

# **Dynamic Taint Tracking for Domain Driven Security**

FREDRIK ADOLFSSON

Master in Computer Science

Date: March 19, 2018

Supervisor: Musard Balliu

Examiner: Mads Dam

Swedish title: Dynamisk taint spårning för domändriven säkerhet

School of Computer Science and Communication



## Abstract

## **Sammanfattning**

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Definitions . . . . .	2
1.2	Problem . . . . .	3
1.3	Aim . . . . .	3
1.4	Related Work . . . . .	4
1.5	Delimitations . . . . .	4
1.6	Methodology . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Web Application . . . . .	6
2.1.1	Structured Query Language . . . . .	7
2.2	Security Vulnerabilities . . . . .	7
2.2.1	CIA Triad . . . . .	8
2.2.2	Injection . . . . .	8
2.2.3	Cross-site Scripting . . . . .	10
2.3	Dynamic Taint Tracking . . . . .	12
2.4	Domain Driven Security . . . . .	12
2.5	Java Instrumentation . . . . .	14
2.5.1	Java Virtual Machine . . . . .	14
2.5.2	Javassist . . . . .	14
<b>3</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1	Policies . . . . .	16
3.1.1	Confidentiality . . . . .	16
3.1.2	Integrity . . . . .	16
3.2	Notable Problems . . . . .	16
3.3	Software Architecture . . . . .	16
<b>4</b>	<b>Benchmarking</b>	<b>17</b>

4.1	Test Environment . . . . .	17
4.2	Evaluation . . . . .	17
<b>5</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>19</b>
6.1	Domain Driven Security . . . . .	19
<b>7</b>	<b>Future Work</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>22</b>

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

The creation of the World Wide Web (web) has caused a huge impact on today's society [33]. The web is a source for information and it connects the world through a unanimous platform. Many businesses have decided to take advantage of the web platform to share information and communicate with customers. However, this does not come without drawbacks. The information sharing is a weakness in the same manner as it is a strength. The web application is not only accessible for the targeted user groups but for anyone with access to the web. This entails that malicious users who wish to abuse and/or cause harm to other users have the accessibility to possibly do so.

There are several possible attacks that a web application is vulnerable to. The attack most frequently conducted today will probably not be the same as the most conducted in the future. The Open Web Applications Security Project, known as OWASP, is an online community which aims to provide knowledge about how to secure web applications [22]. OWASP have produced reports about the top 10 security risks for a web application and the latest was published 2017. In this report was Injection Attacks number one and Cross-Site Scripting number seven [23, 22, 7].

To minimize the risk of accidentally introducing security flaws in to the application have a variety of tools and methodologies been created. One of these is Dynamic Taint Tracking which marks input from the user as tainted through a taint variable attached to the input. This taint variable follows the input throughout the application and prop-

agates onto the other variables it encounters. It is possible to detain the input but this is only done after the input have been validated. The taint value is later checked in sensitive areas through something called sinks. Execution is halted if a tainted variable is detected trying to enter the sensitive area through the sink [24, 30]. One of the methodologies that have been coined is the programming paradigm Domain Driven Security. Domain Driven Security aim to secure applications by focusing on the core domain models and making certain that validation of the value objects is correct [32, 17].

The following sections of the chapter will aim to specify the why and how behind the conduction of the thesis. It starts with a section of *Definitions* followed by *Problem* description and explanation of the thesis *Aim*. These sections is then followed by *Related Work* in the field and a *Delimitations* section. Lastly, is there a section about the *Methodology* behind the thesis.

## 1.1 Definitions

**Definition 1.1.1.** Application is a computer process which is constructed to solve one or more tasks for the user.

**Definition 1.1.2.** Web Application is an application deployed with accessibility from the web.

**Definition 1.1.3.** Taint denotes marking data with a flag indicating possibility to be harmful for the application.

**Definition 1.1.4.** Detaint denotes the process of removing the taint flag from a value and therefore marking the value as safe to the application.

