**Lab 5. The Common Vulnerability Scoring System CVSS**

**Versions for task 2:**

* **MySQL Stored SQL Injection**

**Vulnerability**

A vulnerability in the MySQL Server database could allow a remote, authenticated user to inject SQL code that runs with high privileges on a remote MySQL Server database. A successful attack could allow any data in the remote MySQL database to be read or modified. The vulnerability occurs due to insufficient validation of user-supplied data as it is replicated to remote MySQL Server instances.

**Attack**

An attacker requires an account on the target MySQL database with the privilege to modify user-supplied identifiers, such as table names. The account must be on a database which is configured to replicate data to one or more remote MySQL databases. An attack consists of logging in using the account and modifying an identifier to a new value that contains a quote character and a fragment of malicious SQL. This SQL will later be replicated to, and executed on, one or more remote systems, as a highly privileged user. The malicious SQL is injected into SQL statements in a way that prevents the execution of arbitrary SQL statements.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The attacker connects to the exploitable MySQL database over a network. |
| Attack Complexity |  | Replication must be enabled on the target database. We assume the system is configured in this way |
| Privileges Required |  | The attacker requires an account with the ability to change user-supplied identifiers, such as table names. Basic users do not get this privilege by default, but it is not considered a sufficiently trusted privilege to warrant this metric being High. |
| User Interaction |  | No user interaction is required as replication happens automatically. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component is the MySQL server database that the attacker logs into to perform the attack. The impacted component is a remote MySQL server database (or databases) that this database replicates to. |
| Confidentiality |  | The injected SQL runs with high privilege and can access information the attacker should not have access to. Although this runs on a remote database (or databases), it may be possible to exfiltrate the information as part of the SQL statement. The malicious SQL is injected into SQL statements that are part of the replication functionality, preventing the attacker from executing arbitrary SQL statements. |
| Integrity |  | The injected SQL runs with high privilege and can modify information the attacker should not have access to. The malicious SQL is injected into SQL statements that are part of the replication functionality, preventing the attacker from executing arbitrary SQL statements. |
| Availability |  | Although injected code is run with high privilege, the nature of this attack prevents arbitrary SQL statements being run that could affect the availability of MySQL databases. |

* **SSLv3 POODLE Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

The SSL protocol 3.0, as used in OpenSSL through 1.0.1i and other products, uses nondeterministic CBC padding, which makes it easier for man in the middle attackers to obtain plaintext data via a padding-oracle attack, aka the "POODLE" (Padding Oracle on Downgraded Legacy Encryption) issue.

**Attack**

A typical attack scenario is that a victim has visited a web server and their web browser now contains a cookie that an attacker wishes to steal. For a successful attack, the attacker must be able to modify network traffic between the victim and this web server, and both victim and system must be willing to use SSL 3.0 for encryption.

A typical attack starts by the attacker tricking the victim into visiting a web site containing malicious code that then runs on the victim's web browser. Same Origin Policy (SOP) restrictions in web browsers prevent this code from directly accessing the cookie the attacker is trying to steal, but HTTP requests that the code sends to the web server automatically have the cookie added, and this behavior is used in the attack.

The malicious code sends an HTTP request that guesses the value of the first byte of the cookie and positions this byte in a specific location. The attacker modifies the encrypted HTTP request such that this byte is used as a padding value. If the server accepts the modified request, the value guessed was correct; if not, the code guesses a different value in a new request. This process is repeated until the entire cookie is disclosed.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The attack is conducted over a network. Note that the attack can take place at any point between the victim and web server over which the network traffic is routed. The value is therefore Network rather than Adjacent Network; the latter is only used for attacks where the attacker must be on the same physical network (or equivalent). |
| Attack Complexity |  | This is a man in the middle attack, and therefore complex for the attacker to perform. |
| Privileges Required |  | An attacker requires no privileges to mount an attack. |
| User Interaction |  | The victim must be tricked into running malicious code on their web browser. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component is the web server because it insecurely responds to padding errors in a way that can be used to brute force encrypted data.  The impacted component is also the web server because the cookie information disclosed is part of its authorization authority. |
| Confidentiality |  | The attack discloses cookie information that the attacker should not have access to. |
| Integrity |  |  |
| Availability |  |  |

* **VMware Guest to Host Escape Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

Due to a flaw in the handler function for Remote Procedure Call (RPC) commands, it is possible to manipulate data pointers within the Virtual Machine Executable (VMX) process. This vulnerability may allow a user in a Guest Virtual Machine to crash the VMX process resulting in a Denial of Service (DoS) on the host or potentially execute code on the host.

**Attack**

A successful exploit requires an attacker to have access to a Guest Virtual Machine (VM). The Guest VM needs to be configured to have 4GB or more of memory. The attacker would then have to construct a specially crafted remote RPC call to exploit the VMX process.

The VMX process runs in the VMkernel that is responsible for handling input/output to devices that are not critical to performance. It is also responsible for communicating with user interfaces, snapshot managers, and remote console. Each virtual machine has its own VMX process which interacts with the host processes via the VMkernel.

The attacker can exploit the vulnerability to crash the VMX process resulting in a DoS of the host or potentially execute code on the host operating system.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | VMX process is bound to the network stack and the attacker can send RPC commands remotely. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The only required condition for this attack is for virtual machines to have 4GB of memory. Virtual machines that have less than 4GB of memory are not affected. |
| Privileges Required |  | The attacker must have access to the guest virtual machine. This is easy in a tenant environment |
| User Interaction |  | The attacker requires no user interaction to successfully exploit the vulnerability. RPC commands can be sent anytime. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component is a VMX process that can only be accessed from the guest virtual machine. The impacted component is the host operating system which has separate authorization authority from the guest virtual machine. |
| Confidentiality |  | Full compromise of the host operating system via remote code execution. |
| Integrity |  | Full compromise of the host operating system via remote code execution. |
| Availability |  | Full compromise of the host operating system via remote code execution. |

* **Apache Tomcat XML Parser Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

Apache Tomcat 4.1.0 through 4.1.39, 5.5.0 through 5.5.27, and 6.0.0 through 6.0.18 permits web applications to replace an XML parser used for other web applications, which allows local users to read or modify the (1) web.xml, (2) context.xml, or (3) tld files of arbitrary web applications via a crafted application that is loaded earlier than the target application.

