



# Google ios Application Security Assessment Report.

Google ios Application

---

**REPORT PUBLISH DATE**

**Thursday Jul 4 2024 01:06 GMT+0000 (UTC)**

## Table of Contents

|     |                                   |    |
|-----|-----------------------------------|----|
| 1   | Executive Summary .....           | 3  |
| 1.1 | Strategic Recommendation .....    | 3  |
| 1.2 | Scope of Work .....               | 3  |
| 1.3 | Summary of Findings .....         | 3  |
| 2   | CVSS: Score Vulnerabilities ..... | 4  |
| 2.1 | How to use this report .....      | 5  |
| 3   | Findings Overview .....           | 7  |
| 4   | Technical Reports .....           | 8  |
| 4.1 | t .....                           | 9  |
| 5   | Annexures .....                   | 11 |
| 5.1 | OWASP TOP 10:2021 .....           | 11 |
| 5.2 | Tools Used .....                  | 12 |

## 1 Executive Summary

### 1.1 Strategic Recommendation

It is recommended to fix all critical, high and medium vulnerabilities before releasing the application to customer.

### 1.2 Scope of Work


The scope of this penetration test was limited to the URL mentioned below:

| Scope Details |                  |                 |   |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------|---|
| Sr. No.       | Application Name | Application URL | Scope   |
| 1.            | Google           | www.google.com  | Google ios Application Manually & using Burpsuite |

### 1.3 Summary of Findings

- Graphical Summary

**Vulnerability v/s Severity Pie Chart**



**Vulnerability Summary**

| Severity      | Count |
|---------------|-------|
| Critical      | 0     |
| High          | 0     |
| Medium        | 0     |
| Low           | 1     |
| Informational | 0     |
| Total         | 1     |

## 2 CVSS: Score Vulnerabilities

there are three types of scores that can be calculated: a base score, a temporal score and an environmental score. For purposes of reporting in this document, the CVSS base score will be provided. The base score assesses the following characteristics:

| Characteristics     | Description  |
|---------------------|--|
| Attack Vector       | Assesses whether or an adversary can mount attack from a remote network, a local network or if an adversary must be logged on to the target of evaluation or physically connected. |
| Attack Complexity   | Assesses the complexity of an attack dependent on how many of the attack variables are within the control of the adversary.  |
| Privileges Required | Assesses the level of access that an attacker needs to mount a successful attack.  |
| User Interaction    | Assesses the extent to which actions of the victim are required for an attack to be successful.  |
| Scope               | Assess whether the impact of an attack is limited to the target of evaluation or if the attack has impact on other systems as well.  |
| Confidentiality     | Assesses the negative impact that an attack can have on the target of evaluation's confidentiality.  |
| Integrity           | Assesses the negative impact that an attack can have on the target of evaluation's integrity.  |
| Availability        | Assesses the negative impact that an attack can have on the target of evaluation's availability.   |

As indicated above, the assessment of these characteristics results in a severity score which ranges from 1-10. This score can be further broken down into the following rating levels:

| Range      | Rating   | Description  |
|------------|----------|--|
| 9.0 - 10.0 | Critical | These types of vulnerabilities should be reviewed immediately for impact to the business. This rating usually indicates that an exploit exists that could easily be use severely impact confidentiality, integrity and/or availability.  |
| 7.0 - 8.9  | High     | These types of vulnerabilities need to be assessed in the short term for impact to the business. A score in this range indicates that a vulnerability could be exploited with low to medium complexity and could have moderate or high impact on confidentiality, integrity and/or availability. |
| 4.0 - 6.9  | Medium   | These vulnerabilities should also be evaluated for impact to the business, but the base score shows that these types of vulnerabilities may be only exploitable with increased effort or have little impact to confidentiality, integrity and/or availability.                                   |
| 0.1 - 3.9  | Low      | These vulnerabilities should also be evaluated, but from evaluating the base characteristics, the exploitation of these vulnerabilities is likely to result in little negative impact to confidentiality, integrity and/or availability.   |

The CVSS score provided in this report is meant to serve as a tool to assist with the prioritizing vulnerability resolution. This score, however, does not take into consideration the context of the business. For some business IT contexts some lower-scored vulnerabilities could have serious business impact. Hence, all of the reported vulnerabilities should be taken into consideration.

## 2.1 How to use this report

The vulnerabilities reported in this document provide a view of the target of evaluation's security posture at the time of testing. This timeframe, "at the time of testing", is important to highlight because the report cannot address future changes to the target of evaluation, changes in the systems that support the target of evaluation and emerging, publicly disclosed exploits that could have an impact on the target of evaluation.

The goal of this document is to provide input to help identify and prioritize the vulnerabilities that were detected at the time of testing and to provide some guidance as to how the vulnerabilities might be mitigated.

| Characteristics           | Description  |
|---------------------------|--|
| Status                    | This field will contain either "Verified" or "Detected". If this value is "Verified", then the tester exploited this vulnerability during the penetration test. If it is "Detected", then evidence of the vulnerability was found, but it was not exploited during testing. There are many reasons why a tester may not be able to exploit a vulnerability during testing. Examples include threat of system instability after exploit, lack of time during testing and/or inability to find a vector by which a vulnerability could be exploited. |
| CVSSv3.1 Scoring          | This provides the overall severity score for a vulnerability including the individual assessments for attack vector, attack complexity, privileges required, user interaction, scope, confidentiality, integrity and availability.   |
| Vulnerability Description | This provides an overview of the identified vulnerability including how it could be useful to an adversary.  |
| Proof of Concept          | This provides a description of how the vulnerability was detected and/or a description of how it can be reproduced for testing purposes.   |
| Affected Uri              | This provides a list of the url that are relevant to the vulnerability.  |
| Recommendation            | This provides suggestions on how to mitigate the vulnerability.  |
| References                | This provides links to CVEs, CWEs and other known resources to learn more about the vulnerability and how to mitigate the vulnerability.   |

The report is broken up into three major sections: an executive summary, a technical detail report and an appendix. The executive summary will provide a high-level overview of the vulnerabilities detected during the penetration test.