**Definition 1.1.5.** Source denotes an entry point to the system where the input is possibly malicious.

**Definition 1.1.6.** Sink denotes entry point to sensitive code areas.



**Definition 1.1.7.** Domain is explained in Secure by Design [20] as part of the real world where something happens.

**Definition 1.1.8.** Domain Model is a fraction of the domain where each model have a specific meaning.

## 1.2 Problem

*How can an implementation of a Dynamic Taint Tracking tool enforce the security gains of Domain Driven Security.*

Unwanted information disclosure is a growing problem today. Work towards protecting user data is needed and Domain Driven Security have been proven to secure applications from Injection and Cross-Site Scripting attacks. Is it then possible to achieve the security gains of Domain Driven Security through applying Dynamic Taint Tracking to web applications. What would the possible drawbacks and advantages be.

## 1.3 Aim

This thesis will implement and evaluate a Dynamic Taint Tracking tool to prevent confidentiality and integrity vulnerabilities in web applications. The thesis will also evaluate the security benefits of Domain Driven Security, a programming paradigm which has been proposed to combat confidentiality and integrity vulnerabilities. Concretely, we will benchmark our Dynamic Taint Tracking tool against injection, cross-site scripting and information disclosure vulnerabilities.

## 1.4 Related Work

Stendahl [28] wrote a thesis in 2016 where he evaluated if a Domain Driven Security can prevent Injection Attacks and Cross-Site Scripting. He concluded that there is a security gain towards Injection Attacks and Cross-Site Scripting by following the Domain Driven Security methodology. The gained security comes from proper validation of variables before propagating the data into the value objects.

Halдар, Chandra, and Franz [13] have written a report about Dynamic Taint Tracking in Java where they try to solve the problem of not properly validating user input. They managed to construct a tool that is independent from the web applications source code and the results from using the tool is a gain in security. Halдар, Chandra, and Franz [13] ran their benchmarks on OWASP's project WebGoat [3] but acknowledged in their report that benchmarks of real-world web applications need to be tested.

There do exist two Dynamic Taint Tracking tools where Phosphor [26] is one and Security Taint Propagation [9] is another. Both are open source projects and developed for Java applications.

## 1.5 Delimitations

The focus of the thesis lies on web applications security vulnerabilities. However, other application areas might be vulnerable to the same kind of vulnerabilities. Information and discussions about those areas will not be given.

Some delimitations for the applications is that it will only consist of a dynamic taint tracker and not in any form a static version. The application will as well only be developed for java application. Development will be conducted in Java with the help of the library Javassist.

## 1.6 Methodology

The methodology of this thesis is a combination of quantitative and qualitative research. The first part of the thesis consists of a literature study followed by reasoning about tainting and detainting rules. This is done on quantitative research. The Second part of the thesis is to evaluate the implemented Dynamic Taint Tracking tool. This is done quantitatively where benchmarks evaluating performance and security gain functionality will be conducted and evaluated.

# Chapter 2

## Background

This Chapter will present background knowledge needed to comprehend conduction of the thesis. The chapter starts with a general description about *Web Application* structure and is followed by a section discussion common *Security Vulnerabilities* to web applications. After those follows two sections describing *Dynamic Taint Tracking* and *Domain Driven Security*. The last section is a chapter about *Java Instrumentation*.

### 2.1 Web Application

To make applications available for large set of people and make them accessible from now days almost everywhere do businesses deploy their applications on the web. The deployment of an application can vary a lot but the most common structure for a web application is based on a three-tier architecture. The first tier is the presentation which is the visual components rendered by the browser. The second is the logic tier which is the brain of the application. The last and third tier is the storage, where the second tier can store data as needed [5]. A illustration of the three layer architecture can be seen in figure 2.1.

It can be seen in figure 2.1 that the tiers only communicate with the tier closest to themselves. This causes the second tier to become a safe guard for tier three where the valuable and possibly sensitive information is stored. The storage tier contains all the information the application needs to provide the wanted service. Such information might for




Figure 2.1: Web application architecture [13].

example be name, email, personal number and credit card information [5].

The scope of the thesis lies in tier two where the brain of the application lies. The programming language for tier two might vary a lot but one common and the chosen language for this thesis is Java.

### 2.1.1 Structured Query Language

Communication between tier two and tier three is done through a standardize language called Structured Query Language, mostly known as SQL. SQL is created to anagrammatically manipulate and access databases. The clear majority of today's database uses SQL. The language works by building queries specifying the wanted information or task. The query will be evaluated and handled up upon by the SQL engine [8].