**Attack**

This Tomcat vulnerability allows a web-apps to reference an XML parser instead of using the default Apache XML parser. The attacker must remove all existing web-apps including those in server/webapps, then install a web-app with an XML parser is stored in WEB-INF/lib. This will cause Tomcat to use the new XML parser to process all web.xml, context.xml and tld files of other webapps. If that non-standard XML parser is replaced with a malicious one, the content of the victim web app XML can be disclosed, the resulting JSP could be corrupted (if it compiled at all) or possibly even weaponized for further attacks.

There are 2 different ways this attack may manifest. First a local privileged user could simply replace the non-Apache XML parser with a malicious variant. The second is that an attacker may use social engineering and user interaction to inject the malicious XML parser into the system. We will score for the former.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: 4.2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | Local user access is required to read/modify Tomcat configuration files. |
| Attack Complexity |  | No special knowledge is necessary to impact XML parser integrity. |
| Privileges Required |  | The user requires high privileges to be able to modify Tomcat configuration files. |
| User Interaction |  |  |
| Scope |  | Assuming simple webapps that do not maintain separate authorization authority. |
| Confidentiality |  | Webapp xml and tld files can be exposed. |
| Integrity |  | The integrity of the XML parser is lost, possibly resulting in a corrupt JSP. |
| Availability |  | The reasonable outcome behind modifying the XML parser is to make certain web applications unavailable. |

* **Cisco IOS Arbitrary Command Execution Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

Cisco IOS 12.2 through 12.4 and 15.0 through 15.2 and IOS XE 2.1.x through 2.6.x and 3.1.xS before 3.1.2S, 3.2.xS through 3.4.xS before 3.4.2S, 3.5.xS before 3.5.1S, and 3.1.xSG and 3.2.xSG before 3.2.2SG, when AAA authorization is enabled, allow remote authenticated users to bypass intended access restrictions and execute commands via a (1) HTTP or (2) HTTPS session, aka Bug ID CSCtr91106.

**Attack**

The vulnerability allows an attacker to bypass command authorization restrictions assigned to their specific user account and execute commands that are available to the Roll/Privilege level for which the user is assigned. For example, a user that is in a group that is assigned to Privilege level 15 (admin) but was restricted to executing a single command via AAA (RADIUS/TACACS) could exploit the vulnerability to execute any other command available to an unrestricted admin user at Privilege level 15.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | Attacks are executed via network API. |
| Attack Complexity |  | No specialized conditions or advanced knowledge is required. |
| Privileges Required |  | While several variants are possible, assume worst-case scenario of captive admin exploiting vulnerability. |
| User Interaction |  | No additional user interaction required for exploit. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerability allows authorization bypass, but impact is contained to the original scope of vulnerable component. |
| Confidentiality |  | Successful exploitation could result in a complete compromise of the targeted device which results in a complete (High) impact on Confidentiality of the device. |
| Integrity |  | Successful exploitation could result in a complete compromise of the targeted device which results in a complete (High) impact on Integrity of the device. |
| Availability |  | Successful exploitation could result in a complete compromise of the targeted device which results in a complete (High) impact on the Availability of the device. |

* **Apple iWork Denial of Service Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

iWork in Apple iOS before 8.3 and Apple OS X before 10.10.3 allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code or cause a denial of service (memory corruption) via a crafted iWork file.

**Attack**

A remote user can create a specially crafted iWork file that, when loaded by the target user, will trigger a memory corruption error and execute arbitrary code. The attacker must deliver and then convince the local user to open the malicious iWork file.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The vulnerability is in the local parser. |
| Attack Complexity |  | Specialized conditions or advanced knowledge is not required. |
| Privileges Required |  |  |
| User Interaction |  | The victim needs to open the malicious iWork file. |
| Scope |  |  |
| Confidentiality |  | Arbitrary code execution. |
| Integrity |  | Arbitrary code execution. |
| Availability |  | Arbitrary code execution. |

* **OpenSSL Heartbleed Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

The (1) TLS and (2) DTLS implementations in OpenSSL 1.0.1 before 1.0.1g do not properly handle Heartbeat Extension packets, which allows remote attackers to obtain sensitive information from process memory via crafted packets that trigger a buffer over-read, as demonstrated by reading private keys, related to d1\_both.c and t1\_lib.c, aka the Heartbleed bug.

**Attack**

A successful attack requires only sending a specially crafted message to a web server running OpenSSL. The attacker constructs a malformed “heartbeat request” with a large field length and small payload size. The vulnerable server does not validate that the length of the payload against the provided field length and will return up to 64 kB of server memory to the attacker. It is likely that this memory was previously utilized by OpenSSL. Data returned may contain sensitive information such as encryption keys or user names and passwords that could be used by the attacker to launch further attacks

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The vulnerability is in a network service that uses OpenSSL. |
| Attack Complexity |  | An attacker needs to only find a listening network service to mount an attack. |
| Privileges Required |  | An attacker requires no privileges to mount an attack. |
| User Interaction |  | No user access is required for an attacker to launch a successful attack. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component is OpenSSL which is integrated with the network service, therefore no change in scope occurs during the attack. |
| Confidentiality |  | Access to only some restricted information is obtained, but the disclosed information presents a direct, serious impact to the affected scope (e.g. the attacker can read the administrator's password, or private keys in memory are disclosed to the attacker). |
| Integrity |  | No information can be modified by the attacker. |
| Availability |  | The attacker cannot affect availability through this attack. |

* **GNU Bourne-Again Shell (Bash) ‘Shellshock’ Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

GNU Bash through 4.3 processes trailing strings after function definitions in the values of environment variables, which allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code via a crafted environment, as demonstrated by vectors involving the ForceCommand feature in OpenSSH sshd, the mod\_cgi and mod\_cgid modules in the Apache HTTP Server, scripts executed by unspecified DHCP clients, and other situations in which setting the environment occurs across a privilege boundary from Bash execution, a.k.a. "Shellshock."

