-MEM56-a | Do not store an already-owned pointer value in an unrelated smart pointer. |
| PVS-Studio | 7.01 | V1006 |  |

#### Coding Standard 5

| **Coding Standard** | **Label** | **Name of Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Memory Protection** | [STD-005-CPP] | Properly deallocate dynamically allocated resources. |

| **Noncompliant Code** |
| --- |
| The local variable s1 is passed as the expression to the placement new operator. The resulting pointer of that call is then passed to ::operator delete(), resulting in undefined behavior due to ::operator delete() attempting to free memory that was not returned by ::operator new(). |
| #include <iostream>  struct S {  S() { std::cout << "S::S()" << std::endl; }  ~S() { std::cout << "S::~S()" << std::endl; }  };  void f() {  S s1;  S \*s2 = new (&s1) S;  // ...  delete s2;  } |

| **Compliant Code** |
| --- |
| This compliant solution removes the call to ::operator delete(), allowing s1 to be destroyed as a result of its normal object lifetime termination. |
| #include <iostream>  struct S {  S() { std::cout << "S::S()" << std::endl; }  ~S() { std::cout << "S::~S()" << std::endl; }  };  void f() {  S s1;  S \*s2 = new (&s1) S;  // ...  } |

**Note: Stop here for the milestone. Complete this section for Project One in Module Six.**

| **Principles(s):** Passing a pointer value to a deallocation function that was not previously obtained by the matching allocation function results in undefined behavior, which can lead to exploitable vulnerabilities. |
| --- |

**Threat Level**

| **Severity** | **Likelihood** | **Remediation Cost** | **Priority** | **Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High | Likely | Medium | P18 | L1 |

**Automation**

| **Tool** | **Version** | **Checker** | **Description Tool** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Astree | 20.10 | Invalid\_dynamic\_memory\_alocation\_dangling\_pointer\_use |  |
| Axivion | 6.9.0 | CERTC++-MEM51 |  |
| Clang | 3.9 | Clang-analyzer | Checked by clang but does not catch all violations of this rule |
| CodeSonar | 6.0p0 | ALLOC.FNH  ALLOC.DF  ALLOC.TM | Free non-heap variable  Double free  Type mismatch |
| Helix QAC | 2021.1 |  |  |
| Klocwork | 2021.1 | CL.FFM.ASSIGNFM  CL.FFM.COPY  CL.FMM  FMM.MIGHT  FMM.MUST  FNH.MIGHT  FNH.MUST  FUM.GEN.MIGHT  FUM.GEN.MUST  UNINIT.CTOR.MIGHT  UNINIT.CTOR.MUST  UNINIT.HEAP.MIGHT  UNINIT.HEAP.MUST  UNINIT.STACK.ARRAY.MIGHT  UNINIT.STACK.ARRAY.MUST  UNINIT.STACK.MIGHT  UNINIT.STACK.MUST |  |
| LDRA tool suite | 9.7.1 | 232 S, 236 S, 239 S, 407 S, 469 S, 470  S, 483 S, 484 S, 485 S, 64 D, 112 D | Partially implemented |
| Parasoft C/C++ test | 2020.2 | CERT\_CPP-MEM51-a  CERT\_CPP-MEM51-b  CERT\_CPP-MEM51-c  CERT\_CPP-MEM51-d | Use the same form in corresponding calls to new/malloc and delete/free.  Always provide empty brackets for delete when deallocating arrays. Both copy constructor and copy assignment operator should be declared for classes with a nontrivial destructor. Properly deallocate dynamically allocated resources. |
| Parasoft insure ++ |  |  | Runtime Detection |
| Polyspace Bug Finder | R20320a | CERT C++:MEM51-CPP | Checks for:  Invalid deletion of pointer  Invalid free of pointer  Deallocation of previously  deallocated pointer  Rule partially covered |
| PRQA QA-C++ | 4.4 | 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2118,  3337, 3339, 4262, 4263, 4264 |  |
| PVS - Studio | 7.07 | V515, V554, V611, V701, V748, V773 |  |
| SonarQube  C/C++ Plugin | 4.10 | S1232 |  |