## 2.2 Security Vulnerabilities

The organization Open Web Applications Security Project, mostly known for its shortening (OWASP), is a online community which aim to provide knowledge how to to secure web applications [22]. OWASP have produced reports about the top 10 security risks with a web application and the latest was published 2017. The report contains information about the ten most common application security risks that for the current year. Information such as how the security risk is exploited and possible prevention method is also presented. This thesis will look




Figure 2.2: CIA Triad

at security risk number one and eight which is Injection Attacks and Cross-site Scripting [23].

### 2.2.1 CIA Triad

Discussions about application security often relies on the CIA Triad which represent the three primary concepts in information security. These three are confidentiality, integrity and availability. Confidentiality are rules that specifies the access restrictions to the application. Integrity specifies that application data should be accurate and not altered. Availability is about ability to access the application and application data [4]. This thesis focuses on confidentiality and integrity vulnerabilities and how we can prevent them.

### 2.2.2 Injection

The most common security risk is Injection Attacks [23]. A Injection Attack is any attack where the attacker's input changes the intent of the execution. Common result of Injection Attacks are file destruction, lack of accountability, denial of access and data loss [29].

Injection Attacks can be divided into two different subgroups. These two subgroups are SQL Injection and Blind SQL Injection [29].

## SQL Injection

SQL Injection is when a SQL query is tampered which results in gaining content from the database which was not intended. Listing 2.1 displays a SQL Query which is open to SQL Injections. This is due to the fact that the variable `UserId` is never validated before it is propagated into the query [5, 29].

Listing 2.1: Code Acceptable to SQL Injection

```
userId = userInput
"SELECT_*_FROM_Users_WHERE_userId=_ " + userId
```

The query will work as intended as long as the user input, notated with *userInput*, only is a valid Integer (since Integer is what we have decided that user id is in this application). But what happens if the user input is *10 or 1 = 1*? This user input would result in the query seen in listing 2.2.

Listing 2.2: SQL Injection

```
SELECT * FROM Users WHERE userId = 10 or 1 = 1
```

This query would result in query that always evaluates to true. The result of this will be that the query returns the whole table of users. This problem can be prevented in a couple of different ways. The first is through validation of the input. By verifying the input as seen in listing 2.3 can we protect the query from being assessable to SQL Injection.

Listing 2.3: Preventing SQL Injection through Verification

```
userId = userInput
isInteger(userId)
"SELECT_*_FROM_Users_WHERE_userId=_ " + userId
```

A second more common alternative is to use SQL Parameters which handles the verification for the user. This leaves the verification and validation of input up to the SQL engine. An example written with SQL Parameters can be seen in listing 2.4.

Listing 2.4: Preventing SQL Injection through SQL Parameters

```
userId = userInput
sqlQuery = "SELECT * FROM Users WHERE userId = @0"
db.Execute(sqlQuery, userId)
```

### Blind SQL Injection

Blind SQL Injection is very similar to SQL Injection. The only difference is that the attacker does not receive the wanted information from the database. The information is instead received by monitoring variables such as how long time the response took or what kind of error messages it returns. An example of the first is a SQL query that tells the SQL engine to sleep depending on a condition. An example of this can be seen in listing 2.5 [5, 29].

Listing 2.5: Time Based Blind SQL Injection

```
SELECT * FROM Users WHERE userId = 1 WAITFOR DELAY '
0:0:5 '
```

The second variant of Blind SQL Injection, which is by analysing the error messages, and depending on what they return build a image of the wanted answer. This is mostly done by testing different combinations of true and false questions [5, 29].

### 2.2.3 Cross-site Scripting

Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) have been a vulnerability since the beginning of the internet. One of the first XSS attacks was created just af-



ter the release of JavaScript. The attack was conducted through loading a malicious web application into a frame on the site that the attacker want to gain information of. The attacker could then through JavaScript access any content that is visible or typed into the web application. To prevent this form of attack were the standard of Same-Origin Policy introduced. Same-Origin Policy restricts JavaScript to only access content from its own origin [12, 27].

But the introduction of the Same-Origin Policy did not stop the attackers from preforming XSS attacks. The next wave of attacks were mostly towards chat rooms where it was possible to inject malicious scripts into the input of the message. Which would then later be reflected by the server itself, when displaying the message for other users, and thereby bypassing the Same-Origin Policy [12].