**Attack**

A successful attack can be launched by an attacker directly against the vulnerable GNU Bash shell, or in certain cases, by an unauthenticated, remote attacker through services either written in GNU Bash or services spawning GNU Bash shells. In the case of an attack against the Apache HTTP Server running dynamic content CGI modules, an attacker can submit a request while providing specially crafted commands as environment variables. These commands will be interpreted by the handler program, the GNU Bash shell, with the privilege of the running HTTPD process. As such, environment variables passed by the attacker could allow installation of software, account enumeration, denial of service, etc. Attacks against other services that have a relationship with the GNU Bash shell are similarly possible.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The reasonable worst-case scenario is a network attack via a web server. |
| Attack Complexity |  | An attacker needs to only gain access to a listening service that uses the GNU Bash shell as an interpreter or interact with a GNU Bash shell directly. |
| Privileges Required |  | The reasonable worst-case scenario is an attack via a web server which does not require any privileges, e.g., a simple CGI script. |
| User Interaction |  | No user interaction is required for an attacker to launch a successful attack. |
| Scope |  | The **vulnerable component** is the GNU Bash shell which is used as an interpreter for various services or can be accessed directly. It runs within the security authority of the operating system.  The **impacted component** is also the operating system, so there is no scope change. |
| Confidentiality |  | An attacker can take complete control of the affected system. |
| Integrity |  | An attacker can take complete control of the affected system. |
| Availability |  | An attacker can take complete control of the affected system. |

* **DNS Kaminsky Bug**

**Vulnerability**

The DNS protocol, as implemented in (1) BIND 8 and 9 before 9.5.0-P1, 9.4.2-P1, and 9.3.5-P1;

(2) Microsoft DNS in Windows 2000 SP4, XP SP2 and SP3, and Server 2003 SP1 and SP2; and other implementations allow remote attackers to spoof DNS traffic via a birthday attack that uses in-bailiwick referrals to conduct cache poisoning against recursive resolvers, related to insufficient randomness of DNS transaction IDs and source ports, aka "DNS Insufficient Socket Entropy Vulnerability" or "the Kaminsky bug."

**Attack**

A successful exploit requires an attacker to identify a recursive nameserver running an implementation of DNS that does not supply sufficient randomization of DNS query/transaction IDs combined with sufficient randomization of source ports. The attacker then must configure a nameserver to be authoritative for a target domain and obtain the source port used by the victim recursive name server. The attacker then queries the victim recursive nameserver for a name within the target domain. Immediately after this request is sent the attacker sends a flood of crafted responses to the victim recursive nameserver attempting to properly guess the query/transaction ID. If the crafted response successfully matches and arrives prior to a legitimate answer from the actual authoritative source, the victim recursive nameserver will accept the crafted response and any information within it. This response data will then be stored in the recursive server cache and remain there based on the TTL parameters specified by the attacker in the response. All queries matching the target domain sent to the victim recursive nameserver will then be answered by the poisoned cache and redirect traffic to the attacker’s malicious nameserver and thus direct traffic where ever the attacker wishes.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The attacker is sending the packets over the network. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The attacker must configure an authoritative source with a public IP to be routed to by the recursive server. The attacker must also beat a race condition to successfully exploit (regardless of how quick that race condition may occur). |
| Privileges Required |  |  |
| User Interaction |  |  |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component is the DNS server. The impacted component is the victim system who is unknowingly re-directed to unintended network locations based on the malicious DNS answers. |
| Confidentiality |  | Any confidentiality impact is secondary. |
| Integrity |  | The victim user has trusted a poisoned cache and is being directed to any destination the attacker wishes. |
| Availability |  | Any availability impact is secondary. |

*Confidentiality, Integrity, and Availability are scored to both vulnerable component and impacted component. However, the impacts are the same.*

* **Sophos Login Screen Bypass Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

Sophos Disk Encryption (SDE) 5.x in Sophos Enterprise Console (SEC) 5.x before 5.2.2 does not enforce intended authentication requirements for a resume action from sleep mode, which allows physically proximate attackers to obtain desktop access by leveraging the absence of a login screen.

**Attack**

When Microsoft Windows systems resume (“wake up”) from sleep or hibernation, the default action is to require the user to re-authenticate. When SDE is installed, this functionality becomes disabled, allowing an attacker who has physical access to the system access without credentials by triggering a resume action.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | Requires physical access to the device. |
| Attack Complexity |  | While the attack requires a specific pre-requisite (resume from sleep mode), the attack will succeed every time that pre-requisite occurs, resulting in low complexity. |
| Privileges Required |  | No privileges are required. |
| User Interaction |  |  |
| Scope |  |  |
| Confidentiality |  | The attacker has full access to the system with the authority of the logged-in user. We assume the worst-case, an administrative user. |
| Integrity |  | The attacker has full access to the system with the authority of the logged-in user. We assume the worst-case, an administrative user. |
| Availability |  | The attacker has full access to the system with the authority of the logged-in user. We assume the worst-case, an administrative user. Regarding availability impact vs. required control of the device. We are measuring the capabilities granted to the attacker from the vulnerability |

* **Joomla Directory Traversal Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

Directory traversal vulnerability in the ccNewsletter (com\_ccnewsletter) component 1.0.5 for Joomla allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files via a .. (dot dot) in the controller parameter in a ccnewsletter action to index.php.

**Attack**

A malicious HTTP request that contains the vulnerable component ‘com\_ccnewsletter’, and proper series of ‘../’ entries allows an attacker the ability to change from the directory where the webserver is installed to any directory on the file system of the host OS. Depending on the privileges of the web application server, an attacker would be able to view the contents of any file in the directory searched. Scope is changed due to the ability of the vulnerable component to access the affected system outside of the controlling authoritative component.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  |  |
| Attack Complexity |  |  |
| Privileges Required |  |  |
| User Interaction |  |  |
| Scope | ] | It is not clear from the publicly available information if Joomla’s own authorization authority is enabled or plays a role here. For this vulnerability we are assuming that Joomla has its own separate authorization authority and the attacker is able to break out from it and access files on the file system with privileges of web server which has a separate authorization authority. |
| Confidentiality | Low | The attacker is able to read files to which web server has access. |
| Integrity | None | There is no indication that the files can be modified as well. |
| Availability | None | No availability impact. |

* **Cisco Access Control Bypass Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

The Cisco Carrier Routing System (CRS-X) running IOS XR Software versions 3.9, 4.0, and 4.1 allows remote attackers to bypass ACL entries via fragmented packets, aka Bug ID CSCtj10975. The vulnerability allows an unauthenticated, remote attacker to bypass device Access Control Entries (ACEs) and send network traffic that should be denied. It only affects devices that have specific ACE structures.