#### Coding Standard 6

| **Coding Standard** | **Label** | **Name of Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assertions** | [STD-006-CPP] | Use a static assertion to test the value of a constant expression. |

| **Noncompliant Code** |
| --- |
| The assert() macro to assert a property concerning a memory-mapped structure that is essential for the code to behave correctly. |
| #include <assert.h>    struct timer {  unsigned char MODE;  unsigned int DATA;  unsigned int COUNT;  };    int func(void) {  assert(sizeof(struct timer) == sizeof(unsigned char) + sizeof(unsigned int) + sizeof(unsigned int));  } |

| **Compliant Code** |
| --- |
| For assertions involving only constant expressions, a preprocessor conditional statement may be used |
| struct timer {  unsigned char MODE;  unsigned int DATA;  unsigned int COUNT;  };    #if (sizeof(struct timer) != (sizeof(unsigned char) + sizeof(unsigned int) + sizeof(unsigned int)))  #error "Structure must not have any padding"  #endif |

**Note: Stop here for the milestone. Complete this section for Project One in Module Six.**

| **Principles(s):** Static assertion is a valuable diagnostic tool for finding and eliminating software defects that may result in vulnerabilities at compile time. The absence of static assertions, however, does not mean that code is incorrect. |
| --- |

**Threat Level**

| **Severity** | **Likelihood** | **Remediation Cost** | **Priority** | **Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Low | Unlikely | High | P1 | L3 |

**Automation**

| **Tool** | **Version** | **Checker** | **Description Tool** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Axivion Bauhaus Suite | 6.9.0 | CERTC-DCL03 |  |
| Clang | 3.9 | Misc-static-assert | Checked by clang-tidy |
| CodeSonar | 6.0p0 | customization | Users can implement a custom check that reports uses of the assert() macro. |
| Compass/Rose |  |  | Could detect violations of this rule merely by looking for calls to assert(), and if it can evaluate the assertion (due to all values being known at compile time), then the code should use static-assert instead; this assumes ROSE can recognize macro invocation |
| ECLAIR | 1.2 | CC2.DCL03 | Fully Implemented |
| LDRA tool suite | 9.7.1 | 44 S | Fully Implemented |

#### Coding Standard 7

| **Coding Standard** | **Label** | **Name of Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Exceptions** | [STD-007-CPP] | Handle all exceptions thrown before main() begins executing. |

| **Noncompliant Code** |
| --- |
| The constructor for S may throw an exception that is not caught when globalS is constructed during program startup. |
| struct S {  S() noexcept(false);  };  static S globalS; |

| **Compliant Code** |
| --- |
| The compliant solution makes globalS into a local variable with static storage duration, allowing any exceptions thrown during object construction to be caught because the constructor for S will be executed the first time the function globalS() is called rather than at program startup. This solution does require the programmer to modify source code so that previous uses of globalS are replaced by a function call to globalS(). |
| struct S {  S() noexcept(false);  };  S &globalS() {  try {  static S s;  return s;  } catch (...) {  // Handle error, perhaps by logging it and gracefully  terminating the application.  }  // Unreachable.  } |

**Note: Stop here for the milestone. Complete this section for Project One in Module Six.**

| **Principles(s):** Throwing an exception that cannot be caught results in abnormal program termination and canlead to denial-of-service attacks. |
| --- |

**Threat Level**

| **Severity** | **Likelihood** | **Remediation Cost** | **Priority** | **Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Low | Likely | Low | P9 | L2 |

