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Description automatically generated

[Company Name]

**Security Assessment Report**

Performed by [Team Name]

[Date]

*This report contains confidential and sensitive information. It is intended solely for the information and use of [Company Name]*

A black text on a white background

Description automatically generated

This engagement was performed in accordance with the signed agreements put forth by *[Company Name]*, and the procedures were limited to those described in the scope and rules. The findings and recommendations resulting from the assessment are provided in this report. Given the time-limited scope of this assessment, the findings in this report should not be taken as a comprehensive listing of all security vulnerabilities.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Table of Contents [REGEN THIS] |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Executive Summary | | |
| At the request of [Company Name], a penetration test was conducted on [specific scope/systems or features being tested]. This assessment was structured in two key stages to identify potential security vulnerabilities and assess the risk to critical assets. The first stage, pre-engagement operations, involved extensive open-source intelligence gathering to identify potential external risks. This was followed by the assessment phase, in which active reconnaissance and controlled exploitation techniques were employed to confirm the existence and potential impact of any identified vulnerabilities.  The following report provides a detailed overview of the findings from these engagement phases, along with targeted recommendations for remediation. In particular, the assessment focused on [mention specific critical systems or data assets relevant to the company], ensuring that these essential systems and data flows were carefully reviewed to uphold their security. This assessment was performed with adherence to relevant data protection laws and regulations, such as [mention specific laws like GDPR, HIPAA, etc., if pertinent], in order to align with compliance standards applicable to [Company Name]’s industry.  This summary includes a high-level overview of the key findings, presented in a visual chart that categorizes vulnerabilities by severity and frequency. This chart provides a quick reference to the most pressing issues, organized by risk level and their potential business impact. Additional details for each of these vulnerabilities can be found in the “Technical Findings” section. Following this, [Team Name] offers strategic insights for bolstering your organization’s security posture, with recommendations for both immediate action and long-term improvements.  [have num of vuln graph, and other graphs that are \*pretty\* and execs will eat up] | **Timeline**  Engagement  Began  *[Date Begin]*  Engagement  Concluded  *[Date end]* | |
| **Findings**  **N** Critical  **N** High  **N** Medium  **N** Low  **N** Informational | |

Strategic Recommendations

To improve the security posture of *[Company Name]*, *[Team Name]* recommends pursuing the following strategies:

**Immediate Actions**

* [FIXME: add findings]

**Long-Term Strategies**

* [FIXME: add findings]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Engagement Outline |

Stuff like network map, what we did, how we did, scope, etc

Overview… blah blah

### Scope

*[Team Name]* performed security testing on *[Company Name]* network infrastructure. Testing was conducted from the perspective of an attacker with a connection to the external network of *[Company Name]*. *[Team Name]* was provided the following networks to test from the scope of work created by *[Company Name]*.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Network | CIDR/Address Space |
| NAME\_OF\_NETWORK | 0.0.0.0/0 |
| NAME\_OF\_NETWORK | 0.0.0.0/0 |
| NAME\_OF\_NETWORK | 0.0.0.0/0 |

Special care was taken to exclude the following specified networks/hosts.

[INSERT TABLE IF APPLICABLE]

### Network Diagram

[IMAGE\_OF\_NET\_DIAGRAM\_HERE – draw.io]

### Attack Narrative

Key steps walking through high points in attack. Basically a high level overview of what we did

### Sample Finding Walkthrough

The following is an example of a typical finding you’ll see in this report. This sample is provided to help you understand the formatting, structure, and detail included in each finding, allowing for a clearer interpretation of the report's layout and content. It illustrates how each vulnerability is documented, from the technical description to the business impact and recommended remediation steps.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Example Finding Name  CVSS: Score - Severity | Score |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Local | Physical | Scope: | Unchanged | Changed |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low | High** | Confidentiality : | **None | Low | High** |
| Required Privileges : | **None | Low | High** | Integrity: | **None | Low | High** |
| User Interaction : | **None | Required** | Availability : | **None | Low | High** |

Each finding begins with a Title, CVSS Score, and Severity level, followed by a detailed breakdown of the CVSS metrics. For an in-depth explanation of these metrics, refer to [this guide on CVSS scores](https://www.balbix.com/insights/base-cvss-scores/).

#### **Description**

This section provides an in-depth explanation of the identified vulnerability, including its technical context and relevance. It clarifies the underlying cause of the issue, potential methods of exploitation, and the resulting impact, equipping you with a clear understanding of the risk presented.

#### **Affected Systems**

This section identifies the specific systems, applications, or network components impacted by the vulnerability. By detailing the affected areas, it enables you to understand the scope of exposure and prioritize remediation efforts accordingly.

#### **Observations**:

This section gives a step-by-step overview of the testing process, including screenshots, error messages, logs, or other outputs that confirm the vulnerability. Each observation is documented clearly to show exactly what was done and the results found during testing.

#### **Business Impact**

This section outlines the potential effects of the vulnerability on your organization, including risks to data security, operational disruptions, financial implications, and reputational damage. It translates the technical findings into clear business consequences, helping you understand the broader impact on your organization.

