

Course: Application Security – laboratories

Lecturer: Michał Apolinarski, Ph.D.

Topic: Security audit – white-box approach (code review)

Duration (on site): 240 min.

PREREQUISITES:

Completion of previous laboratories involving the design and implementation of a web-based content service, as well as the black-box security audit laboratory. Basic knowledge of web application architecture, programming languages used in the project, and common web security vulnerabilities.

GOALS:

The goal of this laboratory is to perform a security audit using a white-box approach, focusing on source code analysis and design review. Students will:

- analyze application source code and internal components,
- identify security vulnerabilities, logic flaws, and insecure design decisions,
- verify and explain vulnerabilities discovered during black-box testing,
- understand the root causes of vulnerabilities at the code and architecture level,
- document findings in a structured security audit report.

GENERAL NOTES

The white-box approach assumes full access to the application source code and configuration. Testing must be conducted in a controlled environment approved by the lecturer. The goal is analysis and understanding, not exploitation or system disruption. Ethical behavior and responsible handling of discovered vulnerabilities are required.

INSTRUCCIONS (tasks for a group of max 2 persons)

PART A – Target selection

1. As in the previous laboratory, select one of the following as the target of the security audit:
 - an application developed by another student group during this course¹,
 - ~~an open-source application used in previous laboratories,~~
 - ~~your own application (only if none of the above options are available).~~
2. The selected application must be approved by the lecturer.

PART B – testing (code review and analysis)

1. Perform a security audit using a white-box approach, with full access to the application's source code, configuration files, and documentation.
2. **The audit must include manual code review and may be supported by automated analysis tools.**
3. **Review the application source code** with particular attention to:
 - authentication and authorization logic,
 - role-based access control and ownership checks,
 - session management and token handling,
 - input validation and output encoding,
 - file upload handling and content processing,
 - error handling and logging,
 - configuration and secret management.
4. **Manually inspect:**
 - critical code paths (login, content creation, deletion, admin actions),
 - access control checks and missing validations,
 - trust boundaries between components,
 - assumptions made by developers that may lead to vulnerabilities.
5. Students should explicitly link identified issues to:
 - broken access control,
 - injection vulnerabilities,
 - insecure design or business logic flaws.
6. **Automated tools (optional, supportive)** may be used to support the review, such as:

¹ Mutual testing between groups is prohibited.

- static analysis tools (e.g. SonarQube, Semgrep),
 - dependency and vulnerability scanners,
 - security linters or SAST tools.
7. **Automated results must be manually reviewed. False positives should be clearly identified and explained in the report.**
 8. Whenever possible, students should explain correlation with black-box results such as:
 - map vulnerabilities found during black-box testing to their root causes in the source code,
 - explain why the vulnerability was possible and how it could be fixed,
 - identify issues that were not visible in black-box testing.

REPORT:

- Include a title page with full details of the student's group, course and exercise.
- The report should be carefully edited and provide evidence of the completion of all exercises (screenshots, code excerpts, explanations, and conclusions).
- A complete report must be submitted to the lecturer at least two days before the next class in which it will be presented.