

# **Website Vulnerability Scanner Report**

https://accounts.google.com/v3/signin/identifier?

continue=https%3A%2F%2Fconsole.cloud.google.com%2Fprojectselector2%2Fnet-security%2Fsecuritypolicies%2Flist%3F\_ga%3D2.10069245.936492860.1607995107-366914458.1596215128%26pli%3D1%26supportedpurview%3Dproject&followup=https%3A%2F%2Fconsole.cloud.google.com%2Fprojectselector2%2Fnet-

security%2Fsecuritypolicies%2Flist%3F\_ga%3D2.10069245.936492860.1607995107-366914458.1596215128%26pli%3D1%26supportedpurview%3Dproject&ifkv=ARZ0qKKTaE-DO9ilsa44Xnp7I5MmjBUcl0jJdMh7V99rrunjEjLAH6b8hngZJgU4jts1xyuQ3fozgQ&osid=1&passive=1 209600&service=cloudconsole&flowName=GlifWebSignIn&flowEntry=ServiceLogin&dsh=S343063 56%3A1710788989531314&theme=glif&ddm=0

Target added due to a redirect from https://console.cloud.google.com/projectselector2/net-security/securitypolicies/list? \_ga=2.10069245.936492860.1607995107-366914458.1596215128&pli=1&supportedpurview=project

•

The Light Website Scanner didn't check for critical issues like SQLi, XSS, Command Injection, XXE, etc. Upgrade to run Deep scans with 40+ tests and detect more vulnerabilities.

### **Summary**

### Overall risk level:





#### **Scan information:**

 Start time:
 Mar 18, 2024 / 21:09:56

 Finish time:
 Mar 18, 2024 / 21:10:39

 Scan duration:
 43 sec

Tests performed: 18/18
Scan status: Finis

## **Findings**

# Missing security header: Referrer-Policy

CONFIRMED

URL	Evidence
https://accounts.google.com/v3/signin/identifier	Response headers do not include the Referrer-Policy HTTP security header as well as the <meta/> tag with name 'referrer' is not present in the response.

### ✓ Details

### Risk description:

The risk is that if a user visits a web page (e.g. "http://example.com/pricing/") and clicks on a link from that page going to e.g. "https://www.google.com", the browser will send to Google the full originating URL in the Referer header, assuming the Referer-Policy header is not set. The originating URL could be considered sensitive information and it could be used for user tracking.

### **Recommendation:**

The Referrer-Policy header should be configured on the server side to avoid user tracking and inadvertent information leakage. The value no-referrer of this header instructs the browser to omit the Referer header entirely.

### References:

https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/Security/Referer\_header:\_privacy\_and\_security\_concerns

### Classification:

**CWE: CWE-693** 

OWASP Top 10 - 2013 : A5 - Security Misconfiguration OWASP Top 10 - 2017 : A6 - Security Misconfiguration

# Unsafe security header: Content-Security-Policy

	NIE:	DNA	ED
CO	NH	IKM	Ŀυ

URL	Evidence	
https://accounts.google.com/v3/signin/identifier	Response headers include the HTTP Content-Security-Policy security header with the following security issues: report-uri: report-uri is deprecated in CSP3. Please use the report-to directive instead. default-src: The default-src directive should be set as a fall-back when other restrictions have not been specified. script-src: script-src directive is missing.	

### ✓ Details

#### **Risk description:**

The Content-Security-Policy (CSP) header activates a protection mechanism implemented in web browsers which prevents exploitation of Cross-Site Scripting vulnerabilities (XSS). If unsafe-inline directive is present in the CSP header, it allows the execution of inline scripts and event handlers. This can be exploited by an attacker to execute arbitrary JavaScript code in the context of the vulnerable application.

#### Recommendation:

Remove unsafe-inline value from the script-src directive in the Content-Security-Policy header.

#### References:

https://cheatsheetseries.owasp.org/cheatsheets/Content\_Security\_Policy\_Cheat\_Sheet.html https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/HTTP/Headers/Content-Security-Policy

#### Classification:

**CWE: CWE-693** 

OWASP Top 10 - 2013: A5 - Security Misconfiguration OWASP Top 10 - 2017: A6 - Security Misconfiguration

## Robots.txt file found

CONFIRMED

### URL

https://accounts.google.com/robots.txt

### ▼ Details

### **Risk description:**

There is no particular security risk in having a robots.txt file. However, it's important to note that adding endpoints in it should not be considered a security measure, as this file can be directly accessed and read by anyone.

### Recommendation:

We recommend you to manually review the entries from robots.txt and remove the ones which lead to sensitive locations in the website (ex. administration panels, configuration files, etc).

### References:

https://www.theregister.co.uk/2015/05/19/robotstxt/

### Classification:

OWASP Top 10 - 2013 : A5 - Security Misconfiguration OWASP Top 10 - 2017 : A6 - Security Misconfiguration

### Missing security header: Strict-Transport-Security

CONFIRMED

URL	Evidence
https://accounts.google.com/.well-known/security.txt	Response headers do not include the HTTP Strict-Transport-Security header

### ✓ Details

### Risk description:

The risk is that lack of this header permits an attacker to force a victim user to initiate a clear-text HTTP connection to the server, thus opening the possibility to eavesdrop on the network traffic and extract sensitive information (e.g. session cookies).