**Automation**

| **Tool** | **Version** | **Checker** | **Description Tool** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Astree | 20.10 | Potentially-throwing-static-initialization | Partially Checked |
| Axivion Bauhaus Suite | 6.9.0 | CERTC++-ERR58 |  |
| Clang | 3.9 | CERT-EER58-CPP | Checked by clang-tidy |
| Helix QAC | 2021.1 |  |  |
| Parasoft C/C++ test | 2020.2 CERT\_CPP-ERR58-a |  | Exceptions shall be raised only after start-up and before termination of the program. |
| PRQA QA-C++ | 4.4 | 4634, 4636, 4637, 4639 |  |
| Rule Checker | 20.10 | Potentially-throwing-static-initialization | Partially checked |

#### Coding Standard 8

| **Coding Standard** | **Label** | **Name of Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Input Output | [STD-008-CPP] | Do not alternately input and output from a file stream without an intervening positioning call. |

| **Noncompliant Code** |
| --- |
| Appends data to the end of a file and then reads from the same file. However, because there is no intervening positioning call between the formatted output and input calls, the behavior is undefined. |
| #include <fstream>  #include <string>  void f(const std::string &fileName) {  std::fstream file(fileName);  if (!file.is\_open()) {  // Handle error  return;  }  file << "Output some data";  std::string str;  file >> str;  } |

| **Compliant Code** |
| --- |
| The std::basic\_istream<T>::seekg() function is called between the output and input, eliminating the undefined behavior. |
| #include <fstream>  #include <string>  void f(const std::string &fileName) {  std::fstream file(fileName);  if (!file.is\_open()) {  // Handle error  return;  }  file << "Output some data";  std::string str;  file.seekg(0, std::ios::beg);  file >> str;  } |

**Note: Stop here for the milestone. Complete this section for Project One in Module Six.**

| **Principles(s):** Alternately inputting and outputting from a stream without an intervening flush or positioning call is undefined behavior. |
| --- |

**Threat Level**

| **Severity** | **Likelihood** | **Remediation Cost** | **Priority** | **Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Low | Likely | Medium | P6 | L2 |

**Automation**

| **Tool** | **Version** | **Checker** | **Description Tool** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Helix QAC | 2021.1 |  |  |
| Parasoft C/C++  test | 2020.2 | CERT\_CPP\_FIO50-a | Do not alternately input and output from a stream without an intervening flush or positioning call. |
| Polyspace Bug Finder | R2020a | ECRT C++:FIO50-CPP | Checks for alternating input and output from a stream without flush or positioning call. |

#### Coding Standard 9

| **Coding Standard** | **Label** | **Name of Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Object Oriented Programming | [STD-009-CPP] | Do not invoke virtual functions from constructors or destructors. |

| **Noncompliant Code** |
| --- |
| The base class attempts to seize and release an object’s resources through calls to virtual functions from the constructor and destructor. However, the B::B() constructor calls B::seize() rather than D::seize(). Likewise, the B::~B()  destructor calls B::release() rather than D::release(). |
| struct B {  B() { seize(); }  virtual ~B() { release(); }  protected:  virtual void seize();  virtual void release();  };  struct D : B {  virtual ~D() = default;  protected:  void seize() override {  B::seize();  // Get derived resources...  }  void release() override {  // Release derived resources...  B::release();  }  }; |

| **Compliant Code** |
| --- |
| The constructors and destructors call a nonvirtual, private member function (suffixed with mine) instead of calling a virtual function. The result is that each class is responsible for seizing and releasing its own resources. |
| class B {  void seize\_mine();  void release\_mine();  public:  B() { seize\_mine(); }  virtual ~B() { release\_mine(); }  protected:  virtual void seize() { seize\_mine(); }  virtual void release() { release\_mine(); }  };  class D : public B {  void seize\_mine();  void release\_mine();  public:  D() { seize\_mine(); }  virtual ~D() { release\_mine(); }  protected:  void seize() override {  B::seize();  seize\_mine();  }  void release() override {  release\_mine();  B::release();  }  }; |

**Note: Stop here for the milestone. Complete this section for Project One in Module Six.**

| **Principles(s):** During the construction and destruction of an object, the rules for virtual method  dispatch on that object are restricted. |
| --- |