**Attack**

Exploitation of this vulnerability can be performed with wide-area network access to the target system and requires the ability to send fragmented IPv4 packets to the vulnerable component (router). An attacker can effectively bypass protocol-based access control for non-initial fragments (fragments with a fragment offset not equal to zero), resulting in an integrity impact on the network or devices under the protection of the firewall.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The attacker can be multiple hops away from the vulnerable component. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The complexity of creating packets that match the criteria (non-first fragments) is low. |
| Privileges Required |  | A non-privileged user can initiate the packet stream. |
| User Interaction |  | The attack does not rely on any user interaction. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component is the CRS itself, while the impacted component is the network and devices protected downstream by the CRS. |
| Confidentiality |  | Impact is scored against the network and devices beyond the firewall (impacted component), and not the CRS (vulnerable component). Any confidentiality loss is a secondary impact. |
| Integrity |  | Exploitation results in an integrity impact on the network or devices (impacted component) under the protection of the CRS (vulnerable component). |
| Availability |  | Impact is scored against the network and devices beyond the firewall (impacted component), and not the CRS (vulnerable component). Any availability is a secondary impact (for example, targeted DoS attack). |

* **Juniper Proxy ARP Denial of Service Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

If Proxy ARP is enabled on an unnumbered interface, an attacker can poison the ARP cache and create a bogus forwarding table entry for an IP address, effectively creating a denial of service for that subscriber or interface. When Proxy ARP is enabled on an unnumbered interface, the router will answer any ARP message from any IP address which could lead to exploitable information disclosure. This issue can affect any product or platform running Junos OS 10.4, 11.4, 11.4X27, 12.1, 12.1X44, 12.1X45, 12.2, 12.3, or 13.1, supporting unnumbered

interfaces.

**Attack**

Exploitation of this vulnerability requires network adjacency with the target system and the ability to generate arbitrary ARP replies sent to the connected interface. A rogue subscriber can poison the ARP cache and/or create a rogue forwarding table entry for an IP of choice, effectively obscuring that IP address or redirecting IP traffic to the attacker.

The resultant impact can be observed as unauthorized modification of a database on the vulnerable component, or as an impact on confidentiality or availability on attached devices (impacted component). Since the CVSSv3 score for a high confidentiality (or availability) impact on a changed scope is higher than a partial impact on the vulnerable component, CVSSv3 guidance recommends scoring for the higher overall impact.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | Exploitation of this vulnerability requires network adjacency with the target system. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The complexity of crafting ARP packets to exploit the vulnerability is low. |
| Privileges Required |  | A non-privileged user can generate the ARP packets. |
| User Interaction |  | The attack does not require any user interaction. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component is the Junos device itself, while the impacted component is any device for which the ARP entry is poisoned.” |
| Confidentiality |  | The attacker can read any traffic intended for the targeted subscriber(s). |
| Integrity |  | While modification of the routing table on the vulnerable component would represent an impact on integrity, the Integrity impact on the downstream (impacted) component is None. |
| Availability |  | Impact on Availability for the downstream (impacted) component results in a complete denial of service for the targeted subscriber(s). |

* **Cantemo Portal Stored Cross-site Scripting Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

Cantemo Portal before 3.2.13, 3.3.x before 3.3.8, and 3.4.x before 3.4.9 has a stored cross-site scripting (XSS) vulnerability.

**Attack**

The Cantemo Portal application is affected by a stored XSS vulnerability that allows low privileged application users to store malicious scripts in the Filename field. These scripts are executed in a victim’s browser when they open the page containing the vulnerable field. In the worst case, the victim who inadvertently triggers the attack is a highly privileged administrator, so the injected scripts can perform operations on the server with the privileges of the victim administrator. Such actions include account creation and deletion, deletion of information contained within the portal application, and installation of a remote shell that could lead to further compromise.

**References:**

[https://HYPERLINK "http://www.bishopfox.com/news/2019/03/cantemo-portal-version-3-8-4-cross-site-scripting/"www.bishopfox.com/news/2019/03/cantemo-portal-version-3-8-4-cross-site-scripting/](https://hyperlink%20%22http://www.bishopfox.com/news/2019/03/cantemo-portal-version-3-8-4-cross-site-scripting/%22www.bishopfox.com/news/2019/03/cantemo-portal-version-3-8-4-cross-site-scripting/) <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2019-7551>

<https://blog-posts--cantemo.netlify.com/news/2019/03/cantemo-portal-xss-vulnerabilities/>

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | A victim must access a vulnerable system via the network. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The exploit is repeatable without the requirement of system specific reconnaissance or dealing with race conditions. |
| Privileges Required |  | An attacker must possess some user level privileges to store the malicious scripts in the vulnerable application field. |
| User Interaction |  | The victim needs to navigate to a web page on the vulnerable server that contains malicious scripts injected by the attacker. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerability is in the web server, but the malicious scripts execute in the victim’s browser on their machine. |
| Confidentiality |  | In the worst case, an attacker can create privileged users or perform RCE via shell uploading to take control of the Cantemo Portal application and the underlying operating system. |
| Integrity |  | In the worst case, an attacker can create privileged users or perform RCE via shell uploading to take control of the Cantemo Portal application and the underlying operating system. |
| Availability |  | In the worst case, an attacker can shut down the Cantemo Portal application, or otherwise disrupt service for all users. |

* **Adobe Acrobat Buffer Overflow Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

Adobe Acrobat and Reader version 9.0 and earlier are vulnerable to a buffer overflow, caused by improper bounds checking when parsing a malformed JBIG2 image stream embedded within a PDF document. By persuading a victim to open a malicious PDF file, a remote attacker could overflow a buffer and execute arbitrary code on the system with the privileges of the victim or cause the application to crash.