#### **Remediations**:

#### This section provides recommended actions to address and resolve the identified vulnerability. Each remediation step is designed to mitigate risks effectively, offering guidance on configuration changes, patches, code updates, or process improvements needed to secure affected systems and prevent similar issues in the future.

#### **References**

This section includes relevant resources and documentation that provide additional information on the vulnerability, remediation techniques, and best practices. References may consist of industry standards, vendor documentation, or research articles to support a deeper understanding and further exploration of the issue.

### Severity Ratings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Explanation | Vulnerability | CVSS Score |
| Vulnerabilities with a CVSS score of 9.0 to 10.0.  These vulnerabilities allow attackers to easily exploit the system, often remotely, and can lead to significant data loss, system compromise, or other severe consequences. Immediate remediation is required. | Critical | 9.0-10.0 |
| Vulnerabilities with a CVSS score of 7.0 to 8.9.  These present a serious risk to the organization and can be exploited by attackers to gain access to sensitive data or disrupt operations. Remediation should be prioritized. | High | 7.0-8.9 |
| Vulnerabilities with a CVSS score of 4.0 to 6.9.  While not immediately critical, these vulnerabilities may still be exploitable and could pose a risk over time or under certain conditions. They should be addressed in a reasonable timeframe. | Medium | 4.0-6.9 |
| Vulnerabilities with a CVSS score of 0.1 to 3.9.  These present a minimal risk and are typically harder to exploit. While they may not pose an immediate threat, they should still be remediated to avoid potential risks over time. | Low | 0.1-3.9 |
| These are not classified as vulnerabilities but are included to provide additional insights into the system or environment. No immediate action is required, but they may be useful for improving overall security posture. | Informational | 0.0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Technical Findings |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Page | Risk | Vulnerability | CVSS Score |
| NUM | Resource-Based Constrained Delegation Abuse | Critical | 9.8 |
| NUM | Constrained Delegation Abuse | Critical | 9.8 |
| NUM | Blank Local Administrator Password | Critical | 9.1 |
| NUM | Golash Script Interpreter RCE | Critical | 9.8 |
| NUM | Improper Handling of Sensitive Information via Social Engineering (Vishing) | High | 8.8 |
| NUM | Guest SMB Access | High | 8.2 |
| NUM | Weak Password Policy | High | 8.2 |
| NUM | API Broken Function Level Authorization | High | 8.2 |
| NUM | Unconstrained Delegation Abuse | High | 8.1 |
| NUM | SMBv1 Enabled | High | 7.3 |
| NUM | Local Administrator Enabled | High | 7.3 |
| NUM | Add Key Credential Link | High | 7.1 |
| NUM | API PII Data Exposure | High | 7.5 |
| NUM | Anonymous RPC Access | Medium | 6.5 |
| NUM | SMB Signing Disabled | Medium | 6.5 |
| NUM | Plaintext Credentials | Medium | 6.5 |
| NUM | PetitPotam Abuse | Medium | 6.3 |
| NUM | Kerberos UserSPN Abuse | Medium | 6.3 |
| NUM | Windows Startup Exclusion Set | Medium | 6.2 |
| NUM | ScaleAI: Password Managers | Medium | 5.8 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource-Based Constrained Delegation Abuse  CVSS: 9.8 - Critical | 9.8 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **High** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **High** |

### **Description**

Resource-Based Constrained Delegation (RBCD) allows an account or computer to impersonate users for specific services it is authorized to access. While more restrictive than unconstrained delegation, RBCD can still be abused if misconfigured, particularly when attackers compromise a service account with delegation rights. This can lead to lateral movement or privilege escalation, enabling attackers to access sensitive resources or impersonate higher-privileged accounts. Properly securing and auditing delegation configurations is crucial to mitigate these risks.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, Team 12 was able to find a specific privilege that allows a user to arbitrarily write delegation permissions to any resource it owns in the network. Through the compromise of this user's credentials, the team was able to add a computer to the domain, write the msDS-AllowedToActOnBehalfofOtherIdentity permission to this resource, and impersonate the domain administrator, resulting in full domain compromise.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* User: a-dmitchell has the AddAllowedToAct permission.

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

If this permission is required for specific functionality, ensure that this user's password is particularly strong and consider implementing Privilege Access Management (PAM) in the Active Directory domain. If this user does not need the ability to write delegation permissions, consider disabling or reducing them, following the principle of least privilege.

### 

### **References**

https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-server/security/kerberos/kerberos-constrained-delegation-overview

https://www.semperis.com/blog/ad-security-101-resource-based-constraint-delegation/

https://blog.netwrix.com/2022/09/29/resource-based-constrained-delegation-abuse/

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Constrained Delegation Abuse  CVSS: 9.8 - Critical | 9.8 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **High** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **High** |

### **Description**

Constrained Delegation is a mechanism in Kerberos that allows accounts to impersonate specific services in an Active Directory environment. Misconfigurations in this feature can lead to attackers abusing delegation privileges, resulting in unauthorized access, privilege escalation, or even full domain compromise.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, Team 12 was able to establish full-domain compromise two different ways by abusing constrained delegation. The first scenario involved the FlakeBook\_SSPR user's credentials, enabling the team to request a ticket as the domain administrator. The second scenario involved the fsserv$ machine account hash, which enabled the team to request a ticket as the domain administrator, as the time SPN is considered a host SPN.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* User: FlakeBook\_SSPR
* System: fsserv$

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

**For Domain-Joined Systems:**

1. Open Active Directory Users and Computers (ADUC).
2. For each account with delegation, right-click, select Properties, navigate to the Delegation tab, and ensure that only necessary services are configured for delegation.
3. Regularly audit accounts with constrained delegation rights to verify they are still necessary and appropriately scoped.
4. If applicable, ensure the passwords for accounts that are configured with delegation are very strong.