**Threat Level**

| **Severity** | **Likelihood** | **Remediation Cost** | **Priority** | **Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Low | Unlikely | Medium | P2 | L3 |

**Automation**

| **Tool** | **Version** | **Checker** | **Description Tool** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Astree | 20.10 | Virtual-call-in-constructor  Invalid\_function\_pointer | Fully checked |
| Axivion Bauhaus Suite | 6.9.0 | CERTC++-OOP50 |  |
| Clang | 3.9 | Clang-analyzer-alpha.cplusplus.VirtualCall | Checked by clang-tidy |
| Helix QAC | 2021.1 |  |  |
| LDRA tool suite | 9.7.1 | 467S, 92D | Fully implemented |
| Parasoft C/C++ test | 2020.2 | CERT\_CPP-OOP50-a  CERT\_CPP-OOP50-b  CERT\_CPP-OOP50-c  CERT\_CPP-OOP50-d | Avoid calling virtual functions from constructors.  Avoid calling virtual functions from destructors.  Do not invoke class’s virtual functions from any of its constructors.  Do not invoke class’s virtual functions from its destructor. |
| PRQA QA-C++ | 4.4 | 4260, 4261, 4273, 4274,  4275, 4276, 4277, 4278, 4279, 4280, 4281, 4282 |  |
| PVS-Studio | 20.10 | Virtual-call-in-customer | Fully checked |
| SonarQube C/C++ Plugin | 4.10 | S1699 |  |

#### Coding Standard 10

| **Coding Standard** | **Label** | **Name of Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Miscellaneous | [STD-010-CPP] | Value returning functions must return a value from all exit paths. |

| **Noncompliant Code** |
| --- |
| The programmer forgot to return the input value for positive input, so not all code paths return a value. |
| int absolute\_value(int a) {  if (a < 0) {  return -a;  }  } |

| **Compliant Code** |
| --- |
| All code paths now return a value. |
| int absolute\_value(int a) {  if (a < 0) {  return -a;  }  return a;  } |

**Note: Stop here for the milestone. Complete this section for Project One in Module Six.**

| **Principles(s):** Failing to return a value from a code path in a value-returning function results in undefined behavior that might be exploited to cause data integrity violations. |
| --- |

**Threat Level**

| **Severity** | **Likelihood** | **Remediation Cost** | **Priority** | **Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Medium | Probable | Medium | P8 | L2 |

**Automation**

| **Tool** | **Version** | **Checker** | **Description Tool** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Astree | 20.10 | Return-implicit | Fully Checked |
| Axivion | 6.9.0 | CERTC++-MSC52 |  |
| Bauhaus Suite |  |  |  |
| Clang | 3.9 | -Wreturn-type | Does not catch all instances of this rule, such as function-try-blocks |
| CodeSonar | 6.0p0 | LANG.STRUCT.MRS | Missing return statement |
| Helix QAC | 2021.1 |  |  |
| LDRA tool suite | 9.7.1 | 2 D, 36 S | Fully implemented |
| Parasoft C/C++  test | 2020.2 | CERT\_CPP-MSC52-a | All exit paths from a function with non-void return type shall have an explicit return statement with an expression |
| Polyspace Bug Finder | R2020a | CERT C++: MSC52-a | Checks for missing return statements  (Rule partially covered) |
| SonarQube C/C++ Plugin | 4.10 | S935 |  |
| PRQA QA-C++ | 4.4 | 1510 |  |
| PVS-Studio | 7.07 | V591 |  |
| RuleChecker | 20.10 | Return-Implicit | Fully Checked |

### Defense-in-Depth Illustration

This illustration provides a visual representation of the defense-in-depth best practice of layered security.



## Project One

There are seven steps outlined below that align with the elements you will be graded on in the accompanying rubric. When you complete these steps, you will have finished the security policy.