**Attack**

The vulnerability is exploited by convincing a victim to open a malicious document on a system that uses a vulnerable version of Adobe Acrobat or Reader. An attacker must deliver a malicious document to the victim and relies upon the user to open it. Then the code execution achieved by the attacker depends on the privilege level of the user on the system and could potentially result in High impacts to Confidentiality, Integrity, and Availability.

**References**

<http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2009-0658> <http://www.adobe.com/support/security/advisories/apsa09-01.html>

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | A flaw in the local document software that is triggered by opening a malformed document. |
| Attack Complexity |  |  |
| Privileges Required |  |  |
| User Interaction |  | The victim needs to open the malformed document. |
| Scope |  |  |
| Confidentiality |  | Assuming a worst-case impact of the victim having High privileges on the affected system. |
| Integrity |  | Assuming a worst-case impact of the victim having High privileges on the affected system. |
| Availability |  | Assuming a worst-case impact of the victim having High privileges on the affected system. |

* **Microsoft Windows Bluetooth Remote Code Execution Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

The Bluetooth Stack 2.1 in Microsoft Windows Vista SP1 and SP2 and Windows 7 Gold and SP1 does not prevent access to objects in memory that (1) were not properly initialized or (2) have been deleted, which allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code via crafted Bluetooth packets, aka "Bluetooth Stack Vulnerability."

The vulnerability could allow remote code execution if an attacker sent a series of specially crafted Bluetooth packets to an affected system.

**Attack**

This vulnerability only affects systems with Bluetooth capability. The attacker first needs to obtain system’s 48-bit Bluetooth address, which is not “discoverable” by default in affected Windows versions. If the system were “discoverable,” it would respond to attacker SDP queries with its Bluetooth address. But in the default state, an attacker must obtain your Bluetooth address another way – either via bruteforcing it or extracting it from Bluetooth traffic captured over-the-air. The attacker would need to be in the same proximity as the target machine in order to send and receive radio transmissions within the Bluetooth radio spectrum. Once it is exploited, the attacker can run arbitrary code. The attacker could install programs; view, change, or delete data; or create new accounts with full user rights.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The attacker would need to be in the same proximity as the target machine in order to send and receive radio transmissions within the Bluetooth radio spectrum. |
| Attack Complexity |  | We are assuming that Bluetooth is enabled on the OS. The attacker can obtain system’s 48-bit Bluetooth address by extracting it from Bluetooth traffic captured over-the-air. This attack vector is considered as Low Attack Complexity based on the criteria listed in the specification. |
| Privileges Required |  | An attacker requires no privileges to mount an attack. |
| User Interaction |  | No user interaction is required for this attack. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component and impacted component are the same, which is operating system. |
| Confidentiality |  | The attacker can view, change, or delete data; or create new accounts with full user rights. |
| Integrity |  | The attacker can view, change, or delete data; or create new accounts with full user rights. |
| Availability |  | The attacker can view, change, or delete data; or create new accounts with full user rights. |

* **Apple iOS Security Control Bypass Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

The iCloud subsystem in Apple iOS before 7.1 allows physically proximate attackers to bypass an intended password requirement and turn off the Find My iPhone service or complete a Delete Account action and then associate this service with a different Apple ID account, by entering an arbitrary iCloud Account Password value and a blank iCloud Account Description value.

**Attack**

Find My iPhone helps you locate and protect your iPhone, iPad, iPod touch, or Mac if it’s ever lost or stolen. With Find My iPhone set up on your device, you can do the following:

* Locate your device on a map
* Play a sound on your device to help you find it
* Use Lost Mode to lock and track your device
* Remotely erase all your personal information from the device

Find My iPhone includes a feature called Activation Lock that is designed to prevent anyone else from using your iPhone, iPad, or iPod touch if it's ever lost or stolen. Activation Lock is enabled automatically when you turn on Find My iPhone on a device using iOS 7 or later. Find My iPhone Activation Lock, your Apple ID and password will be required before anyone can:

* Turn off Find My iPhone on your device
* Erase your device
* Reactivate and use your device

This vulnerability allows the attacker to bypass the Activation Lock when attempting to turn off Find My iPhone. The attacker can turn off Find My iPhone feature, delete the current iCloud account and associate the device with new iCloud Account without any Apple ID and password of current user.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The attacker requires physical access to the device |
| Attack Complexity |  | The attack steps are simple |
| Privileges Required |  | We will consider the worst-case scenario and assume that the device is not protected with a PIN |
| User Interaction | None | No user interaction is required for this attack |
| Scope | Unchanged | The vulnerable and impacted components are the same |
| Confidentiality | None | No direct impact to confidentiality |
| Integrity | High | High due to importance (security) of this feature |
| Availability | None | No direct impact to the availability of the service |

* **SearchBlox Cross-Site Request Forgery Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

SearchBlox is an enterprise search and data analytics service utilizing Apache Lucene and Elasticsearch.

A cross-site request forgery (CSRF) vulnerability in SearchBlox Server before version 8.2 allows remote attackers to perform actions with the permissions of a victim user, provided the victim user has an active session and is induced to trigger the malicious request.

**Attack**

A specially-crafted URL to the SearchBlox Server containing the appropriate parameter values of an action the attacker wants to perform may be sent to a victim user. This URL may be sent to the victim as part of an HTML document, an email, or via some other method. If the user interacts with the URL while the user has an active session on the SearchBlox Server, the URL will send a request to the server to perform some action with the victim user’s credentials.

Since SearchBlox Server prior to version 8.2 has no request validation mechanism, the request will be completed if the victim user’s permissions allow such an action. Possible actions include creating or deleting a user account or uploading new SearchBlox configuration settings.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | A victim must access a vulnerable system via the network. |
| Attack Complexity |  | A phishing email does not absolutely require victim reconnaissance. |
| Privileges Required |  | The attacker does not need any permissions to perform this attack, the attacker lets the victim perform the action on the attacker’s behalf. |
| User Interaction |  | The victim must click a specially crafted link provided by the attacker. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component is SearchBlox. The impacted component is also SearchBlox as the actions only affect the SearchBlox configuration. |
| Confidentiality |  | The attacker can obtain permissions to view all confidential data contained in SearchBlox. |
| Integrity |  | User accounts can be modified at will as well as SearchBlox configuration. |
| Availability |  | SearchBlox configuration may be modified such as to disable services. |

* **SSL/TLS MITM Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

An attacker using a carefully crafted handshake can force the use of weak keying material in OpenSSL SSL/TLS clients and servers. This can be exploited by a Man-in-the-middle (MITM) attack where the attacker can decrypt and modify traffic from the attacked client and server. The attack can only be performed between a vulnerable client and server. This is also known as the "CCS Injection" vulnerability, named after the vulnerable ChangeCipherSpec messages.