XSS can be divided into three different sub categories. Which are: reflected, Stored and DOM Based XSS.

### **Reflected XSS**

Reflected XSS is mostly conducted through a malicious link that an unknowing user clicks. The malicious link will exploit a vulnerable input on the targeted web application and though the input reflect back content to the user [29].

### **Stored XSS**

Stored XSS is when malicious scripts is stored in the targeted web applications database. This malicious script is then loaded and presented for each user which is trying to access the application [29].

### **DOM Based XSS**

DOM Based XSS is very similar to Reflected XSS but it dose not necessary have to be reflected from the application server. DOM Based XSS modifies the DOM tree and is able to exploit the user [29].

## 2.3 Dynamic Taint Tracking

Taint Tracking, also known as taint analysis, taint checking and taint propagation, is a tool to analyse the flow of information in a domain [24]. It works by giving input data a tainted property which follows the data and propagates onto other data which it comes in contact with. Tainted data can be detainted. This is done by validating the data. The taint property is later checked in security sensitive sinks [24]. Taint Tracking can be done in two different ways: Static and dynamic. The static is a evaluation tool which is done statically and before runtime. Dynamic Taint Tracking is a tool that is executing in runtime. Dynamic Taint Tracking works by actively blocking any data that is trying to enter the sink. This thesis will not be handle the Static version of Taint Tracking.

Perl and Ruby are two programming languages which have adapted to user Dynamic Taint Checking [25, 18]. And there are some tools who enables taint checking for other languages such as TaintDroid [19] and FlexTaint [30].

As named earlier is two of OWASP's top 10 application security risks of 2017 Injection Attack and Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) [23]. Protection against these two attacks are best done by validating input data which Dynamic Taint Tracking helps to enforce.

## 2.4 Domain Driven Security

There exists a plethora of tools who aim to help in the process of developing complex domain models, but Domain Driven Design is not one if them [2, 16]. Domain Driven Design is more of a thought process and methodology to follow every step of the process [11]. In *Domain-driven design reference: definitions and patterns summaries* do Evans [10] describe Domain Driven Design through three core ideas:

- Focus on the core domain.
- Explore models in a creative collaboration of domain practitioners and software practitioners.

- Speak a ubiquitous language within an explicitly bounded context.

The core domain is the part of your product that is most important and often is your main selling point compared to other similar products [21]. A discussion and even possible a documentation describing the core domain is something that will help the development of the product. The idea is to keep everybody on the same track heading in the same direction [11].

The second idea is to explore and develop every model in collaboration between domain practitioners, who are experts in the given domain, and software developers. This ensures that important knowledge needed to successfully develop the product is communicated back and forth between the two parties [21]. The third idea is important to enable and streamline the second. By using a ubiquitous language will miscommunication between domain and software practitioners be minimized and the collaboration between the two parties can instead focus on the important parts which is to develop the product [10].

Evans [10] do as well argue about the weight of clearly defining the bounded contexts for each defined model, and this needs to be done in the ubiquitous language created for the specific product. The need of this exists because of the otherwise great risk of misunderstandings and erroneous assumptions in the collaborations between the different models [21].

Wilander [32] and Johnsson [17] created 2009 a blog post each in a synchronous manner where they together introduces the concept of Domain Driven Security to the public. They describe Domain Driven Security as the intersection between Domain Driven Design and application security. Domain Driven Design is about developing complex domain models and one of the most basic rule of application security is to always validate input data. Domain Driven Security in other hand, is about the importance of creating and maintaining domain models who are reflecting the product correctly and that they are validated so they cant be populated with erroneous data [32, 17, 1, 28].

## 2.5 Java Instrumentation

Java Instrumentation is a way to modify the execution of a application on the Java Virtual Machine (JVM) without having knowledge nor the need of modifying the application code itself. This makes it beneficial to implement for example monitoring agents and event loggers through Java Instrumentation. Java Instrumentation works by modifying the bytecode of the JVM [14] and this can be done in runtime. There exists a number of libraries that can help the developer in the task of instrumenting the JVM by providing libraries with functionality of translating Java code into the needed bytecode that the JVM Instrumentation api understand. The library used in this thesis is Javassist [15].