### 

### **References**

https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/defender-for-identity/security-assessment-unconstrained-kerberos

https://blog.netwrix.com/2023/04/21/attacking-constrained-delegation-to-elevate-access/

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Blank Local Administrator Password  CVSS: 9.1 - Critical | 9.1 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **High** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

Having a blank local administrator password is a serious security vulnerability, as it allows unauthorized users or attackers to gain full access to a system without any authentication. This creates a significant risk of system compromise, as the local administrator account typically has unrestricted privileges, including the ability to modify system settings, install malicious software, and access sensitive data. Without a password, the account is effectively an open gateway for exploitation.

Business Impact

Due to the current configuration anyone on the network could gain full access two the two hosts leading to exposure of PII, source code, Internal documents, etc. The leaking of these types of sensitive information could cost Oui Croissant millions in fine, legal fees ,and lost development hours.

### 

### **Observations**

During the assessment Finals-12 was able gain access to two hosts as the local administrators have a blank password.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.2.100 - OC-DESKTOP01
* 10.0.2.104 - OC-DESKTOP04

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

The local administrator can be set from the command prompt on the host by typing net user administrator \*. The password set should be inline with the example password policy from the "Weak Password Policy" finding

### 

### **References**

https://answers.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/forum/all/local-admin-account-password-windows-10/1652b8b1-3158-48cd-9708-4474579aa5e5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Improper Handling of Sensitive Information via Social Engineering (Vishing)  CVSS: 8.8 - High | 8.8 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **High** |
| User Interaction : | **Required** | Availability : | **High** |

### **Description**

A vishing attack involves a threat actor using social engineering techniques over the phone to manipulate an individual into giving out sensitive information such as credentials, personal data, or financial details. In this type of attack, the threat actor typically masquerades as a trusted employee, or representative. Once the threat actor gains access to credentials via phishing, the attacker can use to gain unauthorized access to systems and escalate privileges

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, Team 12 performed a vishing attack against the service desk in an attempt to gain the credentials of Jamie Thompson user. The team was able to obtain the email **jamie.thompson@yyy.chat** with the password **Rockyou!**

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* Service Desk Employees

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

* Education and Awareness Training
  + Conduct regular training sessions for employees on recognizing vishing attacks and social engineering.
* Multi-Factor Authentication
  + Require MFA for all critical systems and accounts, reducing the risk of compromise if credentials are stolen.
* Limit Access to sensitive information
  + Apply the principle of least privilege, ensuring employees only have access to information that's necessary for their role.

### 

### **References**

https://blog.lastpass.com/posts/vishing

https://www.mcafee.com/learn/what-is-vishing-and-how-to-avoid-it/

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Guest SMB Access  CVSS: 8.2 - High | 8.2 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **Low** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

Server Message Block (SMB) is a network protocol that enables users to share files, printers, and other resources across a network. In Windows, Guest SMB access allows unauthenticated users to access shared resources without valid credentials. This can expose sensitive files or systems, making the environment vulnerable to unauthorized access or information disclosure.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, it was discovered that some machines had the Guest machine enabled.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.1.7
* 10.0.2.100
* 10.0.2.104

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

**For Non Domain-Joined Systems:**

1. Open the Windows Registry Editor by pressing Windows+R, typing regedit, and pressing OK.
2. Navigate to: HKEY\_LOCAL\_MACHINE\SYSTEM\CurrentControlSet\Services\LanmanServer\Parameters
3. Create a DWORD value named NullSessionShares and set its value to 0.

**For Domain-Joined Systems:**

1. Open the Group Policy editor by pressing Windows+R, typing gpedit.msc, and pressing OK.
2. Navigate to: Computer Configuration > Windows Settings > Security Settings > Local Policies > Security Options > Network security: LAN Manager authentication level
3. Set the policy to "Send NTLMv2 response only. Refuse LM & NTLM."

### 

### **References**

https://www.tenable.com/plugins/nessus/26919

https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-server/storage/file-server/enable-insecure-guest-logons-smb2-and-smb3?tabs=group-policy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Weak Password Policy  CVSS: 8.2 - High | 8.2 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **Low** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

A weak password policy presents a significant security risk as it increases the likelihood of unauthorized access to systems and sensitive information. Simple or easily guessable passwords make it easier for attackers to exploit vulnerabilities through methods such as brute force attacks or credential stuffing. This can result in data breaches, financial losses, and reputational damage. Implementing a robust password policy is essential to mitigate these risks and enhance the overall security posture of an organization.