**Attack**

OpenSSL before 0.9.8za, 1.0.0 before 1.0.0m, and 1.0.1 before 1.0.1h does not properly restrict processing of ChangeCipherSpec messages during the SSL/TLS handshake. A ChangeCipherSpec message tells the client/server to switch from unencrypted to encrypted communication. If a ChangeCipherSpec message is sent by the attacker after the connection is initiated but before the master secret has been generated, OpenSSL will generate the keys for the handshake with an empty master secret. This zero-length master key allows an attacker to crack the encryption and consequently obtain sensitive information and/or modify SSL/TLS traffic. Note that an attacker requires a man-in-the-middle position with the client user in order to exploit this attack.

OpenSSL is a library that by itself is not prone to attack. The application that embeds OpenSSL becomes vulnerable. So, scoring the vulnerability in OpenSSL must be done assuming the usage that has the worst consequences. Although some programs use OpenSSL purely to perform cryptographic operations unrelated to networking, e.g., to encrypt/decrypt files stored on disk, the reasonable worst-case scenario where the vulnerability applies is that a program uses OpenSSL to encrypt/decrypt network traffic

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The attacker needs network level access to the communication channel between the client and server |
| Attack Complexity |  | The attacker must be able to monitor and alter victims' network traffic acting as a man in the middle |
| Privileges Required |  | Measurable effort is typically required to intercept network traffic in this way and there are uncertainties involved, making attack complexity "High". |
| User Interaction |  | The attacker doesn’t need any privilege with the client or the server in order to exploit this vulnerability. |
| Scope |  | If any human party is involved in the communication, his/her intervention is required. But user interaction is not required for system to system communications. |
| Confidentiality |  | As per “User Guide Section 3.7. Scoring Vulnerabilities in Software Libraries”, the reasonable worst-case usage scenario is considered. |
| Integrity |  | The vulnerable component is OpenSSL. The impacted component is the application using OpenSSL. But OpenSSL, being an embedded library, resides in the security authority of the embedding application. So, the impacts don’t propagate beyond the security authority where vulnerable component resides. |
| Availability |  | An attacker is able to decrypt all SSL/TLS traffic between the client and server. |

* **Google Chrome Sandbox Bypass vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

The Inter-process Communication (IPC) implementation in Google Chrome before 22.0.1229.94 allows remote attackers to bypass intended sandbox restrictions and write to arbitrary files by leveraging access to a renderer process.

**Attack**

Google Chrome uses a multi-process architecture in which each browser tab may run a separate renderer process that communicates with other Chrome processes using the IPC. By persuading a victim to visit a specially crafted Web site, a remote attacker could exploit this vulnerability to write arbitrary files to the operating system.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The victim must visit a malicious website that may exist outside the local network. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The attacker does not need to perform any special reconnaissance for this attack. |
| Privileges Required |  | The attacker does not need any permissions to perform this attack, the attacker lets the victim perform the action on the attacker’s behalf. |
| User Interaction |  | The victim must click a specially crafted link provided by the attacker. |
| Scope |  | Based on the assumption that the attacker is breaking out of Chrome’s controlled sandboxed environment, the vulnerable component is Google Chrome and the impacted component is the operating system on which Chrome is running. |
| Confidentiality |  | The worst-case scenario is Chrome running with administrative privileges. The attacker can overwrite system configuration and grant the attacker access to any data or Administrative privileged access on the system. |
| Integrity |  | The worst-case scenario is Chrome is running with administrative privileges. The attacker can overwrite any file, including important system files. |
| Availability |  | The worst-case scenario is Chrome running with administrative privileges. The attacker can cause a system crash by overwriting specific system files or denying a user access by system reconfiguration. |

* **Google Chrome PDFium JPEG 2000 Remote Code Execution Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

This vulnerability allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code on vulnerable installations of Google Chrome. User interaction is required to exploit this vulnerability in that the victim must visit a malicious page or open a malicious file.

The specific flaw exists within the handling of JPEG 2000 images. A specially crafted JPEG 2000 image embedded inside a PDF can force Google Chrome to write memory past the end of an allocated object. An attacker can leverage this vulnerability to execute arbitrary code under the context of the current process.

**Attack**

An attacker creates a PDF file embedding a maliciously crafted JPEG 2000 image. This is made available to victims, e.g., via a web page. A victim opens the PDF document using a Google

Chrome browser, and the browser displays the PDF using the built-in PDFium PDF viewer. This triggers the exploit and runs the executable code that the attacker placed in the image, taking over the browser.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | Vulnerabilities where the vulnerable component is a separate program invoked from a browser, e.g., a word processor, and which require user interaction to download or receive malicious content which could also be delivered locally, should be scored as Local. For example, a document parsing vulnerability which does not require the network in order to be exploited should be scored as Local, regardless of the method used to distribute such a malicious document (e.g., it could be a link to a web site, or via a USB drive).  However, for this vulnerability, a PDF file opened in Google Chrome is automatically displayed using the PDFium functionality that is part of the browser. In such cases where the victim could load a malicious PDF file either via a network or from local media (e.g., a hard disk or USB drive), we score Attack Vector as Network, as this gives the higher Base Score.  Vulnerabilities in functionality added to a browser, e.g., libraries, plugins, extensions and add-ons, are treated as part of the browser when determining Attack Vector. For example, a vulnerability in Adobe Flash is scored with an Attack Vector of Network (assuming the victim loads the exploit over a network). |
| Attack Complexity |  | Specialized access conditions or extenuating circumstances do not exist. |
| Privileges Required |  | An attacker requires no privileges to mount an attack. |
| User Interaction |  | A successful attack requires a victim to open a malicious PDF file. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component is the victim's Google Chrome web browser.  The impacted component is also the victim's Google Chrome browser. |
| Confidentiality |  | The Google Chrome web browser is completely compromised and runs executable code created by the attacker. |
| Integrity |  | The Google Chrome web browser is completely compromised and runs executable code created by the attacker. |
| Availability |  | The Google Chrome web browser is completely compromised and runs executable code created by the attacker. |

* **WordPress Mail Plugin Reflected Cross-site Scripting Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

Versions of the *WP Mail* WordPress plugin before 1.2 are vulnerable to a reflected cross-site scripting (XSS) attack. The *replyto* parameter is not sufficiently sanitized, allowing JavaScript to be inserted in the URL.