The technical detail report will provide the details of the vulnerabilities identified during the penetration test. Each vulnerability will include the following descriptors.

The appendix will contain information about the testing environment and further details gathered during testing that do not fit within the first three chapters. This information is necessary to have a complete picture of the penetration test, but it is in the appendix to make accessing the testing results more userfriendly.

### 3 Findings Overview

The following table summarizes the list of findings discovered during the security assessment

| Summary Table |                    |                               |          |              |
|---------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|----------|--------------|
| Sr. No.       | Vulnerability Name | OWASP Category                | Severity | CVSS Score++ |
| 1             | t                  | A05-Security Misconfiguration | Info     | 2.6          |

## 4 Technical Reports

The following findings were made during the assessment.

| Finding Name               | Remediation Effort |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Critical Severity Findings |                    |
| High Severity Findings     |                    |
| Medium Severity Findings   |                    |
| Low Severity Findings      |                    |
| Informational Findings     |                    |
| t                          | Planned            |



4.1 t

**Status:** New

**Severity:** Info

**OWASP Category:** A05-Security Misconfiguration

**CVSS Score:** 2.6


**Affected Hosts/URLs:**

- gh

**Summary:**

gh

**Screenshot:**



**Steps of Reproduce:**

1. edr

**Impact:**

1. fe

**Remediation:**

1. fre

**Reference:**

1. fre

## 5 Annexures

### 5.1 OWASP TOP 10:2021

| OWASP TOP 10:2021                                       |  |
|---|--|
| Name  | Description  |
| <b>A01:2021-Broken Access Control</b>                   | Access control enforces policy such that users cannot act outside of their intended permissions. Failures typically lead to unauthorized information disclosure, modification, or destruction of all data or performing a business function outside the user's limits.   |
| <b>A02:2021-Cryptographic Failures</b>                  | Previously known as Sensitive Data Exposure, Cryptographic Failures involve protecting data in transit and at rest. This includes passwords, credit card numbers, health records, personal information, and business secrets that require extra protection, especially if that data falls under privacy.   |
| <b>A03:2021-Injection</b>                               | Injection flaws, such as SQL, OS, XXE, XSS and LDAP injection occur when untrusted data is sent to an interpreter as part of a command or query. The attacker's hostile data can trick the interpreter into executing unintended commands or accessing data without proper authorization.  |
| <b>A04:2021-Insecure Design(Currently out of scope)</b> | Insecure design is a broad category representing different weaknesses, expressed as "missing or ineffective control design." Secure design is a culture and methodology that constantly evaluates threats and ensures that code is robustly designed and tested to prevent known attack methods.   |
| <b>A05:2021-Security Misconfiguration</b>               | Security misconfiguration is the most commonly seen issue. This is commonly a result of insecure default configurations, incomplete or ad hoc configurations, open cloud storage, misconfigured HTTP headers, and verbose error messages containing sensitive information. Not only must all operating systems, frameworks, libraries, and applications be securely configured, but they must be patched/upgraded in a timely fashion. |
| <b>A06:2021-Vulnerable and Outdated Components</b>      | Components, such as libraries, frameworks, and other software modules, almost always run with full privileges. If a vulnerable component is exploited, such an attack can facilitate serious data loss or server takeover. Applications using components with known vulnerabilities may undermine application defences and enable a range of possible attacks and impacts.   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>A07:2021-Identification and Authentication Failures</b>                    | Application functions related to authentication and session management are often implemented incorrectly, allowing attackers to compromise passwords, keys, or session tokens, or to exploit other implementation flaws to assume other users' identities (temporarily or permanently).   |
| <b>A08:2021-Software and Data Integrity Failures (Currently out of scope)</b> | Software and data integrity failures relate to code and infrastructure that does not protect against integrity violations. This new category is making assumptions related to software updates, critical data, and CI/CD pipelines without verifying integrity.   |
| <b>A09:2021-Security Logging and Monitoring Failures</b>                      | Insufficient logging and monitoring, coupled with missing or ineffective integration with incident response, allows attackers to further attack systems, maintain persistence, pivot to more systems, and tamper, extract, or destroy data. Most breach studies show time to detect a breach is over 200 days, typically detected by external parties rather than internal processes or monitoring. |
| <b>A10:2021-ServerSide Request Forgery(SSRF)</b>                              | SSRF flaws occur whenever a web application is fetching a remote resource without validating the user-supplied URL. It allows an attacker to coerce the application to send a crafted request to an unexpected destination, even when protected by a firewall, VPN, or another type of network access control list (ACL).   |

## 5.2 Tools Used

| Tools:     |   |
|------------|---|
| Name       | Description   |
| Burp suite | Burp Suite is an integrated platform for attacking web applications.<br><a href="http://portswigger.net/suite">http://portswigger.net/suite</a> |
| Nmap       | Nmap is a network mapper tool to scan for SSL related vulnerabilities<br><a href="https://nmap.org">https://nmap.org</a>                        |