### Recommendation:

The Strict-Transport-Security HTTP header should be sent with each HTTPS response. The syntax is as follows:

Strict-Transport-Security: max-age=<seconds>[; includeSubDomains]

The parameter max-age gives the time frame for requirement of HTTPS in seconds and should be chosen quite high, e.g. several months. A value below 7776000 is considered as too low by this scanner check.

The flag includeSubDomains defines that the policy applies also for sub domains of the sender of the response.

#### Classification:

CWE: CWE-693

OWASP Top 10 - 2013: A5 - Security Misconfiguration OWASP Top 10 - 2017: A6 - Security Misconfiguration

# Server software and technology found

UNCONFIRMED 0

Software / Version	Category
➡ HTTP/3	Miscellaneous
♦ HSTS	Security

#### ▼ Details

#### **Risk description:**

The risk is that an attacker could use this information to mount specific attacks against the identified software type and version.

#### Recommendation:

We recommend you to eliminate the information which permits the identification of software platform, technology, server and operating system: HTTP server headers, HTML meta information, etc.

#### References:

https://owasp.org/www-project-web-security-testing-guide/stable/4-Web\_Application\_Security\_Testing/01-Information\_Gathering/02-Fingerprint\_Web\_Server.html

#### Classification:

OWASP Top 10 - 2013: A5 - Security Misconfiguration OWASP Top 10 - 2017: A6 - Security Misconfiguration

# Security.txt file is missing

CONFIRMED

### URL

Missing: https://accounts.google.com/.well-known/security.txt

### ▼ Details

### Risk description:

We have detected that the server is missing the security.txt file. There is no particular risk in not creating a valid Security.txt file for your server. However, this file is important because it offers a designated channel for reporting vulnerabilities and security issues.

### **Recommendation:**

We recommend you to implement the security.txt file according to the standard, in order to allow researchers or users report any security issues they find, improving the defensive mechanisms of your server.

### References:

https://securitytxt.org/

### Classification:

OWASP Top 10 - 2013: A5 - Security Misconfiguration OWASP Top 10 - 2017: A6 - Security Misconfiguration

# Website is accessible.

# Nothing was found for vulnerabilities of server-side software.

Nothing was found for client access policies.
 Nothing was found for use of untrusted certificates.
 Nothing was found for enabled HTTP debug methods.
 Nothing was found for secure communication.
 Nothing was found for directory listing.
 Nothing was found for missing HTTP header - Content Security Policy.
 Nothing was found for missing HTTP header - X-Content-Type-Options.
 Nothing was found for domain too loose set for cookies.
 Nothing was found for HttpOnly flag of cookie.
 Nothing was found for Secure flag of cookie.

### Scan coverage information

### List of tests performed (18/18)

- Checking for website accessibility...
- ✓ Checking for missing HTTP header Referrer...
- ✓ Checking for unsafe HTTP header Content Security Policy...
- Checking for website technologies...
- Checking for vulnerabilities of server-side software...
- Checking for client access policies...
- Checking for robots.txt file...
- ✓ Checking for missing HTTP header Strict-Transport-Security...
- Checking for absence of the security.txt file...
- Checking for use of untrusted certificates...
- Checking for enabled HTTP debug methods...
- Checking for secure communication...
- Checking for directory listing...
- ✓ Checking for missing HTTP header Content Security Policy...
- Checking for missing HTTP header X-Content-Type-Options...
- Checking for domain too loose set for cookies...
- Checking for HttpOnly flag of cookie...
- Checking for Secure flag of cookie...

### Scan parameters

https://accounts.google.com/v3/signin/identifier?

 $continue = https\%3A\%2F\%2F console.cloud.google.com\%2F project selector 2\%2F net-security\%2F securitypolicies\%2F list\%3F\_ga\%3D2.10069245.936492860.1607995107-securitypolicies\%2F list\%3F\_ga\%3D2.10069245.936492860.1607-securitypolicies\%2F list\%3F\_ga\%3D2.10069245.936492860.1607-securitypolicies\%2F list\%3F\_ga\%3D2.10069245.93649280.1007-securitypolicies\%2F list\%3F\_ga\%3D2.10069245.93649280.1007-securitypolicies\%2F list\%3F\_ga\%3D2.10069245.93649280.1007-securitypolicies\%2F list\%3F\_ga\%3D2.10069245.93649280.1007-securitypolicies\%2F list\%3F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F list\%3F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-securitypolicies\%2F\_ga\%3D2.1007-sec$ 

366914458.1596215128%26 pli%3D1%26 supported purview%3D project&followup=https%3A%2F%2F console.clouds and the project of th

ud.google.com%2Fprojectselector2%2Fnet-

Target: security%2Fsecuritypolicies%2Flist%3F\_ga%3D2.10069245.936492860.1607995107-

366914458.1596215128% 26 pli% 3D1% 26 supported purview% 3D project & if kv=ARZ0qKKTaE-toks and the project with the projec

DO9ilsa44Xnp7l5MmjBUcl0jJdMh7V99rrunjEjLAH6b8hngZJgU4jts1xyuQ3fozgQ&osid=1&passive=1209600&service=cloudconsole&flowName=GlifWebSignIn&flowEntry=ServiceLogin&dsh=S34306356%3A171078898953131

4&theme=glif&ddm=0

Scan type: Light Authentication: False

### Scan stats

Unique Injection Points Detected: 1
URLs spidered: 1
Total number of HTTP requests: 9

Average time until a response was

received:

69ms