### 

### **Observations**

During testing it was observed that Oui Croissant implements a weak password policy. This was the case in the previous assessment as well.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* oui.local and subdomains

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

Changing the domain password policy can be done through the Group Policy Management Console by going to Domains > Group Policy objects > Default Domain Policy. Within the Default Domain Policy navigate to Computer Configuration\Policies\Windows Settings\Security Settings\Account Policies\Password Policy.

A strong password policy consists of the following elements:

* Length requirements (15+ characters)
* Complexity requirements (password must include number, capital and lowercase, and special characters)
* Blacklist common words (company name, seasons, names, etc.)
* Expiration dates (password must be changed every 30-60 days)

### 

### **References**

https://pages.nist.gov/800-63-4/sp800-63b.html#appA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| API Broken Function Level Authorization  CVSS: 8.2 - High | 8.2 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **Low** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **High** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

Broken Function Level Authorization (BFLA) is a vulnerability that occurs when an API fails to properly enforce user authorization at the function or endpoint level. This allows unauthorized users or low-privileged users to access or execute sensitive API functionality that should be restricted.

The vulnerability often arises from inconsistent or missing access control checks, enabling attackers to escalate privileges, perform unauthorized actions, or access sensitive data.

### 

### **Observations**

finals-12 found multiple API functions of Y which allowed any user to perform actions on the platform with excessive permissions such as banning other user accounts, and changing any user's profile data.

Note: you must be signed in as any user account and must supply a valid Authorization Cookie in the request Header to perform this. This gives any low-level user the administrative privilege of changing or banning any user on Y with minimal effort.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

http://admin.yyy.chat:7000/api/users/edit

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

* Implement Role-Based Access Control (RBAC)
* Define user roles and permissions clearly, such as:
* Regular Users: Can modify only their own profile.
* Moderators/Admins: Can ban users or modify profiles as per their assigned privileges.
* Ensure every API endpoint or function enforces these roles to control access strictly.
* Integrate into the Authorization Cookies used by Y, and restricting the admin.yyy.chat:7000 API to only accept tokens given to specified administrators

### 

### **References**

https://owasp.org/API-Security/editions/2023/en/0xa5-broken-function-level-authorization/

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Unconstrained Delegation Abuse  CVSS: 8.1 - High | 8.1 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **High** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **High** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **High** |

### **Description**

Unconstrained delegation is a mechanism within Kerberos that allows users to impersonate any service or user in an Active Directory environment. If environments are utilizing unconstrained delegation, it is strongly recommended to migrate over to constrained delegation. Abusing unconstrained delegation privileges enables an attacker to impersonate any user or computer that authenticates to it, potentially resulting in full domain compromise.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, Team 12 was able to abuse unconstrained delegation configured on OC-Desktop01. This allowed the team to impersonate the domain administrator, resulting in full domain compromise. The tools utilized throughout this procedure required the team to configure an antivirus exclusion on the machine, and Team 12 received prior authorization to do so before continuing. After the proof-of-concept was complete, the antivirus exclusion was removed.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* System: OC-Desktop01$

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

**For Domain-Joined Systems:**

1. Open Active Directory Users and Computers (ADUC).
2. For each account with unconstrained delegation, right-click, select Properties, and under the Delegation tab, disable unconstrained delegation if not absolutely necessary.
3. Use constrained delegation as an alternative where delegation is required, and regularly audit delegation settings for any high-risk misconfigurations.

### 

### **References**

https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/defender-for-identity/security-assessment-unconstrained-kerberos

https://www.crowe.com/cybersecurity-watch/unconstrained-delegation-too-trusting-for-its-own-good

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SMBv1 Enabled  CVSS: 7.3 - High | 7.3 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **Low** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **Low** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **Low** |

### **Description**

Server Message Block version 1, or SMBv1, is an outdated protocol that lacks major security features and is often susceptible to various attacks. If SMBv1 is enabled, various vulnerabilities could result in remote code execution, potentially leading to further system and/or domain compromise.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, Team 12 discovered that SMBv1 was enabled.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.1.7

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

**For Non Domain-Joined Systems:**

1. Open the Windows Registry Editor by pressing Windows+R, typing regedit, and pressing OK.
2. Navigate to: HKEY\_LOCAL\_MACHINE\SYSTEM\CurrentControlSet\Services\LanmanServer\Parameters
3. Set the DWORD value SMB1 to 0 to disable SMBv1.

**For Domain-Joined Systems:**

1. Open the Group Policy editor by pressing Windows+R, typing gpedit.msc, and pressing OK.
2. Navigate to: Computer Configuration > Administrative Templates > Network > Lanman Workstation
3. Set the policy "Enable insecure guest logons" to Disabled.