### Revise the C/C++ Standards

You completed one of these tables for each of your standards in the Module Three milestone. In Project One, add revisions to improve the explanation and examples as needed. Add rows to accommodate additional examples of compliant and noncompliant code. Coding standards begin on the security policy.

### Risk Assessment

Complete this section on the coding standards tables. Enter high, medium, or low for each of the headers, then rate it overall using a scale from 1 to 5, 5 being the greatest threat. You will address each of the seven policy standards. Fill in the columns of severity, likelihood, remediation cost, priority, and level using the values provided in the appendix.

### Automated Detection

Complete this section of each table on the coding standards to show the tools that may be used to detect issues. Provide the tool name, version, checker, and description. List one or more tools that can automatically detect this issue and its version number, name of the rule or check (preferably with link), and any relevant comments or description—if any. This table ties to a specific C++ coding standard.

### Automation

Provide a written explanation using the image provided.



Automation will be used for the enforcement of and compliance to the standards defined in this policy. Green Pace already has a well-established DevOps process and infrastructure. Define guidance on where and how to modify the existing DevOps process to automate enforcement of the standards in this policy. Use the DevSecOps diagram and provide an explanation using that diagram as context.

This is a beneficial outline for the structure for the system. It helps to always be mindful of defense in depth and making sure that we are testing early and often to detect any flaws or vulnerabilities so that we can be able to catch any bugs and errors early. Catching these errors and vulnerabilities early will help keep the project on schedule and budget.

### Summary of Risk Assessments

Consolidate all risk assessments into one table including both coding and systems standards, ordered by standard number.

| Rule | Severity | Likelihood | Remediation Cost | Priority | Level |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STD-001-CPP | High | Unlikely | Medium | P4 | L3 |
| STD-002-CPP | High | Probable | High | P6 | L2 |
| STD-003-CPP | High | Likely | Medium | P18 | L1 |
| STD-004-CPP | High | Likely | Medium | P18 | L1 |
| STD-005-CPP | High | Likely | Medium | P18 | L1 |
| STD-006-CPP | Low | Unlikely | High | P1 | L3 |
| STD-007-CPP | Low | Likely | Low | P9 | L2 |
| STD-008-CPP | Low | Likely | Medium | P6 | L2 |
| STD-009-CPP | Low | Unlikely | Medium | P2 | L3 |
| STD-010-CPP | Medium | Probable | Medium | P8 | L2 |

### Create Policies for Encryption and Triple A

Include all three types of encryption (in flight, at rest, and in use) and each of the three elements of the Triple-A framework using the tables provided***.***

* 1. Explain each type of encryption, how it is used, and why and when the policy applies.
  2. Explain each type of Triple-A framework strategy, how it is used, and why and when the policy applies.

Write policies for each and explain what it is, how it should be applied in practice, and why it should be used.

| 1. **Encryption** | **Explain what it is and how and why the policy applies.** |
| --- | --- |
| Encryption in rest | Designed to prevent the attacker from accessing the unencrypted data by ensuring the data is encrypted when on disk. If an attacker obtains a hard drive with encrypted data but not the encryption keys, the attacker must defeat the encryption to read the data. |
| Encryption at flight | The process of encrypting data while the data is being transmitted. In some applications, such as remote replication, data may be unencrypted while it is at rest on drive arrays but encrypted while it is being transmitted to provide protection. |
| Encryption in use | Compromising data in use enables access to encrypted data at rest and data in motion. For example, someone with access to random access memory can parse that memory to locate the encryption key for data at rest. Once they have obtained that encryption key, they can decrypt encrypted data at rest. |

| 1. **Triple-A Framework\*** | **Explain what it is and how and why the policy applies.** |
| --- | --- |
| Authentication | Authentication is the process where the user is being confirmed as someone who has access to the system. This can include user login and password information for the user to be able to access parts of the system. Some newer methods use 2 step authentication or multi-tier authentication. |
| Authorization | Authorization is the level of access that a user has within the system. This can include if the user can read, create, delete, or modify files within the database. This can also lead to access to whether a user can add or delete files and users withing the system. |
| Accounting | Accounting is the process of monitoring what a user is doing with their level of access to the system. This will keep track of what databases are accessed, what was done when it was accessed, and what user accessed the system to begin with. |