### 2.5.1 Java Virtual Machine

"Write once, run anywhere" is a slogan describing the benefits of using Java as the chosen development language. The slogan was created by Sun Microsystems which at the time were the company behind Java and the Java Virtual Machine, known as JVM. [6]. The idea behind the JVM is to have one language that executed the same on all platforms. And then modify the JVM to be able to run on as many platforms as possible. The JVM is a virtual machine with its own components of heap storage, stack and program counter, method area and runtime constant pool.

Figure 2.3 illustrates the architecture of the JVM. The compiled Java code that the developer creates is loaded through the Class Loader and added into the JVM Memory. [31].

### 2.5.2 Javassist




Figure 2.3: Java Virtual Machine Architecture

# **Chapter 3**

## **Implementation**

### **3.1 Policies**

#### **3.1.1 Confidentiality**

#### **3.1.2 Integrity**

### **3.2 Notable Problems**

### **3.3 Software Architecture**

# **Chapter 4**

## **Benchmarking**

### **4.1 Test Environment**

### **4.2 Evaluation**

## **Chapter 5**

### **Result**



# **Chapter 6**

## **Discussion**

### **6.1 Domain Driven Security**

## **Chapter 7**

### **Future Work**

## **Chapter 8**

## **Conclusion**

# Bibliography

- [1] Johan Arnör. "Domain-Driven Security's take on Denial-of-Service (DoS) Attacks". In: (2016), p. 54. URL: <http://kth.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:945831/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- [2] Steven C Bankes. "Tools and techniques for developing policies for complex and uncertain systems Introduction: The Need for New Tools". In: (). URL: [http://www.pnas.org/content/99/suppl%7B%5C\\_%7D3/7263.full.pdf](http://www.pnas.org/content/99/suppl%7B%5C_%7D3/7263.full.pdf).
- [3] Category:OWASP WebGoat Project - OWASP. URL: [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Category:OWASP%7B%5C\\_%7DWebGoat%7B%5C\\_%7DProject](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Category:OWASP%7B%5C_%7DWebGoat%7B%5C_%7DProject) (visited on 03/06/2018).
- [4] "Chapter 1 - What is Information Security?" eng. In: *The Basics of Information Security*. 2014, pp. 1–22. ISBN: 978-0-12-800744-0.
- [5] Justin Clarke-Salt. *SQL Injection Attacks and Defense, 2nd Edition*. eng. Syngress, June 2009. ISBN: 9781597499736.
- [6] Iain D Craig. *Virtual Machines*. London : Springer London, 2006.
- [7] Michael Cross. *Developer's guide to web application security*. eng. Rockland, MA: Syngress Publishing, 2007. ISBN: 1-281-06021-6.
- [8] Cristian Darie. *The Programmer's Guide to SQL*. eng. 2003. ISBN: 1-4302-0800-7.
- [9] *Dynamic Security Taint Propagation in Java via Java Aspects*. URL: [https://github.com/cdaller/security\\_taint\\_propagation](https://github.com/cdaller/security_taint_propagation) (visited on 03/06/2018).
- [10] Eric Evans. *Domain-driven design reference: definitions and patterns summaries*. Dog Ear Publishing, 2015.
- [11] Eric Evans. *Domain-driven design : tackling complexity in the heart of software*. eng. Boston, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 2004. ISBN: 0-321-12521-5.