### 

### **References**

https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-server/storage/file-server/troubleshoot/detect-enable-and-disable-smbv1-v2-v3?tabs=server

https://techcommunity.microsoft.com/t5/windows-server-for-it-pro/disable-smbv1/td-p/3289007

https://community.spiceworks.com/t/how-to-lock-down-smb1/946967

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Local Administrator Enabled  CVSS: 7.3 - High | 7.3 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **Low** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **Low** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **Low** |

### **Description**

For domain-joined systems, keeping the local administrator enabled can lead to unaccounted risks or vectors of abuse. Because the local administrator of a system does not adhere to the group policy of a domain, security measures such as password policies, password complexity, and more, could leave systems vulnerable if the local administrative account is enabled. For domain-joined systems, it is recommended to disable the local administrator account, as administrative procedures can be performed with domain-attached administrative accounts.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, it was discovered that the local administrator account was enabled on the Dev network with a blank password. The local administrator has the seImpersonate privilege, which allows the running of various commands as active users on the system.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.2.104
* 10.0.2.100

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

1. Open the Group Policy Management Console.
2. Navigate to: Computer Configuration > Windows Settings > Security Settings > Local Policies > User Rights Assignment
3. Disable local administrator accounts where unnecessary and ensure unique, strong passwords for any remaining accounts.

### 

### **References**

https://sbscyber.com/blog/the-danger-of-local-administrative-privileges

https://www.securden.com/blog/local-admin-accounts-management.html

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Add Key Credential Link  CVSS: 7.1 - High | 7.1 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **Low** | Integrity: | **Low** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

The Add Key Credential Link attack is a security vulnerability in Active Directory that allows attackers to gain unauthorized access by abusing the KeyCredentials attribute of the user accounts, service principals, or managed identities.

### 

### **Observations**

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.1.6

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

* Restrict permissions to Modify KeyCredentials
  + Limit who can assign or modify the KeyCredential attribute for users, service principals and managed identities.
  + Use role-based access control (RBAC) to ensure only trusted administrators or applications can perform these operations.
* Audit KeyCredentials Regularly
  + Perform regular audits of active directory accounts, service principals and manage identities.
  + Look for unexpected public keys added to KeyCredentials attribute.

### 

### **References**

https://posts.specterops.io/shadow-credentials-abusing-key-trust-account-mapping-for-takeover-8ee1a53566ab

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Anonymous RPC Access  CVSS: 6.5 - Medium | 6.5 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **Low** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **None** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **Low** |

### **Description**

Remote Procedural Call (RPC) is a protocol in Windows that allows a program to request a service over the network. Anonymous RPC, or unauthenticated RPC, allows users to perform various RPC commands without any credentials. This mechanism could be abused by an attacker, potentially leading to information disclosure, unauthorized access, or even remote code execution in some cases.

### 

### **Observations**

During the internal penetration test, it was found that a host allowed an anonymous connection to RPC allowing enumeration on the host.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.1.6

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

**For Non Domain-Joined Systems:**

1. Open the Windows Registry Editor. This can be done by pressing Windows+R, typing regedit and pressing OK.
2. Navigate to the following key: HKEY\_LOCAL\_MACHINE\SOFTWARE\Policies\Microsoft\Windows NT\Rpc
3. Right-click in the right window, select 'New' and create a 32-bit DWORD value named RestrictRemoteClients
4. Once created, right click the new registry entry, and select 'Modify.' Set it's value to 1 to enable it.

**For Domain-Joined Systems:**

1. Open the Group Policy editor. This can be done by pressing Windows+R, typing gpedit.msc and pressing OK.
2. Navigate to the following key: Computer Configuration > Administrative Templates > System > Remote Procedure Call > 'Restrict Unauthenticated RPC clients'
3. Double-click the policy and choose 'Enabled.'

### 

### **References**

https://www.syxsense.com/syxsense-securityarticles/rpc/syx-1024-10907.html

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SMB Signing Disabled  CVSS: 6.5 - Medium | 6.5 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **Low** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **Low** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

In the Server Message Block (SMB) protocol, signing is a security feature that ensures a user's authentication request has not been tampered with before that user is granted access to resources in the network. If SMB signing is disabled, the destination computer may be vulnerable to man-in-the-middle attacks, where an attacker can control the connection of a valid user or system in the network. This can lead to remote code execution, breaches of confidentiality, or even system compromise.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, it was discovered that SMB signing was disabled on multiple hosts.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.2.104
* 10.0.2.100

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

**For Non Domain-Joined Systems:**

1. Open the Windows Registry Editor by pressing Windows+R, typing regedit, and pressing OK.
2. Navigate to: HKEY\_LOCAL\_MACHINE\SYSTEM\CurrentControlSet\Services\LanmanServer\Parameters
3. Set the DWORD value RequireSecuritySignature to 1 to enable SMB signing.

**For Domain-Joined Systems:**

1. Open the Group Policy editor by pressing Windows+R, typing gpedit.msc, and pressing OK.
2. Navigate to: Computer Configuration > Windows Settings > Security Settings > Local Policies > Security Options
3. Enable the policy "Microsoft network client: Digitally sign communications (always)."

### 

### **References**

https://www.blumira.com/integration/how-to-configure-smb-signing/

https://techcommunity.microsoft.com/t5/storage-at-microsoft/configure-smb-signing-with-confidence/ba-p/2418102

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Plaintext Credentials  CVSS: 6.5 - Medium | 6.5 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **Low** | Integrity: | **None** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

Plaintext credential files pose a significant security risk, as they can be easily accessed by unauthorized users if shares are improperly configured or compromised. When attackers discover plaintext credentials they can use them to gain unauthorized access to systems, escalate privileges, and move laterally within the network. This expose significantly increases the risk of data breaches and system compromise.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, it was discovered that there was a file called admin-portal.txt in a SMB share that had plaintext credentials.

the 10.0.2.5 system in the dev network also contained plaintext credentials in found in this file HYPERLINK http://10.0.2.5:3000/src/routes/login.jsx http://10.0.2.5:3000/src/routes/login.jsx . This is exposed to any non-privileged user in the dev network.