**\***Use this checklist for the Triple A to be sure you include these elements in your policy:

* User logins
* Changes to the database
* Addition of new users
* User level of access
* Files accessed by users

### Map the Principles

Map the principles to each of the standards, and provide a justification for the connection between the two. In the Module Three milestone, you added definitions for each of the 10 principles provided. Now it’s time to connect the standards to principles to show how they are supported by principles. You may have more than one principle for each standard, and the principles may be used more than once. Principles are numbered 1 through 10. You will list the number or numbers that apply to each standard, then explain how each of these principles supports the standard. This exercise demonstrates that you have based your security policy on widely accepted principles. Linking principles to standards is a best practice.

**NOTE:** Green Pace has already successfully implemented the following:

* Operating system logs
* 3-Architect and Design for Security Policies
* 4-Keep it Simple
* 5-Default Deny
* 6-Adhere to the Principle of Least Privilege
* 7-Sanitize Data Sent to Other Systems
* 8-Practice Defense in Depth
* 10-Adopt a Secure Coding Standard
* Firewall logs
* 1-Validate Input Data
* 4-Keep it Simple
* 5-Default Deny
* 6-Adhere to the Principle of Least Privilege
* 7-Sanitize Data Sent to Other Systems
* 8-Practice Defense in Depth
* 10-Adopt a Secure Coding Standard
* Anti-malware logs
* 1-Validate Input Data
* 4-Keep it Simple
* 5-Default Deny
* 6-Adhere to the Principle of Least Privilege
* 7-Sanitize Data Sent to Other Systems
* 8-Practice Defense in Depth
* 10-Adopt a Secure Coding Standard

The only item you must complete beyond this point is the Policy Version History table.

## Audit Controls and Management

Every software development effort must be able to provide evidence of compliance for each software deployed into any Green Pace managed environment.

Evidence will include the following:

* Code compliance to standards
* Well-documented access-control strategies, with sampled evidence of compliance
* Well-documented data-control standards defining the expected security posture of data at rest, in flight, and in use
* Historical evidence of sustained practice (emails, logs, audits, meeting notes)

## Enforcement

The office of the chief information security officer (OCISO) will enforce awareness and compliance of this policy, producing reports for the risk management committee (RMC) to review monthly. Every system deployed in any environment operated by Green Pace is expected to be in compliance with this policy at all times.

Staff members, consultants, or employees found in violation of this policy will be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

## Exceptions Process

Any exception to the standards in this policy must be requested in writing with the following information:

* Business or technical rationale
* Risk impact analysis
* Risk mitigation analysis
* Plan to come into compliance
* Date for when the plan to come into compliance will be completed

Approval for any exception must be granted by chief information officer (CIO) and the chief information security officer (CISO) or their appointed delegates of officer level.

Exceptions will remain on file with the office of the CISO, which will administer and govern compliance.

## Distribution

This policy is to be distributed to all Green Pace IT staff annually. All IT staff will need to certify acceptance and awareness of this policy annually.

## Policy Change Control

This policy will be automatically reviewed annually, no later than 365 days from the last revision date. Further, it will be reviewed in response to regulatory or compliance changes, and on demand as determined by the OCISO.

## Policy Version History

| Version | Date | Description | Edited By | Approved By |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.0 | 08/05/2020 | Initial Template | David Buksbaum |  |
| 1.1 | 05/22/2022 | First Revision | Brandon Lingenfelter | [Insert text.] |
| 1.2 | 06/12/2022 | Final Revision | Brandon Lingenfelter | [Insert text.] |

## Appendix A Lookups

### Approved C/C++ Language Acronyms

| Language | Acronym |
| --- | --- |
| C++ | CPP |
| C | CLG |
| Java | JAV |