**Attack**

The attacker creates a link to a WordPress website running a vulnerable version of the WP Mail plugin. This link contains malicious JavaScript code for the *replyto* parameter. The attacker fools a victim into visiting the link, e.g., by sending the link to the victim in an email or posting the link on a website and hoping it will be clicked.

When a victim clicks the link, the vulnerable WordPress server will send the victim a legitimate web page that has the malicious JavaScript chosen by the attacker. The victim's browser will run the malicious JavaScript in the context of the vulnerable WordPress website, allowing it to read and modify data associated with that site. Reflected XSS attacks typically steal cookies associated with the vulnerable website or launch further attacks.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The attack can only be exploited over a network. We assume the vulnerable WordPress website is connected to the Internet, as this is a common deployment. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The attacker can expect repeatable success. |
| Privileges Required |  | The attacker requires no privileges to perform the attack. |
| User Interaction |  | A victim needs to click the malicious link created by the attacker. |
| Scope |  | The **vulnerable component** is the vulnerable WordPress web server.  The **impacted component** is the victim's browser. |
| Confidentiality |  | Information in the victim's browser associated with the vulnerable WordPress website can be read by the malicious JavaScript code and sent to the attacker. |
| Integrity |  | Information in the victim's browser associated with the vulnerable WordPress website can be modified by the malicious JavaScript code. |
| Availability |  | The malicious JavaScript code cannot significantly impact the victim's browser. |

* **Opera DLL search order hijacking**

**Vulnerability**

Opera before 57.0.3098.106 is vulnerable to a DLL Search Order hijacking attack where an attacker can send a ZIP archive composed of an HTML page along with a malicious DLL to the target. Once the document is opened, it may allow the attacker to take full control of the system from any location within the system. The issue lies in the loading of the shcore.dll and dcomp.dll files: these files are being searched for by the program in the same system-wide directory where the HTML file is executed.

**Attack**

The vulnerability allows an attacker to load a malicious DLL from any location accessible by the current user. This means that to exploit this vulnerability, an attacker will not need any special access to the system; instead, an attacker can craft a malicious package and send it across to his target. The target can download and keep this package anywhere in the system.

Once extracted and any HTML page is executed from this malicious package, due to the vulnerability, the browser tries to load the DLL files from its current folder. Here, the presence of malicious DLL files will trigger the backdoor as soon as the page tries to load in the browser.

The vulnerability is a little different than the conventional DLL hijack because most of the DLL hijacks occur from the executable path of the software and are not system-wide. This means in a conventional scenario the attacker will place malicious DLL files in the executable folder for the software which would typically be Program Files directory. However, such scenarios would require an attacker to have access to the target machine already. In this particular case, since the DLL files are searched from the current directory from where the HTML files are executed, the attacker will not require local access at all.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | Attacker must gain local access, either directly or through social engineering, to load the malicious DLL. |
| Attack Complexity |  | Attack is repeatable and deterministic. |
| Privileges Required |  | No special privileges are required by the attacker. |
| User Interaction |  | Victim interaction is required to execute the malicious DLL. |
| Scope |  | Vulnerable and Impacted Component are the same system. |
| Confidentiality |  | Allows the attacker to take full control of the system |
| Integrity |  | Allows the attacker to take full control of the system |
| Availability |  | Allows the attacker to take full control of the system |

<https://blog.lucideus.com/2019/02/opera-search-order-hijacking-cve-2018-18913.html>

* **Remote Code Execution in Oracle Outside in Technology**

**Vulnerability**

Versions 8.4.0, 8.5.1, 8.5.2 and 8.5.3 of Oracle Outside in Technology include filters which perform insufficient validation of their inputs, resulting in unintended behavior.

Oracle Outside in Technology is a library and is not exploitable without a program that passes data to it. Section 3.7 of the User Guide provides guidance on how to score vulnerabilities in libraries and similar software.

**Attack**

The User Guide states that we assume the reasonable worst-case in how the library is likely to be used, score based on this usage and document these assumptions. The nature of the attack is based on the assumptions we make. These are discussed in more detail in the *Comments* column of the CVSS v3.1 table below.

A successful attack may allow an attacker to read all other data accessible to the library, modify some data accessible to the library, and create partial denial of service conditions.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | Although it is possible that this program only accepts input from local processes, the library is commonly used with a web application server which is often deployed on the Internet. We assume the latter as it is the reasonable worst case, i.e. the metric value that results in the greatest Base Score. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The library can be exploited at will, and we assume the program using the library is the same and does not add any complexity that an attacker needs to overcome to perform a successful attack. |
| Privileges Required |  | We assume the program using the library does not require credentials to be supplied before passing potentially malicious data to it. This is a reasonable worst-case assumption for this library as it is sometimes used on public websites to perform document and image conversions for anonymous users. |
| User Interaction |  | We assume the program using the library does not require the attacker to rely on another user performing an action to perform a successful attack. |
| Scope |  | We assume the impact of an attack is limited to the library and the program using it. Given the nature of this library it is unlikely it would be used in a way that impacts other components. |
| Confidentiality |  | A successful attack may allow an attacker to read all other data accessible to the library. |
| Integrity |  | A successful attack may allow an attacker to modify some data accessible to the library. |
| Availability |  | A successful attack may allow an attacker to create partial denial of service conditions. |

* **Lenovo ThnkPwn Exploit**

**Vulnerability**

The SmmRuntime BIOS EFI Driver allows local administrators to execute arbitrary code with System Management Mode (SMM) privileges via unspecified vectors.

