Survey - Practitioner's Perspective on the MVN+ of Vulnerability Management in Maven Ecosystem


Dear Participant,

We are conducting a survey to understand practitioners' perceptions of vulnerability management in the Maven ecosystem. We are providing a vulnerability management tool, **MVN+**, and comparing it to the existing public platforms the Maven Repository and the Open Source Insights. This survey will take you around 10 minutes.

Background

Modern software often reuses functionality from other software libraries (i.e., dependencies) to provide a full working system. For Java projects, the Maven plays the central role of a software supply chain to manage software reuse.

Vulnerability propagation in the supply chain



The figure above is an example of a Maven project "testScratch".

 The dependency in the yellow box and the gray box are direct dependency and transitive dependency of "testScratch", respectively. - If we found a vulnerability from the dependency "xmlParserAPIs", the vulnerability would propagate from the dependency chain to the project "testScratch".

Although Maven provides great convenience to developers, there are also potential risks related to the quality of the dependencies. So, for the developers who reused other libraries, they will try to avoid the vulnerabilities impacting the whole project.

Current state-of-the-art in Vulnerability Management

Below, there are three links showing the vulnerability management result one library (org.apache.spark: spark-core_2.11: 1.2.2) on **Maven Repository**, **Open Source Insights** and our tool **MVN+**.

Maven Repository result of library (org.apache.spark: spark-core 2.11: 1.2.2)

Open Source Insights result of library (org.apache.spark: spark-core 2.11: 1.2.2)

MVN+ result of library (org.apache.spark: spark-core 2.11: 1.2.2)

This library is the example we used in this questionnaire. You can click to visit each link to get the full results for the library on each platform. We also provide screenshots of relevant parts in the questions below.

The main goal of this survey is to investigate:

- (1) user satisfaction of three platforms;
- (2) examine the **importance** of each aspect;
- (3) user feedback on our approach.

We will not reveal your identity in any form of the research outcomes. All of the information provided in the survey will be used for research purposes only. We sincerely appreciate your participation in our study.

Part 1: Information about the Participant

In this part, we will ask you for some background information related to your role and experience.

For each question, please type your answer in the corresponding area.

Q1: Which of the following best describes your primary job role?

A. Developer B. Algorithm engineer C. Test engineer D. Project manager

E. Researcher F. Data analyst G. Other (Please specify below)

Answer: E

Q2: How many years of experience do you have in software development/software maintenance/programming?

Answer: 4

Part 2: Vulnerability Listing

Maven Repository shows the IDs and the total number of vulnerabilities from each dependency. If you want to know details of the vulnerabilities, you should click the link and go to the homepage of the dependency library (e.g., go to **netty-all** to find the details).





Open Source Insights shows a list of the vulnerabilities associated with a library. The vulnerabilities may or may not come from other dependencies.



MVN+ shows a list of dependencies and their associated vulnerabilities grouped by different dependency types (e.g., direct vs transitive).

Direct	Direct Compile Dependency (39) (Priority:CRITICAL) Directly used					
Depth	Group / Artifact	Version	Vulnerabilities			
1	log4j » log4j	1.2.17	CVE-2019-17571 (9.8) CVE-2022-23305 (9.8) CVE-2022-23302 (8.8) CVE-2021-4104 (7.5)			
1	org.eclipse.jetty » jetty-server	8.1.14.v20131031	CVE-2017-7657 (9.8) CVE-2017-7656 (7.5) CVE-2015-2080 (7.5) CVE-2019-10241 (6.1) CVE-2019-10247 (5.3) CVE-2021-34428 (3.5)			

Direct Test Dependency (10) (Priority:LOW) Only be used in test scope					
Depth	Group / Artifact	Version	Vulnerabilities		
1	junit » junit	4.10	CVE-2020-15250 (5.5)		
1	asm » asm	3.3.1			
1	com.novocode » junit-interface	0.10			

^{*} Note: By default, test dependencies will not be included in the final binary. Hence, MVN+ shows that vulnerabilities in test dependencies have a low priority.

Q3: On a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive), how would you rate Maven repository's vulnerability listing approach?

Answer:2

Feedback (optional):

Q4: On a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive), how would you rate Open Source Insights' vulnerability listing approach?

Answer:3

Feedback (optional):

Q5: On a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive), how would you rate MVN+'s vulnerability listing approach?

Answer:5

Feedback (optional):

Q6: On a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive), how useful is listing every single vulnerability that is *from each dependency* helpful for developers (e.g., DependencyA has Vulnerability1 and Vulnerability2)?

Answer:4 Feedback (optional):

Q7: On a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive), how useful is grouping the dependencies/vulnerabilities based on dependency scope (e.g., direct dependency and test dependency)?

Answer:4


Feedback (optional):

Part 3: Vulnerability Severity Score and Ranking

Maven Repository only shows the vulnerability from direct dependencies **(depth=1)** and does not show the <u>vulnerability severity score</u>. If you want to know the details of the vulnerabilities, you need to click the link and go to the homepage of the dependency library (e.g., go to **netty-all** to find the details) and search based on the CVE ID for the severity score by yourself.


4.1.79.Final

2.18.0



CVE-2016-4970

Open Source Insights shows the vulnerability from direct dependencies (depth=1) and transitive (depth>1) dependencies. OSI does not show the dependency depth information. OSI ranks the vulnerabilities by severity score (as illustrated below by the red arrow).



MVN+ shows the dependencies ranked by dependency depth. Then, MVN+ ranked the dependency based on the highest severity score.

Depth	Group / Artifact	Version	Vulnerabilities
3	net.sourceforge.htmlunit » htmlunit	2.14	CVE-2020-5529 (8.1)
3	org.apache.httpcomponents » httpclient	4.3.2	CVE-2014-3577 (5.8) CVE-2020-13956 (5.3) CVE-2015-5262 (4.3)
3	commons-io » commons-io	2.4	CVE-2021-29425 (4.8)
4	commons-collections » commons-collections	3.2.1	CVE-2015-6420 (7.5)
4	xerces » xercesImpl	2.11.0	CVE-2012-0881 (7.5) CVE-2022-23437 (6.5)
4	com.google.guava » guava	15.0	CVE-2018-10237 (5.9) CVE-2020-8908 (3.3)
5	org.eclipse.jetty » jetty-io	8.1.14.v20131031	CVE-2021-28165 (7.5)

```
Q8: On a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive), how would you rate Maven repository's
vulnerability listing approach?
Answer:3
Feedback (optional):
Q9: On a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive), how would you rate Open Source Insights'
vulnerability ranking approach?
Answer:4
Feedback (optional):
Q10: On a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive), how would you rate MVN+'s ranking approach?
Answer:5
Feedback (optional):
Q11: On a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive), how is depth and rank of dependency by
depth, helpful for developers?
(e.g.,
   (1) {Dependency A (depth=2) [CVE-1 (9), CVE-2 (5)]},
   (2) {Dependency B (depth=3) [CVE-3 (9.8)]},
   (3) {Dependency C (depth=3) [CVE-4 (8), CVE-5 (6)]}
)
Answer:5
Feedback (optional):
Q12: On a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive), how would you rate the ranking of
vulnerabilities by their severity score? (e.g.,
   (1) CVE-3 (9.8)
   (2) CVE-1 (9)
   (3) CVE-4 (8)
   (4) CVE-5 (6)
   (5) CVE-2 (5)
)
Answer:5
Feedback (optional):
```