- [12] Seth Fogie. *XSS attacks cross-site scripting exploits and defense*. eng. Burlington, MA: Syngress, 2007. ISBN: 1-281-06024-0.
- [13] Vivek Haldar, Deepak Chandra, and Michael Franz. "Dynamic Taint Propagation for Java". In: (). URL: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/bf4a/9c25889069bb17e44332a87dc6e2651dce86.pdf>.
- [14] *Instrumentation (Java Platform SE 8 )*. URL: <https://docs.oracle.com/javase/8/docs/api/java/lang/instrument/Instrumentation.html> (visited on 02/27/2018).
- [15] *Instrumentation (Java Platform SE 8 )*. URL: <https://docs.oracle.com/javase/8/docs/api/java/lang/instrument/Instrumentation.html> (visited on 02/27/2018).
- [16] Rabia Jilani et al. "ASCoL: A Tool for Improving Automatic Planning Domain Model Acquisition". In: *AI\*IA 2015 Advances in Artificial Intelligence*. Ed. by Marco Gavanelli, Evelina Lamma, and Fabrizio Riguzzi. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 438–451. ISBN: 978-3-319-24309-2.
- [17] Dan Bergh Johnsson. *Dear Junior - Letters to a Junior Programmer: Introducing Domain Driven Security*. 2009. URL: <http://dearjunior.blogspot.se/2009/09/introducing-domain-driven-security.html> (visited on 01/25/2018).
- [18] *Locking Ruby in the Safe*. URL: <http://ruby-doc.com/docs/ProgrammingRuby/html/taint.html> (visited on 01/25/2018).
- [19] Jianan Ma. "TaintDroid : An Information- - Flow Tracking System for Realtime Privacy Monitoring on Smartphones Jianan Ma Problem Contribution / Implementation Details Questions / Suggestions". In: (2010), p. 3.
- [20] FIX ME!!! *Secure by Design*. FIX ME!!!, 2018.
- [21] Scott Millett. *Patterns, principles, and practices of domain-driven design*. Wrox, a Wiley brand, 2015.
- [22] Open Web Application Security Project. OWASP. URL: [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Main%7B%5C\\_%7DPage](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Main%7B%5C_%7DPage) (visited on 02/01/2018).
- [23] OWASP. "OWASP Top 10 - The Ten Most Critical Web Application Security Risks". In: *Owasp* (2017), p. 22. URL: [https://www.owasp.org/images/7/72/OWASP%7B%5C\\_%7DTop%7B%5C\\_%7D10-2017%7B%5C\\_%7D%7B%5C\\_%7D28en%7B%5C\\_%7D29.pdf.pdf%7B%5C\\_%7D0Ahttp://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en%7B%5C\\_%7DbtnG=Search%7B%5C\\_%7D](https://www.owasp.org/images/7/72/OWASP%7B%5C_%7DTop%7B%5C_%7D10-2017%7B%5C_%7D%7B%5C_%7D28en%7B%5C_%7D29.pdf.pdf%7B%5C_%7D0Ahttp://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en%7B%5C_%7DbtnG=Search%7B%5C_%7D)

- 7B%5C&%7Dq=intitle:OWASP+Top+10+-2010%7B%5C#%7D1.
- [24] Jinkun Pan, Xiaoguang Mao, and Weishi Li. “Analyst-oriented taint analysis by taint path slicing and aggregation”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering and Service Sciences, ICSESS 2015-November (2015)*, pp. 145–148. ISSN: 23270594. DOI: 10.1109/ICSESS.2015.7339024.
  - [25] *perlsec - perldoc.perl.org*. URL: <http://perldoc.perl.org/perlsec.html> (visited on 01/25/2018).
  - [26] *Phosphor: Dynamic Taint Tracking for the JVM*. URL: <https://github.com/gmu-swe/phosphor> (visited on 03/06/2018).
  - [27] *Same Origin Policy - Web Security*. URL: [https://www.w3.org/Security/wiki/Same%7B%5C\\_%7DOrigin%7B%5C\\_%7DPolicy](https://www.w3.org/Security/wiki/Same%7B%5C_%7DOrigin%7B%5C_%7DPolicy) (visited on 02/07/2018).
  - [28] Jonas Stendahl. “Domain-Driven Security”. In: (2016), p. 39. URL: <http://kth.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:945707/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
  - [29] Praveenkumat H Subbulakshmi T. *Secure Web Application Deployment Using Owasp Standards: An Expert Way of Secure Web Application Deployment*. Createspace Independent Publishing Platform, 2017.
  - [30] Guru Venkataramani et al. “FlexiTaint: A programmable accelerator for dynamic taint propagation”. In: *Proceedings - International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (2008)*, pp. 173–184. ISSN: 15300897. DOI: 10.1109/HPCA.2008.4658637.
  - [31] Bill Venners. *Inside the Java virtual machine*. McGraw-Hill, 1999.
  - [32] Johan Wilander. *OWASP Sweden: Domändriven säkerhet / Domain-Driven Security*. 2009. URL: <http://owaspsweden.blogspot.se/2009/09/domanddriven-sakerhet-domain-driven.html> (visited on 01/25/2018).
  - [33] *World wide web skapas – nu kan internet bli en publiksuccé | Internetmuseum*. URL: <https://www.internetmuseum.se/tidslinjen/www/> (visited on 03/06/2018).