This was a valid admin login for this web application

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.1.6/yyyFiles/Legal
* http://10.0.2.5:3000/ HYPERLINK http://10.0.2.5:3000/src/routes/login.jsx src/routes/login.jsx

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

* Store credentials security using password managers or secure vaults
* Avoid saving credentials in scripts, configuration files, or shared directories

### 

### **References**

https://attack.mitre.org/techniques/T1552/

https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/256.html

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PetitPotam Abuse  CVSS: 6.3 - Medium | 6.3 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **Low** |
| Required Privileges : | **Low** | Integrity: | **Low** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **Low** |

### **Description**

PetitPotam is a vulnerability that abuses the MS-EFSRPC (Microsoft Encrypting File System Remote Protocol) to coerce authentication from Windows systems. Exploiting this vulnerability could lead to unauthorized access, lateral movement within the network, and, if successful, complete system or even domain compromise.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, Team 12 was able to identify and abuse Petitpotam, which resulted in the obtaining of an NTLMv1 ESS hash from the domain controller. Had the team had enough time and resources, they would have been able to crack and revert this hash to an NTLM, resulting in full domain compromise.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.1.6

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

Update the Domain Controller that is affected.

**Furthermore, Disabling NTLM authentication is another good remediation:**

1. Open the Group Policy editor by pressing Windows+R, typing gpedit.msc, and pressing OK.
2. Navigate to: Computer Configuration > Windows Settings > Security Settings > Local Policies > Security Options
3. Set the policy "Network security: Restrict NTLM: Incoming NTLM traffic" to Deny all accounts to help prevent NTLM relay attacks.
4. Disable the Encrypting File System (EFS) service if not required.

### 

### **References**

https://www.calcomsoftware.com/how-to-mitigate-petitpotam-ntlm-relay-attack/

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Kerberos UserSPN Abuse  CVSS: 6.3 - Medium | 6.3 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **Low** |
| Required Privileges : | **Low** | Integrity: | **Low** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **Low** |

### **Description**

Service Principal Names (SPNs) in Kerberos are typically associated with services, and are often relatively hard to break because service tickets are encrypted with a long and randomly-generated password by default. However, if a user has a Kerberos SPN applied to a user, tickets are encrypted with that user's password, resulting in a much higher chance of cracking a service ticket depending on the user's password's strength. If this is successfully exploited, an attacker can obtain the credentials for other accounts, resulting in abuse of privileges or pivoting.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, Team 12 was able to obtain the service ticket for a user SPN tied to the FlakeBook\_SSPR user. This resulted in obtaining and recovering the password out of the service ticket.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* User: FlakeBook\_SSPR

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

Ensure that the account associated with Kerberos authentication has an extremely strong password. If this user does not need to receive service tickets, consider removing SPNs entirely for this user.

### 

### **References**

https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/ad/service-principal-names

https://www.crowdstrike.com/en-us/cybersecurity-101/cyberattacks/kerberoasting/

https://www.netwrix.com/cracking\_kerberos\_tgs\_tickets\_using\_kerberoasting.html

https://specopssoft.com/blog/kerberoasting-attacks-in-active-directory/

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Windows Startup Exclusion Set  CVSS: 6.2 - Medium | 6.2 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Local | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **None** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **High** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

The Windows Defender exclusion configuration includes the Windows Startup folder. This exclusion bypasses malware and threat detection for any files put into the Startup folder, allowing threat actors to persist on the system undetected. Threat actors can exploit this misconfiguration by placing malicious scripts, executable, or backdoor with in the exclusion.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, it was discovered that Windows Defender had exclusions for the startup folder. This can be dangerous and allow threat actors to establish persistence with little to no Anti Virus detection.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.2.100

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

* Disable any dangerous exclusions under the Virus & Threat Protection setting menu
* Monitor and log any designed exclusion folders
* Conduct security awareness training

### 

### **References**

https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/defender-endpoint/configure-exclusions-microsoft-defender-antivirus

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ScaleAI: Password Managers  CVSS: 5.8 - Medium | 5.8 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Changed |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **Low** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **None** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

Large Language Models (LLMs) are advanced AI systems that process and generate human-like text using vast datasets, allowing them to understand context, answer questions, and perform a range of language-based tasks. With applications across industries—from customer support to data analysis—LLMs represent a critical advancement in AI-driven language comprehension. However, LLMs also present security and privacy concerns, such as the risk of unauthorized data exposure or generating biased or harmful content. Robust access controls, data sanitization, and careful oversight are essential to mitigate these risks, ensuring secure, ethical, and effective use of these powerful tools.