**Attack**

Attacker creates a buffer in memory containing exploit code to be executed in SMM context. Attacker then creates a structure with a pointer to the exploit code’s entry point and triggers an SMI passing a reference to that structure. The SMM driver then calls the exploit code via the supplied function pointer.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: 8.2\_\_(High)\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector | Local | The attacker must be able to execute code on the system. |
| Attack Complexity | Low | This attack leverages a failure to verify input parameters in the SmmRuntime driver and can be reproduced consistently with simple code. |
| Privileges Required | High | The attacker must be able to run kernel level (ring 0) code on the target system. |
| User Interaction | None | The vulnerability is built into the BIOS and is always available. There is no user configuration involved. |
| Scope | Changed | Exploiting the vulnerable component grants access to SMM resources that are otherwise protected by hardware and are not accessible from outside SMM. The vulnerable component is not intended to grant unlimited access to this mode of operation. |
| Confidentiality | High | Normally the contents of SMRAM are hidden by hardware from access by kernel level (ring 0) code. This attack allows full disclosure of the precise current contents of SMRAM. |
| Integrity | High | Normally the contents of SMRAM and some specific hardware registers are protected by hardware mechanisms. This exploit grants full access to both SMRAM and any hardware registers that have access restricted to SMM. |
| Availability | High | The attacker can completely control the entire system from SMM and deny access to the system by not returning from SMM. |

* **Failure to Lock Flash on Resume from sleep (CVE-2015-2890)**

**Vulnerability**

Some UEFI BIOS implementations failed to set Flash write protections such as the BIOS\_CNTL locking on resume from the S3 suspend to RAM sleep state.

**Attack**

Attacker causes or waits until the system resumes from suspend, and then writes over the current BIOS image in Flash with a new BIOS image modified by the attacker.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The attacker must be able to execute code on the system. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The attacker has unfettered access to the Flash part on which the BIOS is stored. |
| Privileges Required |  | The attacker must be able to run kernel level (ring 0) code on the target system, in order to access the Flash part. |
| User Interaction |  | Many affected systems may enter the S3 sleep state on their own in standard configurations after some time has passed without user activity. |
| Scope |  | There is one component impacted, and that component is responsible for enforcing its own security. |
| Confidentiality |  | The contents of the BIOS Flash part are not read protected and can be read regardless of this vulnerability. |
| Integrity |  | If the BIOS Flash part is not properly protected, the BIOS can be completely overwritten. |
| Availability |  | An attacker can permanently deny service by erasing or corrupting the BIOS and resetting the system. |

* **Intel DCI Issue**

**Vulnerability**

Existing UEFI setting restrictions for DCI (Direct Connect Interface) in 5th and 6th generation Intel Xeon Processor E3 Family, Intel Xeon Scalable processors, and Intel Xeon Processor D Family allows a limited physical presence attacker to potentially access platform secrets via debug interfaces.

**Attack**

An attacker with physical access can attach a debug device to the DCI interface and directly interrogate and control the processor state starting from very early in the boot process.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score: \_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The attacker must have physical access to the DCI port in order to attach the debugging device. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The debugging device is off the shelf hardware that can be purchased from Intel by anybody. |
| Privileges Required |  | The attacker has complete access to the state of the processor, directly bypassing all security protections. |
| User Interaction |  | Affected systems enable DCI support by default in the BIOS setup screen. |
| Scope |  | The attacker is granted full access to the state of the machine at a hardware level not normally available to users of the system. All software- based security mechanisms and many hardware- based security mechanisms are fully bypassed. |
| Confidentiality |  | The entire operational state of the target machine is fully exposed. Any secret that enters memory is exposed. |
| Integrity |  | The entire operational state of the target machine may be modified to any state permitted by hardware. |
| Availability |  | An attacker can permanently deny service by multiple means, including but not limited to replacing the operating system and modifying UEFI variables that would normally be inaccessible which govern the boot process. |

* **Scripting Engine Memory Corruption Vulnerability**

**Vulnerability**

A remote code execution vulnerability exists in the way the scripting engine handles objects in memory in Microsoft browsers. The vulnerability could corrupt memory in such a way that an attacker could execute arbitrary code in the context of the current user. An attacker who successfully exploited the vulnerability could gain the same user rights as the current user. If the current user is logged on with administrative user rights, an attacker who successfully exploited the vulnerability could take control of an affected system. An attacker could then install programs; view, change, or delete data; or create new accounts with full user rights.

The security update addresses the vulnerability by modifying how the scripting engine handles objects in memory.

**Attack**

In a web-based attack scenario, an attacker could host a specially crafted website designed to exploit the vulnerability through a Microsoft browser and then convince a user to view the website. An attacker could also embed an ActiveX control marked "safe for initialization" in an application or Microsoft Office document that hosts the browser rendering engine. The attacker could also take advantage of compromised websites and websites that accept or host user-provided content or advertisements. These websites could contain specially crafted content that could exploit the vulnerability.

**CVSS v3.1 Base Score \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Attack Vector |  | The victim must visit a malicious website that may exist outside the local network. |
| Attack Complexity |  | The attacker can expect repeatable success. |
| Privileges Required |  | The attacker does not need any permissions to perform this attack, the attacker lets the victim perform the action on the attacker's behalf. |
| User Interaction |  | The victim must click a specially- crafted link provided by the attacker. |
| Scope |  | The vulnerable component and impacted component are the same, which is operating system. |
| Confidentiality |  | The Internet Explorer sandbox runs at a higher integrity level than Edge and allows sandbox features to be disabled, granting access to local files. Edge restricts access to local resources that are generated when browsing (cookies, temp files, etc.). |
| Integrity |  | Internet Explorer could be configured to allow access to local files, which may include access to important system files. An attacker could overwrite these files. The Edge AppContainer restricts access to system files. |
| Availability |  | Internet Explorer could be configured to allow access to local files, which may include access to important system files. An attacker could cause a system crash by overwriting these files. The Edge AppContainer restricts access to system files. |