**Business Impact:** Insecure LLMs and other AI related models are likely to result in attacks like evasion, extraction, or even dataset poisoning, potentially resulting in data breaches or other violations of privacy and confidentiality.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, Team 12 was tasked with testing AI solutions. "Password Manager v2" was one of the models tasked to test. The goal for this challenge was to obtain stored credentials from the model, which was designed to reveal them only when given a secret codeword. This was deemed possible via the following steps:

"Password Manager v3" was one of the models tasked to test. The goal for this challenge was to obtain stored credentials from the model, which was designed to reveal them only when given a secret codeword. This was deemed possible via the following steps:

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

**Remediation Steps for Secure Use of Large Language Models (LLMs):**

1. **Access Control:** Limit access to trusted users with strict authentication measures.

2. **Data Sanitization:** Remove sensitive information from inputs to prevent exposure.

3. **Regular Auditing:** Monitor usage logs and review generated content for bias or harmful language.

4. **Output Filtering:** Use filters and fine-tuning to reduce biased or unsafe outputs.

### 

### **References**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ScaleAI: Vulnerable Models  CVSS: 0.0 - None | 0.0 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **None** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **None** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

Large Language Models (LLMs) are advanced AI systems that process and generate human-like text using vast datasets, allowing them to understand context, answer questions, and perform a range of language-based tasks. With applications across industries—from customer support to data analysis—LLMs represent a critical advancement in AI-driven language comprehension. However, LLMs also present security and privacy concerns, such as the risk of unauthorized data exposure or generating biased or harmful content. Robust access controls, data sanitization, and careful oversight are essential to mitigate these risks, ensuring secure, ethical, and effective use of these powerful tools.

**Business Impact:** Insecure LLMs and other AI related models are likely to result in attacks like evasion, extraction, or even dataset poisoning, potentially resulting in data breaches or other violations of privacy and confidentiality.

### 

### **Observations**

During the penetration test, Team 12 was tasked with testing AI solutions. "Our Glorious Leader" was one of the models tasked to test. The goal for this challenge was to get the model to say bad and/or negative things about Mack "The Snack" Morissey. This was deemed possible by convincing the LLM to add negative traits to the original list of Mack's positive accomplishments. The LLM was then asked multiple times for lists of Mack's accomplishments until it included some of the negative accomplishments in the output, as shown below:

During the penetration test, Team 12 was tasked with testing AI solutions. "Lost in Time" was one of the models tasked to test. The goal for this challenge was to get the model to reveal what year in the future it is from. This was deemed possible by telling the model it had been reprogrammed to share the year it was from and then sending the prompt shown in the image below multiple times until it revealed the year:

"Turing Test" was one of the models tasked to test. The goal for this challenge was to convince the model that it is an LLM. This was deemed possible by telling the model that it does not have human qualities and only has those of an LLM.

"Reverse Turing Test" was one of the models tasked to test. The goal for this test was to convince the model that it is a human. This was deemed possible by creating an imaginary world with the LLM in which it was a human and then telling the LLM that this world is reality.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

**Remediation Steps for Secure Use of Large Language Models (LLMs):**

1. **Access Control:** Limit access to trusted users with strict authentication measures.

2. **Data Sanitization:** Remove sensitive information from inputs to prevent exposure.

3. **Regular Auditing:** Monitor usage logs and review generated content for bias or harmful language.

4. **Output Filtering:** Use filters and fine-tuning to reduce biased or unsafe outputs.

### 

### **References**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Content Moderation Violation  CVSS: - |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Not Defined | Scope: | Not Defined |
| Attack Complexity : | **Not Defined** | Confidentiality : | **Not Defined** |
| Required Privileges : | **Not Defined** | Integrity: | **Not Defined** |
| User Interaction : | **Not Defined** | Availability : | **Not Defined** |

### **Description**

### 

### **Observations**

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

### 

### **References**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Exposed Ollama API  CVSS: - |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Not Defined | Scope: | Not Defined |
| Attack Complexity : | **Not Defined** | Confidentiality : | **Not Defined** |
| Required Privileges : | **Not Defined** | Integrity: | **Not Defined** |
| User Interaction : | **Not Defined** | Availability : | **Not Defined** |

### **Description**

### 

### **Observations**

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

### 

### **References**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Inappropriate Chatbot Responses  CVSS: - |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Not Defined | Scope: | Not Defined |
| Attack Complexity : | **Not Defined** | Confidentiality : | **Not Defined** |
| Required Privileges : | **Not Defined** | Integrity: | **Not Defined** |
| User Interaction : | **Not Defined** | Availability : | **Not Defined** |

### **Description**

The chatbot was observed generating inappropriate, offensive, or unexpected responses when provided with specific inputs. This behavior occurs due to a lack of sufficient safeguards in processing user inputs and/or filtering the chatbot's outputs. Although this issue does not pose a direct security threat, it can harm user experience, reduce trust in the system, and potentially damage the organization’s reputation.

### 

### **Observations**

During testing, finals-12 was able to prompt the HYPERLINK http://yyy.chat yyy.chat chatbot in order to get it to respond to the user in an offensive manner. This may be something to take note of and put stricter input validation on this model. Although this poses no security risk the the Oui Croissant environment, it may damage the customer experience of Y as well as causing reputational damage.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

10.0.1.5 - yyy.chat

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

Increased input validation depends on how this chatbot is implemented (code/libraries used), but is the correct way of preventing this offensive output from the Y chatbot. Below is an example of a python library that can be used to enforce tighter restrictions on what data gets processed by the LLM model. AI experts could also be brought in to better train and test the model used on Y.

### 

### **References**

https://www.mechanical-orchard.com/insights/llm-toolkit-validation-is-all-you-need

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Stored XSS  CVSS: - |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Not Defined | Scope: | Not Defined |
| Attack Complexity : | **Not Defined** | Confidentiality : | **Not Defined** |
| Required Privileges : | **Not Defined** | Integrity: | **Not Defined** |
| User Interaction : | **Not Defined** | Availability : | **Not Defined** |

### **Description**

### 

### **Observations**

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

### 

### **References**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Golash Script Interpreter RCE  CVSS: 9.8 - Critical | 9.8 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **High** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **High** |

### **Description**

The Golash Script Interpreter is an alternative to SSH that doesn't support password authentication and directly runs GO script via an eval command.

### 

### **Observations**

During testing, it was found that Golosh could be used to gain access to the host.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

* 10.0.2.250

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

It is highly recommended to use SSH over the Golash interpreter. SSH is a mature and well established protocol which is well suited for the problem Golash attempts to solve.

However if the use of Golash is critical to business function the following actions should be taken:

* Implement strong authentication such as public key or password based with a strong policy (20+ characters).
* Implement roles or users so that Golash does not run as root and follows the principal of least privilege.
* Encrypt Golash traffic. Utilize SSL/TLS or a similar solution to ensure Golash traffic cannot be intercepted.

### 

### **References**

https://www.reddit.com/user/BugSquasherTay/comments/1hwyf9e/introducing\_golash\_a\_golang\_script\_interpreter/?rdt=54782

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| API PII Data Exposure  CVSS: 7.5 - High | 7.5 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Network | Scope: | Unchanged |
| Attack Complexity : | **Low** | Confidentiality : | **High** |
| Required Privileges : | **None** | Integrity: | **None** |
| User Interaction : | **None** | Availability : | **None** |

### **Description**

An API Data Exposure vulnerability has been identified that allows unauthorized access to sensitive user data. This issue occurs when the API does not properly enforce authentication and authorization checks, enabling anyone with knowledge of the API endpoint to retrieve all user information. This data breach resulted in the information of roughly 2000 Y users.

### 

### **Observations**

finals-12 found that the API route HYPERLINK http://yyy.chat/auth/query/User?personID=1 http://yyy.chat/auth/query/User?personID=1 leaks PII of registered users of Y, including first name, last, date of birth, email, and more information about users. The only authentication required to obtain this sensitive data is to be authenticated as any low-level Y user. This essentially allows anyone to freely pull the PII of all users registered on Y. This can be reproduced by signing in or registering a new user account on Y and visiting the following routes in a browser.

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

HYPERLINK http://yyy.chat/api/auth/query/User?personID=1 http://yyy.chat/api/auth/query/User?personID=1   
 HYPERLINK http://yyy.chat/api/auth/query/AllUsers?limit=2000&offset=0 http://yyy.chat/api/auth/query/AllUsers?limit=2000 HYPERLINK http://yyy.chat/api/auth/query/AllUsers?limit=2000&offset=0 & HYPERLINK http://yyy.chat/api/auth/query/AllUsers?limit=2000&offset=0 offset=0

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

Create a Role-Based Access Control policy for Authorization cookies for Y. Ensure that sensitive API's are restricted such as this one only allow Authorization cookies specified as admin tokens. For regular user accounts, restrict those Authorization cookies to only read data from their own profile. This data is also not used by the frontend of Y, and due to it not being needed the sensitive PII should also be stored in a backend database stored with encryption.

### 

### **References**

https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/security/zero-trust/develop/protect-api

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| sign  CVSS: - |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attack Vector: | Not Defined | Scope: | Not Defined |
| Attack Complexity : | **Not Defined** | Confidentiality : | **Not Defined** |
| Required Privileges : | **Not Defined** | Integrity: | **Not Defined** |
| User Interaction : | **Not Defined** | Availability : | **Not Defined** |

### **Description**

### 

### **Observations**

### 

### **Proof of Vulnerability**

### 

### **Affected Assets**

### **Business Impact**

### 

### **Remediation**

### 

### **References**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Appendix |

### Open Source Intellegence

[Team Name] was able to find public information on the following employees. It may be desirable to limit the exposure or connection of these public accounts to the company to maintain a superior security posture.

##### Social Media:

[TABLE WITH FINDINGS HERE THAT COULD BE RELEVANT]

##### Other Things:

These accounts combined allowed *[Team Name]* to collect significant information, for example:

### Thank You

We would like to extend our sincere appreciation to [COMPANY NAME] for the opportunity to conduct this penetration testing engagement. It has been a privilege to work with your team and assist in enhancing your organization's security posture.

Our goal was to identify potential vulnerabilities and provide actionable recommendations to help [COMPANY NAME] mitigate risks and strengthen its defenses against potential threats. We are confident that, by addressing the findings outlined in this report, [COMPANY NAME] will be well-equipped to maintain a more secure environment.

Thank you once again for entrusting us with this important work. If you have any questions or require further assistance, please do not hesitate to reach out to our team.